NO
NEW
LEADERS

NO
NEW
GODS

Fred Allaback
Holland 1995
Utrech GC Session
Holland 1995

56th Seventh-day Adventist General Conference Session

Fred Allaback
7th-day Adventist Home Church
Creal Springs, IL

“As for my people...women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths.” Isaiah. 3:12.

As you already know, one of the big items on the agenda for discussion this General Conference Session is the ordination of women to pastoral ministry. The request for Women’s Ordination was voted by the North American Division Executive Committee and sent on to the General Conference Executive Committee’s Annual Council this past October. Annual Council members voted to refer this item to the present General Conference session for final decision. As a delegate, you will be called upon to vote for or against this important issue. DEAR READER, PLEASE DO NOT VOTE YES ON THIS ISSUE!

WHY THE BIG CHANGE IN LEADERS

Choosing leaders to conduct church worship services is an important responsibility. Adventists from all around the world are asking this same vital question: “Why is there such a big push from the N.A.D. to ordain women in the ministry?” Are there really dozens of local churches across North America who are eagerly chanting in unison: “We need ordained women pastors! We need ordained women Pastors!” Has the lack of ordained women pastors somehow frustrated the gospel commission? Has the second advent of Christ really been delayed as the result of some stubborn denominational unwillingness to officially ordain women? Or are there other reasons?

NOT TELLING WHY

During one of his presidential election campaigns Bill Clinton made a promise to Homosexuals. He promised them that if they would vote for him, he would pass legislation allowing them to enter military service. As you know, Bill Clinton was elected the United States President and he did seek to pass legislation allowing homosexuals to join the military with full benefits.

How was this bill worded? Did it say, “I, Bill Clinton really wanted to be president. I wanted all the power, prestige and authority that goes along with the job. I was willing to make any compromise and concession with special interest groups in order to get their vote. So please allow these homosexual men and women join the military because they voted for me.” Of course not! This bill talked about how we can’t “discriminate” and “equal rights” and all that, which was nothing more than rhetoric. The real reason was never stated in the bill itself. In a similar way, the real reasons why the N.A.D. is pushing so hard for the ordination of women are not being candidly stated nor addressed.

You are not going to hear from the platform this G.C. session: “The Seventh-day Adventist church needs to ordain women because all the other Protestant churches are doing it, and we want to win their favor and approval.” Nor will it be said: “If you other divisions only knew what pressures have been put on N.A.D. leaders by the large and vocal feminist movement within the Adventist church you would be more sympathetic toward our desire to ordain women.”

Instead, you will probably hear (as you have heard all year through the “Review”) how God’s Church is neither “male nor female,” (Gal. 3:28) “equal rights,” “we can’t discriminate” and how the ordination of Adventist woman has nothing to do with influences by the feminist movement etc.

BE LIKE THE OTHER CHURCHES

In his new book devoted to the subject, Seventh-day Adventist doctor U.J. Underwood reveals the reason why the ordination of S.D.A. women is such a big and urgent issue within the church today. Why do so many N.A.D. church leaders feel “compelled” to ordain women?

"In the 1970's the SDA denomination started to 'seriously' consider the role women could fill in the actual gospel ministry...One influence was that most other Protestant denominations were ordaining women to the gospel ministry by this time. How sad that the leaders of a denomination feel compelled to act only when other denominations proceed to do what is just." 3

The need to be like and accepted by the other Protestant denominations is a strong motivating factor compelling N.A.D. leaders to ordain women in pastoral ministry. Yet, is it really God who is influencing these other denominations to ordain women in the ministry, or is there another influence?

INFLUENCED BY FEMINISTS

Why are "most other Protestant denominations" pushing for the ordination of women?

"It is hard to believe that only in the 1970s did significant numbers of women feel that they were called by God to be ordained; or, even more unlikely, that God only chose to call women in the seventies...What made the 1970s watershed years was the occurrence of major social and cultural shifts following World War II, especially during the 1960s, making it possible for women to consider (or press for) ordained ministerial status as a way of responding to God's call...For one thing, there was the existence of a strong and vocal feminist movement pushing for changes, not only in the broader society, but also within the churches.

"Within the broader society the success of the feminist movement was aided by the passage of a number of federal laws regarding equality of opportunity, including the 1964 Civil Rights Act's Title VII, outlawing dis-crimination on the basis of sex... While the legislation did not extend to churches, it no doubt helped change perceptions about what constitute appropriate professions for women to enter, including the ordained ministry." 4

Here we see the strong influence of the feminist movement as the major factor influencing the Protestant denominations to consider the ordination of women. Many Protestant churches have been seduced to concede to many (if not all) of the feminists demands.
FEMINISTS FIGHTING FOR ABSOLUTE EQUALITY

The goals and objectives of the feminist movement are very simple. Feminists are fighting for absolute equality between men and women in everything: equal opportunity for employment, equal wages, equal authority in the home family, equal authority in the church family. Some advocates even encourage equal dress and appearance to men (unisex). The primary premise of the entire feminist (and ordination of women) argument is simple:

• 1) Aside from physical differences, men and women are absolutely equal.

• 2) Because men and women are absolutely equal; the Creator made no permanent role distinctions between men and women. If God did make any role distinctions between two beings who are absolutely equal, then they would be arbitrary role distinctions. God would be arbitrary, partial, or “sexist.”

• 3) Because men and women are absolutely equal; because the Creator made no role distinctions between men and women; therefore, role distinctions between men and women are the result of cultural influences and not intentionally designed by God Himself. These role distinctions are subject to change depending upon which society or era of time you live in and can be partially or fully interchangeable.

• 4) Those who do not believe that role distinctions between men and women can be partially or fully interchangeable must be old-fashioned at best, or bigoted, sex discriminators at worst.

This line of reasoning is logical and fully understandable. In fact, one could find no fault in it at all except: These premises and conclusions are not Biblical.

WOMEN HAVE NEVER BEEN THE FAMILY OR CHURCH LEADER

The Biblical testimony clearly reveals that:

• The family and church leader was not the woman at creation.
• The family and church leader was not the woman in the patriarchal church.
• The family and church leader was not the woman in the Old Testament Jewish church.
• The family and church leader was not the woman in the New Testament Christian church.
• The family and church leader was not the woman during the Protestant reformation.
• The family and church leader was not the woman during the early Adventist movement.
• The family and church leader was not the woman during past six thousand years of history.
• Women have only generally been accepted as the family and/or church leader in the United States for about the last twenty five years (see appendix p. 39).

ONE OF TWO CONCLUSIONS

The above facts leave us with one of two necessary conclusions.

1) God never intended women to assume authority over men by fulfilling the primary role of family and church leader. The exclusive male leadership role in the family and church is not merely a cultural preference but was ordained by God’s original design and magnified in consequence of sin.

2) Women have generally been denied their rightful position as family and church leader for the past six thousand years. Therefore, women have been wrongfully discriminated against since creation.

If conclusion number one be correct, it would be Biblically wrong to ordain women pastors in any division of the Adventist church. To do so would be disregarding and rebelling against God’s intended plan for family and church government and promoting the lies of Satan about God.

If conclusion number two be correct, it would only be right to ordain women as pastoral church leaders. Also, the church would be under obligation to apologize for waiting six thousand years to do so.

THE TERRIBLE IMPLICATION OF “ORDINATION”

It is relatively easy for feminists (and even many sincere church leaders) to agree that women have generally been denied their rightful position as family and church leaders for the past six thousand years. Yet few actually realize that secretly couched within this belief is a terrible implication about God. This terrible implication is that God Himself is partially if not fully responsible for this wrongful discrimination against women since creation.

Why has God waited six thousand years to “set the record straight” and give women their rightful place as “ordained pastors” within His church? While believing the feminist theory, God is unconsciously pictured like an arbitrary, partial, and bigoted sexist for tolerating (if not openly endorsing) throughout all history the exclusive male leadership in both family and church. Although unknowingly, the advocates of feminism and ordination of women are helping Satan perpetuate his lies about God. This is the reason why we must vote against each division having the authority to ordain women if they so choose.

LUCIFER- THE FIRST EQUAL RIGHTS LEADER

The first equal rights movement originated with a being called Lucifer. Lucifer is called the “son of the morning” (Isa. 14:12), implying that he was the first angel ever created. The word Lucifer means: “light-bearer.” This term is descriptive of his position in the government of God before he sinned. Lucifer’s job was to transmit the “light” (knowledge or messages) from God to all the universe. The word “angel” simply means “a messenger,” one who carries or delivers the “light” (knowledge or messages) or “sexist.” From here on, for tolerating (if not openly endorsing) throughout all history the exclusive male leadership in both family and church. Although unknowingly, the advocates of feminism and ordination of women are helping Satan perpetuate his lies about God. This is the reason why we must vote against each division having the authority to ordain women if they so choose.

Lucifer was created perfect (Ez. 28:15), and loved God with all of his heart before he rebelled against Him. So how did this most exalted angel fall into rebellion and sin?

“How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!” (Isa. 14:12). The rest of the verse tells us what Lucifer was thinking when he sinned against God: “For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven [achieve a more prominent position of authority], I will exalt my throne above the stars of God [the other angels will worship me]: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north [usurp the place of God’s throne]’ (Ps 48:2). I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High [God will equally share with me all the privileges, powers and prerogatives which He is unjustly withholding ...whether He likes it or not!” (Isa. 14:13,14. emphasis supplied).
From the previous text it is clear that Lucifer (like feminists) aspired to obtain a position in the government of God which he felt justly deserving of, yet was withheld from him. What caused Lucifer to begin his universal “equal rights movement?”

**3RD MEMBER OF THE CREATION COMMITTEE**

Lucifer’s rebellion originated because he was not allowed the “equal opportunity” of entering into the secret councils between God the Father and His Son. When God the Father said to His Son, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,” Lucifer became jealous of Christ (Gen. 1:26). While looking upon his own “beauty” and “bright-ness” Lucifer began to wonder why man should be made only in the image of only two (Father and Son) and not three? (Eze 28:17; Pr. 30:4). Lucifer accused God the Father of arbitrarily with-holding from him the position of equality with Christ during these creation counsels.

When Lucifer realized that humanity was to be created in the image and likeness of both the Father and Son (and not himself), his foresight envisioned the day when this new race would supercede the angelic capacity to manifest and reflect God’s character. Jealousy toward human beings began to bud in his mind as he visualized this new race exalted to a position of honor and authority far greater than himself; sitting beside Christ on the right hand of the Father’s throne. In other words, Lucifer recognized that human beings were destined to one day take over his job.

**3RD MEMBER OF THE REDEMPTION COMMITTEE**

When God the Father counseled with His Son about the redemption plan, Lucifer was again not invited to participate. Lucifer wanted to be included as the third member in the Father and Son committee (Zech. 6:12,13; Eph. 1:3-5).

Lucifer accused God the Father of injustice and partiality for including Christ, yet excluding him from these meetings. Therefore, although Lucifer was jealous of Christ’s position, his primary accusations were against God the Father. Since his initial rebellion in heaven, Lucifer has ever sought to be included in that council between them “Both.” Yet, because God has not and will not permit him this privilege, Satan strives to become the third member of this council within the minds of men.

**BY BEHOLDING HE BECAME CHANGED**

Because God did not voluntarily offer Lucifer the coveted position he desired, he began to doubt certain attributes of God’s character (i.e., His impartiality and justice). These initial doubts grew and affected other attributes of God’s character (His unsentiffish love). Lucifer was re-evaluating His prior perception of God’s character and contemplating the possibility that his previous perceptions of God were inaccurate at least or perhaps totally wrong at most. While God did not implant these doubts in Lucifer’s mind, He did provide the opportunity and the potential for them to exist (free will choice). Without the opportunity to doubt God’s character, love and obedience would be nothing less than a robotic reaction.

In John 8:44 Jesus tells us that the devil abode not in the truth. What was the truth Lucifer did not abide in? It was the truth about God’s righteous character! When Lucifer was not invited to participate as the third member among the secret counsel meetings between God and Christ (Zech. 6:12, 13), he entertained the idea that God was unjust, arbitrary and selfish in degree.

These doubts were not sin until Lucifer made a final decision to believe this false concept or mental picture of God through an act of faith (not having substantial proof his allegations were correct). All of Lucifer’s previous knowledge and experience with God became corrupted through this new concept of Him. Now, instead of his heart responding to God with gratitude, appreciation, love and adoration (“we love him, because he first loved us.”), he responded with resentment, distrust, jealously, hatred and revenge. In other words, “If God is really like this (unjust and selfish), how can I love Him with all of my heart, and how could I tell anyone else to do the same.” God’s close friend had become His “adversary.”

By beholding and accepting by faith this new and false concept of God, his mental and emotional faculties became transformed into the very same image of the “god” he was contemplating. Every one of the false attributes he projected upon his creator became assimilated into his own character through an act of faith. “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he...” (Proverbs 23:7).

**WHAT IS SIN**

“Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.” (Eze 28:15).

The definition of iniquity according to Strong’s #5766 means (moral) evil, perverseness, unjust, unrighteousness, wicked. The prime root word for iniquity in this passage is #5765 which means to distort (morally). “Distort” means: to misrepresent facts. “Moral” means “dealing with, or capable of distinguishing between, right and wrong.”

In other words, Lucifer was perfect until he misrepresented the facts about why God hadn't included him in the councils of creation, and chose to believe that God was morally wrong for excluding him.

“Yet he that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning.” (1Jn. 3:8). The Strong’s reference number for “sin” in 1Jn. 3:8 is #266 which (in Thayer’s Lexicon) is defined as, “an error of the understanding.” What was Lucifer’s erroneous understanding? Lucifer believed that there was something morally wrong with God's character—I.e., God is unfair. As long as Lucifer continued to cling to this erroneous misunderstanding about God, his heart would forever rebelliously respond with resentment and hatred toward Him.

**SIN IS A REACTION**

Once this principle is clearly understood, the term "sin" is viewed more correctly as a "reaction" rather than simply an "action." Transgression of the law is the natural reaction to the "God is wrong" perception of His character. It is this false perception of God, also known as the "carnal mind" (Rom. 8:7), that causes our "enmity against God" and unwillingness to be "subject" to His law. Therefore, the crucifixion of the carnal mind involves the crucifixion of those false perceptions about God that cause our rebellion against Him. This “change of mind” about God is also known as "repentance."

The major issue in the great controversy is not who is physically stronger, God or Satan; but rather who is telling the truth about the Father’s moral character (of which His law is a transcript). Christ, God’s only begotten Son presents to the universe one consistent view of His Father. Satan, on the other hand presents an opposing and contrasting conception of God. The battle in heaven between Christ and His angels and Satan and his angels was not fought with guns, tanks or missiles. The weapons used by both armies were theology. The difference was the ammunition.

Both sin in heaven and on earth was initiated through misrepresentations of the character of God. Through these same misrepresentations, sin has been successfully perpetuated on earth for the last six thousand years. Satan realized that if he could get the human race to believe his false conceptions of God, their hearts would respond toward Him in rebellion. He also realized that these false concepts of God consequently produce false motives for obedience; the result of which is a complete inability to obey
all temptations and sin. Thus, Satan successfully secures the worship and adoration of human beings to himself.

**LUCIFER AND THE "NEW THEOLOGY?"**

The word “theology” comes from the Greek word θεοσ, meaning God, and λογος, meaning discourse. “Theology” means the discourse or “study of God.” When Lucifer’s theology was based on accurate perceptions regarding God’s character, He could honestly say, as Jesus did, “I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart” (Psalm 40:8).

After Lucifer believed his own conjecture lie about God, his entire perception of Him radically changed. Lucifer now bent all of the energies of his mastermind to “enlightening” the rest of the universe with his “new theology” about God’s character. This is why Jesus calls Satan “the father of lies” (John 8:44).

What did Lucifer lie about? Lucifer lied about the righteous character attributes of God the Father! Lucifer, in so many words, told all the other angels that the Father was a withholding God; that He was stingy, unwilling to sacrifice and give. Lucifer suggested that God not only originated this suppressive government, but intended to continue His bigoted discrimination with increasing severity. He succeeded in seducing one third of God’s angels into believing that he should be exalted and worshipped along with the Father and Son; thus forming a co-equal TRINITY. It’s not just coincidental that Lucifer’s coveted position in God’s government (the third equal council member) happened to be the same number as the angels who believed and followed his lies.

It has been Satan’s object ever since that time to twist, distort and confuse our conception of God and the order of His government. Since Satan could not physically change this order in heaven he works to change it conceptually. In whatever form it may come, every false doctrine is intended and designed by Satan to accomplish one final goal—to make God’s character, law, and government appear faulty; thus attributing the cause of all sin and suffering to these deficiencies in God’s character.

If he can make people believe false concepts about God’s Character, Government and purpose for humanity, he has succeeded in rearranging God’s order in the minds of men and redirecting their worship and adoration from God to himself.

**TRUE CONCEPT OF GOD AND FALSE DOCTRINE**

It is a cause and effect principle; whatever our concept of God, our characters become transformed into the image of our conception. Like the chameleon’s skin, which changes its color in harmony with its surroundings; so our thoughts and feelings become assimilated to our mental conception of God’s character. However we believe God to think, feel, and act, our characters respond in accordance to the pattern we are beholding and accepting. When this principle is understood, we also begin to realize that every word and action of every rational human being is ultimately a response to their perception of Deity.

We also realize more clearly the mission and goal of Jesus, as well as Satan. The goal of Jesus is to clarify all misconceptions about the righteous character of God in order that we might love, serve and obey Him with all of our heart. The goal of Satan is to so confuse, blind, and obscure our perception of God in order to light and fuel rebellious reactions toward Him, and thus perpetuate sin indefinitely.

**SATAN CALLS YOU INTO “BABYLON”**

The word “Babylon” simply means confusion. This term is used by the inspired Bible writers to signify governmental and religious systems who are “confused” about God, and are consequently rebelling against His government.

Babylon is described as the “habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.” (Revel 18:2). The words “hold” and “cage” simply mean prison. What is the prison or cage that keeps people in mental “confusion”? This cage is false teachings or doctrines about God’s character and government. These false doctrines are also known as “the wine” which Babylon makes all nations drink (Revel 14:8; 17:2; 18:3).

From the beginning, the mission and purpose of Satan has been to make “all nations” drink of this wine (believe these false doctrines), so that humanity might forever remain confused about God, and there-fore, be slaves to sin (Rom. 6:16).

**THREE PARTS OF BABYLON**

Throughout history Satan has used three divisions of Babylon to promote his lies and misconceptions about God. The book of Revelation tells us that Babylon is “divided into three parts” (Revel 16:19). What are these three parts or divisions? *And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet* (Revel 16:13).

1) THE “DRAGON” = PAGANISM

The first division of Babylon is the pagan religions. The “dragon” is a symbolic title for Satan (Revel 12:9). Yet it is also applied to the pagan systems of religion through which Satan persecuted God’s people for centuries (Rev. 12:4). Every pagan religion after the flood originates from the ancient kingdom of Babel (Gen. 11). Because Satan is personified as the “king of Babylon” (Isa. 14:4,12), the beliefs of all pagan religions have been inspired by him.

Satan has in the past and is presently using these pagan religions to promote his confusing concepts about God. The concept of the Trinity God was first introduced through Paganism (Nimrod, Semiramis, Tammuz). Satan introduced this false teaching in order to distort God’s character of love, and to disprove God’s justice for not allowing him to be the third member in the councils between both God the Father and His Son (Zech. 6:13; Gen. 1:26). Through these pagan religions Satan began to confuse people with the erroneous idea of three co-equal beings who should be worshipped as one God.

2) THE “BEAST” = CATHOLICISM

The second division of Babylon which Satan used to confuse people about God is the “beast” or Roman Catholicism (Rev. 13:1-10). The Catholic church is noted for her amalgamation of paganism and Christianity. This can be clearly seen by Constantine’s continuous efforts to unite pagan practices with “Christian” terminology for the sake of “unity” throughout the empire.

In A.D. 321 Constantine issued the first Sunday law: “Let all judges and townspeople and occupations of all trades rest on the Venerable Day of the Sun [Sunday].” And of course, as Sunday observance was already widely recognized and revered by the pagan worshipers, this official sanctioning of their god’s day made them happy under any pretense. Yet the Catholic Church found it could convert even more pagans by substituting the titles Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in place of the pagan deities Nimrod, Semiramis, and Tammuz.

From the council of Nicea in 325 A.D. to the council of Constantine in A.D. 381 the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity evolved and became established into “the foundation of her whole dogmatic
system,” upon which “all other teachings of the Church” are based. 32 Those conscientious Christians who could not accept the Trinity doctrine were branded as “heretics” and punished severely by torture and even death.33

“The mystery of the Trinity is the central doctrine of Catholic faith. Upon it are based all the other teachings of the Church.” 34

“The Trinity is the term employed to signify the central doctrine of the Christian religion—the truth that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, these Three Persons being truly distinct one from another. Thus, in the words of the Athanasian Creed: ‘the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God.’...Yet, notwithstanding this difference as to origin, the Persons are co-eternal and co-equal: all alike are uncreated and omnipotent. This, the Church teaches, is the revelation regarding God’s nature which she proposes to man as the foundation of her whole dogmatic system.” 35

3) THE “FALSE PROPHET” = APOSTATE PROTESTANTISM

The third division of Babylon through which Satan has promoted his lies and confusion about God is the Protestant religions. The Protestant churches who broke away from the Roman Catholic Church during the reformation of the Sixteenth Century still believed many of the forms and creedal errors of the papacy. The doctrine of the Trinity as well as Sunday sacredness “mark” mainstream Protestantism under Rome’s authority. Why? Catholicism recognizes that these doctrines are not explicitly taught in the Scriptures, yet are accepted by tradition on the authority of early Catholic creeds.

“Our opponents sometimes claim that no belief should be held dogmatically which is not explicitly stated in scripture (ignoring that it is only on the authority of the Church we recognize certain Gospels and not others as true). But the Protestant churches have themselves accepted such dogmas as the Trinity for which there is no such precise authority in the Gospels.” 36

Interesting enough, the doctrinal errors developed first by the Papacy are some of the last to be recognized and renounced by Protestantism (i.e., Sunday sacredness, immortality of the soul, the Trinity). It is a recognized fact that the standard criterion for “orthodox” Protestantism is a firm and unyielding adherence to the doctrine of the Trinity. Those churches that do not accept the Trinitarian creed (i.e., Mormonism, Jehovah’s Witnesses, etc.), are considered by the Evangelical world to be a “cult.” While those churches who can adhere to the Trinitarian doctrine are accepted by the National and World Council of Churches.37

“Every cult, when confronting the doctrine of the Trinity, will often appeal to reason as the foundation for disagreement. This is natural because the Trinity may well be one of the most difficult concepts for the Christian to understand...Almost every cult denies the orthodox definition of the Trinity. Most Pastors avoid teaching on the Trinity because it is so complex, and many Christians simply do not understand it...”

“More than any other doctrine, the doctrine of the Trinity is a clear measure of cultic theology...A sure red light when discussing theology is the denial of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Most Christians are confused about it and therefore insecure about discussing it. The Trinity is difficult to understand and requires faith as well as submission to revelation...It might be puzzling after an extended discussion about the Trinity that I would personally not recommend that you discuss this doctrine at great length with a cultist.” 38

CHRIST CALLS US OUT OF “BABYLON”

Satan’s mission through these three divisions of Babylon (Paganism, Catholicism, and apostate Protestantism) is to confuse people with his false teachings about God and His government. These false teachings cage or imprison people in spiritual confusion and rebellion against God.

In contrast to Satan’s mission through Babylon, the mission of Christ and His church throughout the ages has been “to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound” by the cage of Satan’s lies about God (Isa. 61:1). Jesus said, “And ye shall know the truth” about the righteous character of my Father, “and the truth shall make you free” from Babylon’s confusion (John 8:32).

If Gods people are not united in our understanding of the nature, cause and perpetuation of the great sin problem (the diagnosis), we cannot and will not be united in our understanding as to its remedy (the solution or treatment). How does God terminate this great sin problem forever?

CLARIFICATION OF ALL MISREPRESENTATIONS

As the nature of the sin problem is the misrepresentation of God’s character, the remedy or solution is simply the complete clarification of all misrepresentations. This clarification is also called the “vindication” of God’s character. The greatest fear of Satan is that his misrepresentations about God might be understood and rejected, thus nullifying the power of all his temptations.

Therefore, the “gospel” or good news is “the righteousness of God revealed.” (Rom. 1:17). It is the clarification of Satan’s misrepresentations about God the Father. The mission of Christ to this world was to bring us this good news about His Father, that through a clarified “understanding” we might be conformed into His image once again.

“And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.” (1Jn 5:20).

“And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” (Jn 17:3) Therefore, every duty of the Christian life; justification, sanctification, victory over temptation, and character perfection—is vitally dependent upon a correct knowledge of God. This knowledge is not only our divine pattern, but also the motive onal key unlocking all binding hindrances to Christian victory.39 Jesus tells that this knowledge is eternal life (John 17:3). Jesus also warns us through the prophet Hosea that a willful ignorance or incorrect knowledge of God is eternal death: “there is no... knowledge of God in the land... My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee.” (Hosea 4:1,6).

THE PURPOSE AND MISSION OF GOD’S CHURCH

- God established the Jewish Church to clarify the misconceptions of God which Satan had promoted through the Pagan religions.
- God established the early Christian Church to clarify the misconceptions of God which Satan had promoted through Paganism and apostate Judaism.
- God established the Protestant Church to clarify the misconceptions of God which Satan had promoted through Paganism and Catholicism.

Yet none of these churches have fully and completely clarified all of Satan’s misconceptions and lies about God.

THE PURPOSE AND MISSION OF THE SECOND ADVENT MOVEMENT

God established the Adventist Movement of 1844 to fully clarify all the misconceptions of God which Satan advocated through
Paganism, Catholicism and apostate Protestantism. The scripture which above all others has been both the foundation and central pillar of the advent faith was the declaration, "unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (Daniel 8:14; G.C. 409).

In 1844, God purposed to build a church likened unto no other generation. Not only did God purpose to cleanse all sin from the record books of heaven; but also to cleanse His people “from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit....” (2 Cor.7:1).

Although the church of God in every generation has called people out of Babylon to worship God in spirit and in truth; God’s remnant church are privileged to make the last and final appeal to “come out” of Babylon (Rev. 18:4). This final appeal in made by lighting the earth with the knowledge of God’s wonderful and glorious character of love and justice, exposing the dark lies of Satan forever (Rev. 18:1; 14:7).

Many people believe that coming out of “Babylon” is merely leaving one religious organization and joining another. Yet, personal sin is a manifestation of confused ideas about God; therefore, leaving Babylon involves leaving the doctrines and beliefs that cause you to sin against Him. Overcoming all sin (character perfection Eph. 4:13) and fully coming out of Babylon are synonymous experiences. God’s people truly “come out of Babylon” when, and only when they fully overcome all sin (Rev. 14:4,5, 12).

The Great Second Advent Movement of 1844 was designed by God to re-emphasize the great gems of biblical truth which had been buried under rubbish of papal tradition and error. This was to be accomplished in order to fit His people with perfect-ion of character, vindicate His law before the world, and fully contrast the principles of His government with Satan’s.

The early Adventists recognized the doctrine of the Trinity to be rooted in pagan origins, established upon unscriptural foundations and promoted by Papal creeds, coercion and force.40 Because the early Adventist’s believed the Trinity to be a foundational teaching of Paganism, the Papacy and apostate Protestantism, they therefore classified it as part of the “Wine of Babylon,” along with Sunday sacredness and the immortality of the soul.41

Many articles were written against the Trinity doctrine by prominent leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. As a result of these books and articles against the Trinitarian doctrine, the Protastants classified Seventh-day Adventists as a non-Christian “cult.”42 Although some modern Adventist church historians have been reluctant to admit it (some even outright lying about it), yet, it is a documented fact that the Seventh-day Adventist Church did not believe and advocate the doctrine of the Trinity while Ellen White was still alive.43 So why did the Seventh-day Adventist denomination accept the false Trinity doctrine?

ARE WE JUST LIKE THE JEWISH CHURCH?

We can learn a lot today from the mistakes and failures of ancient Israel. Their purpose and mission was to spread the true knowledge of God to the whole world by precept and example. They were to counteract the lies about God promoted through the pagan religions.

Although God had separated them from the rest of the nations,44 distinguished them as His holy and peculiar people, and had given them his moral and civil law, they kept desiring to become like and accepted by the other non-commandment keeping nations.

God repeatedly told Israel not to make any covenant or agreement with these heathen nations because the association would eventually cause them to worship other gods (Ex. 23:32,33; Deu. 7:2-4).

• CHURCH GOVERNMENT:
  Selfish pride, the desire for acceptance and human praise motivated them to ask for a king so they could be “like all the nations” round about them (1Sam. 8:5, 20).

• WORSHIP LEADERS:
  Ancient Israel did not always follow God’s order for the priesthood either. King Jeroboam and his sons fired the Levites from their ministry in order to ordain priests after the manner of the heathen nations (2Chr. 11:14, 15; 13:9).

• WHEN WE WORSHIP:
  God commanded ancient Israel to observe the seventh-day Sabbath as a test to see if they would keep His law (Ex. 16:4,5, 26-28).

• WHO WE WORSHIP:
  In similar manner, Israel was commanded not to worship any other gods in order to see if they loved God with all of their heart (Deuteronomy 13:3).

THE GREAT SIN

Yet, the great compromise and sin of Ancient Israel was not when they adopted the pagan form of church government (visible, earthly king), although that was bad. The great compromise and sin was not when they incorporated some heathen rituals into their church worship services, (groves, high places, weeping for Tammuz etc.), although these were very bad. The great compromise and sin was not even when they fired God’s ordained priests in favor of ordaining those whom they wanted, although that was very, very bad.

The great compromise and sin of ancient Israel was in forsaking the One true God in order to worship the false gods of the heathen nations surrounding them. This was the root cause of all their other apostasy and rebellion. “And they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them” (Judges 2:12).

WHO WE WORSHIP

As already noted before, the type of church organization we have is important. HOW we worship is also very important. WHEN we worship is extremely important. Yet WHO WE WORSHIP is even more important than everything else combined! How we worship, where we worship, when we worship and why we worship result from our perception of Who we worship.

Ancient Israel had been repeatedly warned that there is only One true God in the universe and not to worship the gods of the heathen nations around them. “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one LORD...Ye Shall not go after other gods, of the gods which are round about you...” (Deuteronomy 6:4, 14).

Yet, in many instances their desire to be accepted and loved by these heathen nations even outweighed their love for God and His truth. Therefore, as opportunities arose the children of Israel combined the concepts of the true God (monotheism- ONE GOD) with the pagan philosophies of their gods (polytheism-many gods). This was done in order to be more accepted by the heathen nations; even under the pretense of being a better “witness” to these deceived souls. Although God had given all these specific and pointed warnings, time and time again ancient Israel “went and served other gods, and worshipped them, gods whom they knew not....” (Deuteronomy 29:26).

CHANGE IN GODS AFTER PROPHET DIES

Ancient Israel was also warned that when the faithful church leaders like Moses were dead, corrupt church leaders would encourage them to worship the gods of the surrounding nations.
“And the LORD said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and this people will rise up, and go a whoring after the gods of the strangers of the land, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake me, and break my covenant which I have made with them. Then thy anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them, and I will hide my face from them, and they shall be devoured, and many evils and troubles shall befall them; so that they will say in that day, Are not these evils come upon us, because our God is not among us?” (Deuteronomy 31:16,17).

MOSES AND ELLEN WHITE PREDICTED THE CHANGE IN GODS

Moses amazedly predicted that after his death, Israel would change its true concept of God, seek to worship the heathen gods, and consequently change their entire religion. Yet even more amazing is that Ellen G. White predicted that the Adventist denomination would do the same thing.

The “alpha” (or beginning of this change in Gods) began to grow while she was still alive. The “omega” (end of this change) is almost entirely complete and mature in our day. Ellen White predicted that after the accepting the “omega” false concept of God, denominational Adventism would gradually become a radical offshoot from the truth while still claiming to be God’s doctrinally pure “remnant church.”

“Living Temple contains the alpha of these theories. I knew that the omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people...The enemy of souls has sought to bring in the supposition that a great reformation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith, and engaging in a process of reorganization. Were this reformation to take place, what would result?

“The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. Our religion would be changed. The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization would be established. Books of a new order would be written. A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced. The founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful work. The Sabbath of course, would be lightly regarded, as also the God who created it. Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement. The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, but God being removed, they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. Their foundation would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure.” 45

WHAT IS THE “OMEGA” DOCTRINE

Most Adventists know that the “alpha” false doctrine (contained in the book “Living Temple” by J.H. Kellogg) was a “pantheistic” understanding about the presence and personality of God. Yet, most Adventists don’t know that J.H. Kellogg also believed and taught the false doctrine of the Trinity. Church leaders like G.I. Butler and A.G. Daniells (G.C. President) pleaded with Dr. Kellogg to give up his false Trinitarian belief. After all appeals for repentance had been in vain, Ellen White calls for all faithful Seventh-day Adventists to separate from J.H. Kellogg and his associates. 46

During these events, Ellen White predicted that the “omega” doctrine would be of a “most startling” nature. Notice this most solemn warning: “Be not deceived; many will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. We have now before us the alpha of this danger. The omega will be of a most startling nature.” 48 “Review” editor William G. Johnson candidly confesses what this “most startling” doctrinal change is.

“Some Adventists today think that our beliefs have remained unchanged over the years, or they seek to turn back the clock to some point when we had everything just right. But all attempts to recover such ‘historic Adventism’ fail in view of the facts of our heritage.

“Adventist beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of ‘present truth.’ Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Saviour and Lord. Many of the pioneers, including James White, J.N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and J.H. Waggoner, held to an Arian or semi-Arian view—that is, the Son at some point in time before the Creation of our world was generated by the Father...the Trinitarian understanding of God, now part of our fundamental beliefs, was not generally held by the early Adventists. Even today a few do not subscribe to it.” 49

Did you catch that? Ellen White predicted that the doctrinal “omega” of apostasy “will be of a most startling nature.” William Johnson in his Review article admits that the “most startling” doctrinal change in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is the doctrine of the Trinity.

HAVE WE CHANGED GODS?

“Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods?” (Jer. 2:11).

Ancient Israel “forsook the Lord God of their fathers...and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them,” (Judges 2:12). Sadly but truly, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination has done the same thing.

Yet, this new god is not called “Baal” as in ancient Bible times. We refer to our modern “philosophical idol” by the simple and orthodox name: “Trinity.” 50

Within the last 75 years after the death of Ellen G. White, the Seventh-day Adventist denomination has undergone drastic and major doctrinal changes in order to be accepted by the other Protestant denominations and not be classified by them as a “cult.” The greatest and most significant of these doctrinal changes is the God we worship.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church did not believe in the Trinity God until long after the death of Ellen G. White. As a result of this doctrinal change most Adventists today do not perceive God nor worship Him the same way as did the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. Even more startling is the fact that the founding fathers of the Adventist Church could not even be members within the denomination today. This proven and undeniable fact is the fulfillment of the prediction: “Our religion would be changed. The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error.” Famous author and Andrews University seminary professor George Night boldly admits this fact.

“Most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination’s Fundamental Beliefs.

“More specifically, most would not be able to agree to belief number 2, which deals with the doctrine of the Trinity. For Joseph Bates the Trinity was an unscriptural doctrine, for James White it was that ‘old Trinitarian absurdity,’ and for M.E. Cornell it was a fruit of the great apostasy, along with such false doctrines as Sunday keeping and the immortality of the soul.

“In like manner, most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would have trouble with fundamental belief number 4, which holds that Jesus is both eternal and truly God. For J.N. Andrews ‘the Son of God...had God for His Father, and did, at some point in the eternity of the past, have beginning of days.’ And E.J. Waggoner, of Minneapolis 1888 fame, penned in 1890 that ‘there was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God...but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite comprehension it is practically without beginning.’

“Neither could most of the leading Adventists have agreed with fundamental belief number 5, which implies the personhood of the Holy
Spirit. Uriah Smith, for example, not only was anti-Trinitarian and semi-Arian, like so many of his colleagues, but also like them pictured the Holy Spirit as “that divine mysterious emanation through which they [the Father and the Son] carry forward their great and infinite work.” On another occasion, Smith pictured the Holy Spirit as a “divine influence” and not a “person like the Father and the Son.”

THE TRINITY IS THE “NEW THEOLOGY”

Not only is Mr. Knight bold enough to admit that: “Most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination’s Fundamental Beliefs,” but he is candid and honest enough to label the Trinity doctrine as the “new theology” for Adventism. Notice his following confession:

“Theological change generally brings pain to those involved, but various individuals respond in different ways. Some, such as Andreasen, were able eventually to accommodate to the ‘new theology.’

“Others, however, found accommodation impossible. One such was J.S. Washburn, a retired minister who in 1939 published a pamphlet in which he noted that the doctrine of the Trinity was ‘a cruel heathen monstrosity,’ ‘an impossible, absurd invention,’ ‘a blasphemous burlesque,’ and ‘a bungling, absurd, irreverent caricature.’ Beyond that, it was a ‘Roman doctrine’ that was ‘seeking to intrude its evil presence into the teachings of the third angel’s message.’ Washburn also claimed that W.W. Prescott could not be a Seventh-day Adventist because he believed in the Trinity.

“One conference president was so impressed with the Washburn pamphlet that he ordered 32 copies to distribute to his ministers. Meanwhile, the Arian views set forth in Uriah Smith’s Daniel and the Revelation were not removed until the mid-1940s.”

HOW DO WE KNOW OUR ADVENTIST PIONEERS WERE NOT TRINITARIAN?

It can be demonstrated that the Seventh-day Adventist Church did not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity until long after the death of Ellen G. White. How can this be proven?

- 1) Many Seventh-day Adventist scholars, theologians and church historians candidly admit that early Adventists did not believe nor teach the doctrine of the Trinity. (see Appendix p. 42).

- 2). Every statement of Adventist belief was distinctly non-Trinitarian prior to the 1931 statement of beliefs and the 27 fundamental beliefs voted in 1980. (see appendix p. 45)

- 3) The personal letters, periodical articles, pamphlets and books written by Seventh-day Adventists prior to the death of Ellen G. White (1915) are distinctly non-Trinitarian. (see appendix p. 48).

WHY WERE THE ADVENTIST PIONEERS NOT TRINITARIAN?

The seventh-day Adventist pioneers did not believe the Trinity doctrine for the following reasons:

- 1) The Trinity doctrine is unscriptural (see appendix p. 46).

- 2) The Trinity doctrine is of Pagan origin. (appendix p. 46).

- 3) The Trinity doctrine is of Catholic origin. (appendix p. 47).

- 4) The Trinity doctrine degrades our understanding of the atonement and God’s great love through the redemption plan.

WHY DID THE ADVENTIST CHURCH BECOME TRINITARIAN?

It is no mystery to the studious, that the early Adventist pioneers were categorically anti-Trinitarian and the modern Seventh-day Adventist Church today is an “avowedly Trinitarian church.” Yet, another question has not been addressed nor answered: Why and how did this great doctrinal change come about? Why did the Adventist Church change its position on the Trinity?

The standard denominational answer is simply: “All the Adventist pioneers were wrong in their non-Trinitarian beliefs and teachings. Modern Adventism has changed its belief about the Trinity because of our great desire to spiritually advance in harmony with Biblical revelation.” Is this true? Let’s look at the big picture. Satan inspired and put pressure on the Pagan religions to teach the false Trinity concept of God. Satan inspired early Catholic-ism to compromise with Paganism and teach the false Trinity concept of God. Talk about pressure, all who did not doctrinally harmonize with the Catholicism were proscribed as “heretics,” persecuted, tortured and killed. The Catholic creed about the Trinity has remained the standard test of “orthodox” Christian faith for about the last seven hundred years.

The apostate Protestant Churches apply the Catholic Trinity doctrine as the main test of fellowship with other churches. Just about anyone who can subscribe to the “Trinity” is welcomed into ecumenical fellowship with open arms. At the same time, any church rejecting the Trinity doctrine is denounced and labeled by Evangelical Protestantism as a “dangerous cult.”

From its very beginning, the early Adventist Church did not accept nor promote the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. Therefore, from the very beginning Adventism has faced and battled incredible pressures from Catholic and apostate Protestant Churches to compromise and harmonize with them. Or...be labeled and stigmatized as a dangerous non-Christian “cult” forever!

Why do you think the Adventist Church is no longer classified as a “cult”? Is it because Catholics and Protestants have generally become more tolerant and sympathetic toward the Advent message? Or, is it because we have changed our message significantly enough to win their favor, approval and acceptance? Now you know the real reason why modern Adventism has changed its position regarding the Trinity.

TWO TERRIBLE IMPLICATIONS

The early Adventists were right in classifying the Trinity as part of Babylon’s “wine” or false doctrine; then this fact alone would reveal that modern denominational Adventism has lost its mission and message to the world, has joined with Catholic-ism and apostate Protestantism in promoting Satan’s lies about God, and has forfeited its biblical classification as the “remnant church” of Bible prophecy.

Why would this be true? Because the Biblical qualifications describing God’s “the remnant church” are:

1) The remnant church keeps all of the commandments of God (Rev. 12:17; 14:12). Is it possible to keep the first commandment while not honoring nor worshipping the true God?

2) The remnant church has the “faith of Jesus” (Rev. 14:12). Is it possible to have the “faith of Jesus” while trusting and worshipping a different God than Jesus did?

3) The remnant church proclaims the “everlasting gospel” (Rev. 14:6). Is it possible to preach the everlasting “good news” while preaching Satan’s lies about God?

4) The remnant church proclaims the first angel’s message: “Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of
his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” (Rev. 14:7). Is it possible to proclaim the first angel’s message while confused about the God you “fear,” “give glory to” and “worship?”

5) The remnant church proclaims the second angel’s message: “saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” (Rev. 14:8). Is it possible to warn the world not to drink Babylon’s “wine” (or false doctrine) while drinking it ourselves?

6) The remnant church proclaims the third angel’s message: “And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand...” (Rev. 14:9). Is it possible not to reverence Catholicism nor apostate Protestantism while believing and teaching their main and foundational false doctrine about God?

7) The remnant church has “no guile” in their mouth “for they are without fault before the throne of God.” (Rev. 14:5). Is it possible not to speak any guile or deceit while at the same time preaching serious lies about God? Is it possible to be “without fault,” to fully overcome all sin and character defects; while at the same time believing the very false concepts which cause that sin and rebellion against God?

THE BIBLE TRUTH ABOUT GOD THE FATHER?

SUMMARY

The Adventist pioneers understood the biblical definition of “one God” as referring to the one supreme being in the universe, namely--God the Father.

ONE GOD

1) NO BEGINNING. God the Father is the One and only being in the universe that has an absolute, past eternal existence. In other words, God the Father is the only being in the universe that did not have a beginning of any kind. God the Father is therefore the ultimate “Father” (meaning source or originator) of everyone and everything. "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him” (1 Cor. 8:6). The phrase “of whom are all things,” means He is the ultimate source or originator of everyone and everything.

Because God the Father is the source of everything, the Scriptures refer to Him as the only being in the universe who is the “One God and Father of all” (Eph. 4:6). If there was anyone in the universe that He was not the "Father" or originator of, then God the "Father" would not be the "Father of all."

As earthly children receive their name from the father, the "whole family in heaven and earth is named" after God the Father (Eph. 3:14,15). "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." (James 1:17).

2) IMMORTALITY. Because God the Father is the One and only being in the universe who never had a beginning of any kind, since He is the ultimate source or originator of everyone and everything; Therefore, He alone possesses non- conferred (no one gave it to Him) and absolute "immortality" (not subject to death).

This is why the Bible refers to God the Father as the One "Who only hath immortality" (1 Tim. 6:16). "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen." (1 Tim. 1:17).

This is also why it was possible for the Son of God to give up His immortality, become a man and die. Yet, it was not possible for God the Father to do this.

3) ONE SUPREME BEING. Bible writers consistently apply the term “One God” to God the Father in order to distinguish Him as the "only Potentate" (1 Tim. 6:15); the "One" who is "above all," (Eph. 4:6); the one and only supreme being in the universe. If there was anyone He was not "above" then He would not be "above all." This is why Bible writers call God the Father the "one God", or the supreme being in the universe.

"But to us there is but one God, the Father" (1 Cor. 8:6). "One God and Father of all" (Eph. 4:6). "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1Tim 2:5). "Thou believest that there is one God; thou dost well: the devils also believe, and tremble." (Jas 2:19). "Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith." (Rom. 3:30).

"That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 15:6). "...glorify your Father which is in heaven." (Mt. 5:16). "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort" (2 Cor. 1:3). "Therewith bless we God, even the Father" (James 3:9). "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth" (Mt. 11:25). "Grace to you and peace from God our Father," (Rom. 1:7; see also 1 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:2; Eph 1:2; Php 1:2; Col. 1:2; 1Th. 1:1; 2Th. 1:1; 2Th. 1:2; 1Ti. 1:2; Phm. 1:3). "...the blessed and only Potentate," (1Ti. 6:15).

God the Father is the "me" (not "us") of the first commandment. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." (Ex 20:3).

God the Father is the "one Lord" of Deuteronomy 6:4,5. "The LORD our God is one LORD (Dt. 6:4). "And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he..." ("he" "not them" Mk. 12:32).

Jesus Himself recognized God the Father as the "one God." "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God" (Mt. 19:17). "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God..." (Jn. 17:3).

God the Father will be recognized as the supreme being in the universe throughout all eternity. "And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one." (Zec. 14:9). "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father" (1 Cor. 15:24).

"And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. 15:28; see also 1 Cor. 15:24- 28).

TWO TRINITY EXTREMEs

There are two basic extreme positions in the doctrine of the Trinity: Modalism and tri-theism. These two positions are briefly described as follows.

• MODALISM: [One being with three modes of manifestation] This teaching states that God is “one” in substance, mind, intelligence and yet manifests Himself in three different roles, functions or “persons” [Father, Son, Holy Spirit]. According to Modalism (Sabellianism, Monarchianism) these titles are all synonyms referring to one being who is acting out the distinct roles of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
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• **TRI-THEISM**. [poly-theism] on the other hand teaches that there are three divine persons or beings who are called “one” because they all have the exact same divine attributes. In other words—Three Gods. The following quotation is another example of tri-theistic Trinitarianism.

Many people, “for example, think of God as a family of three, or as a committee that always votes unanimously.”

---

**THE NEW THEOLOGY ABOUT GOD THE FATHER**

**SUMMARY**

Having briefly mentioned the two extremes of the Trinity doctrine, it may be well to ask the question, “What is the current position of The Seventh-day Adventist Church on the Trinity?” The current S.D.A. position on the Trinity bounces like a ping pong ball between the two extremes of Modalism and tri-theism [depending on which “theologian” you’re talking with], yet the official position of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is tri-theism (three Gods).

In contrast to the Historic Adventist position that the “one God” is the Father, the new theology definition of “one God” is: Three supreme beings (God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit) who are called “one” because they are united in character, purpose, and action. According to this view it takes all three Gods to make up “one God.” Statement number two of the 27 fundamental beliefs states it thus:

“There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unit of three co-eternal Persons. God is immortal, all-powerful, all-knowing, above all, and ever present. He is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known through His self-revelation. He is forever worthy of worship, adoration, and service by the whole creation.—Fundamental Beliefs, 2” (S.A.B. p. 16)

Statement #2 of the 27 fundamental beliefs erroneously teaches that the Bible term “one God” actually means:

• Three beings who are: “co-eternal” (the exact same age)
• Three beings who are: "immortal" (never subject to death)
• Three beings who are: "all-powerful"
• Three beings who are: "all-knowing"
• Three beings who are: "above all" (supreme)
• Three beings who are: "ever present" (omnipresent)
• Three beings who are: "infinite." (no limitations)
• Three beings who are: "worthy of service" by the whole creation
• Three beings who are: "worthy of worship" by the whole creation
• Three beings who are: "worthy of adoration" by the whole creation

**THREE SUPREME GODS**

Statement #2 of the 27 fundamental beliefs distorts and destroys the scriptural concept of one sovereign and supreme being in the universe (God the Father), who is the source of all life and power. This new theology teaches that “one God” means: A committee of three supreme beings who equally share final authority. This theology confuses people as to “Who” they worship, pray to, repent toward, and have faith in. This teaching also gives Satan what he wanted in heaven: Three beings who counsel together and share final authority (Zech. 6:12,13; Pro. 30:4; Gen. 1:26).

“While the Godhead is not one in person, God is one in purpose, mind, and character. This oneness does not obliterate the distinct personalities of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Nor does the separateness of personalities within the Deity destroy the monotheistic thrust of Scripture, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God.” (S.A.B. pp. 22,23)

One must blatantly ignore and twist the plain meaning of Scripture in order to conclude that the Biblical definition of “one God” means “Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” Please notice how confusing it would be to read the Bible according to this new definition of one God. “For there is one God, [Father, Son and Holy Spirit] and one mediator between God [the Father, Son and Holy Spirit] and men, the man Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 2:5, emphasis supplied).

Notice the following erroneous definition of the "one Lord" in Deuteronomy 6:4.

“The Three Persons of the Trinity are clearly revealed, not only in these opening verses of the Bible story but also in many other places in the Scriptures. In fact, the very text so often quoted by those who try to prove God in the singular actually proves the very opposite. In Deuteronomy 6:4 we read, ‘Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.’ The word Lord is used here in the plural form. A literal translation would be: ‘Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our Gods is one Jehovah.’”

“...the Godhead is made up of three different and distinct Gods; God—the Father, God—the Son, and God—the Holy Ghost!”

**CONFUSES OUR PRAYER AND WORSHIP**

The new theology interpretation of “one God” confuses our supreme object of prayer, worship, and praise. This confusion is accurately illustrated by the following statement:

“Most Christians refer to God as ‘he,’ and mean thereby sometimes the Father, sometimes the Son, sometimes the Spirit, but more often all of them in a generalized way and thus none of them specifically.”

Because of this false understanding, it is virtually impossible to observe the single most important commandment in the whole Bible; nay, rather the whole world and entire universe: “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD: And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.”

This commandment is stating that there is only one God as the supreme being in the universe, and you are to love this one God “with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.” In order to bestow supreme love and consequently render supreme obedience, we must first know "who" this someone is.

Jesus, in the Gospels tells us very clearly who this "One" is. The reason why Jesus knows and can tell us, is because this someone happens to be the same "One" whom Jesus Himself loves with all of His heart, soul and might. It is the same "One" whom Jesus came to reveal to this world, “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God...I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world” (Jn. 17:3, 6).

“And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment...

“...the Godhead is made up of three different and distinct Gods; God—the Father, God—the Son, and God—the Holy Ghost!”

“While the Godhead is not one in person, God is one in purpose, mind, and character. This oneness does not obliterate the distinct personalities of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Nor does the separateness of personalities within the Deity destroy the monotheistic thrust of Scripture, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God.” (S.A.B. pp. 22,23)

One must blatantly ignore and twist the plain meaning of Scripture in order to conclude that the Biblical definition of “one God” means “Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” Please notice how confusing it would be to read the Bible according to this new definition of one God. “For there is one God, [Father, Son and Holy Spirit] and one mediator between God [the Father, Son and Holy Spirit] and men, the man Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 2:5, emphasis supplied).
sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." 61

Who was Jesus telling the scribe to love with all of his heart, soul, and strength? Please notice the scribe's response, "Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he [not you]: And to love him [not you] with all the heart," etc. [emphasis supplied]. Clearly then, Jesus applied the "one Lord" of Deuteronomy 6:4 to His God and Father in heaven. Ellen White understood this principle when she wrote:

"The Son of God came to this earth to reveal the character of the Father to men, that they might learn to worship Him in spirit and in truth" (CT-p. 28,29).

Yet instead of following the example of Jesus, modern Adventism is not teaching people to worship "only true God, and Jesus Christ" whom He sent (Jn. 17:3). Instead, Seventh-day Adventist Church leaders are teaching people to worship the "Holy Triad."

"To worship the Holy Triad is no violation of the first commandment... Whether it be the Father, the Son or the Holy Spirit, fellowship with any one of these three is equally extraordinary." 62

THE BIBLE TRUTH ABOUT
THE SON OF GOD

SUMMARY

The Adventist Pioneers believed that in the eons of eternity only one divine being existed. Then, this one divine being had a Son. Not a son by creation, nor by adoption but a Son begotten in the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of the Father's person (Heb. 1:3). The Father's only begotten Son was a duplication of Himself. The Adventist pioneers did not try to explain when or how this process of begetting or birth occurred, yet emphatically maintained the literal Sonship of Jesus prior to his incarnation and birth in Bethlehem.

The Adventist Pioneers believed that while the Son of God shares an equality of nature, divine glory and honor with His Father, all these divine attributes were initially "given" (or "inherited" Heb. 1:4) to the Son by God the Father. It is for this reason that the Son of God is, and always will be, subject unto His Father, even after the millennium and throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. (Jn. 5:19, 26; 6:57; 14:28; 1 Cor. 11:3; Heb. 1:9; 1 Cor. 15:23-28).

The initial false premise of the new theology about the Trinity (three beings the exact same age, one did not exist before, nor derive any attributes from the other), has consequently resulted in a false conclusion which denies that Christ is the "Son of God" prior to His incarnation.

This false conclusion is stated thus: "Yes, the Bible speaks of Christ as the 'Son' of God, but that's only after He came to this earth. The Son didn't become a Son until after He was incarnated." The "new theology" teaches that the Biblical terms "Father" and "Son" are merely titles to help us humans understand the "economy of function" or role which deity acted out; thus virtually deceiving mankind with terminology designed not to reflect their actual relationship.

This theology concludes with a belief that when God gives us His Son, instead of giving up a relationship that was once a literal part of Himself, He is giving us someone other than Himself, thus not giving of Himself at all. With this understanding, people are left without the know-ledge of the supreme sacrifice and love of our heavenly Father. Therefore, hearts respond to God according to this devalued estimation of His sacrifice and gift to them.

THE SON OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Old Testament Bible writers understood that there is one God who had a Son before this earth even existed.

MOSES KNEW

Moses understood that God the Father had a Son before His incarnation when he wrote: "And God [the Father] said [to His Son], Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" (Gen. 1:26 emphasis supplied). The human race consists of one, who became two, yet through marriage become one (in mind, character and purpose) again.

The new theology about the Trinity understands this Bible passage thus: "The origin of the human race is found in a divine council. God said, 'Let Us make man' (Gen. 1:26). The plural 'Us' refers to the trinitarian Godhead -- God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit (see chapter 2 of this book)." SAB- 80. “Just as Father, son, and holy spirit are God, male and female together are to make up 'man.'” SAB-296.

The above concept completely confuses the origin and nature of humanity. If the trinity created man, he must also be created in the "image" and the "likeness" of the trinity. Yet the human race is two, not three. Who was it that became jealous be-cause humanity was going to be made in the "image and likeness" of only two? The new theology teaches man was created in the image of "three."

SOLOMON KNEW

Solomon understood that God the Father had a Son by whom He created all things. "Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name, and what is his son’s name, if thou canst tell?" (Pro. 30:4).

Solomon also wrote one of the most beautiful passages in the Bible concerning the relationship of the Father and His Son. In Proverbs chapter eight, the Son of God is talking about His relationship with His Father before the creation of this earth. 63


23 I was set up [anointed] from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.

24 When there were no depths, I was brought forth [born]; when there were no fountains abounding with water.

25 Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth [born]:

26 While as yet he [the Father] had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.

27 When he [the Father] prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth:

28 When he [the Father] established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep:

29 When he [the Father] gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth:

30 Then I was by him [the Father], as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;

31 Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men." [emphasis supplied].
BEFORE CREATION I WAS BORN

The Hebrew translation for the words "brought forth" in verses 24 and 25 of Proverbs eight, is #2342 in the Strong’s Concordance. This same Hebrew word is translated in other texts using different English words. For example:

- Calve- (Job 39:1) “canst thou mark when the hinds do calve?”
- Shapen- (Psa. 51:5) “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.”
- Bare-(Isaiah 51:2) “Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you.”
- Travail-(Isaiah 54:1) “break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that diest not travail with child”

All these translations for “brought forth” mean one and the same thing: to be born or begotten. Proverbs chapter eight is one of the main Scriptures from where the New Testament Bible writers get the concept and term "only begotten Son of God."

Some might be tempted to say, “this passage is not talking about the Son of God, but rather the personification of wisdom.” Yet, Paul clearly understood who the “wisdom” of the Father was when he wrote: “But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God...But of him are ye in Christ Jesus who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption” (1 Cor. 1:24, 30).

KING DAVID KNEW

King David understood that God the Father had an only begotten Son before Bethlehem for he wrote: “The LORD [God the Father] said unto my Lord [the Son of God], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool” (Psalms 110:1; emphasis supplied).

KING NEBUCHADNEZZAR KNEW

Hundreds of years before Jesus was born in Bethlehem, the king of Babylon understood that God the Father had a Son. Nebuchadnezzar said: “I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God” (Dan. 3:25).

How did this heathen ruler hear about God’s only begotten Son? Undoubtedly because Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego told him. 84

MICAH KNEW

Micah 5:2 is one of the most popular prophecies concerning the Son of God.

Ironically enough, the very text that people quote most often in order to prove Christ’s absolute co-eternity with the Father actually proves the opposite.

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” (Micah 5:2).

People misinterpret this text to mean: Christ existed “from everlasting” as a separate being from God the Father, and therefore cannot be a “literal Son” in any sense of the term. The Hebrew word for “goings forth” (Strong’s #4163) actually means “origin.” This text literally reads, “whose origin (beginning or birth) have been from of old, from everlasting.”

JESUS KNEW HE WAS THE SON OF GOD BEFORE BETHLEHEM

Did Jesus actually understand that He was God’s Son before the creation of the world and His incarnation at Bethlehem?

“Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication (like you); we have one Father, even God. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me” (Jn. 8:41, 42).

“For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. (1) I came forth from the Father, (2) and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father. His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God. Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe?” (Jn. 16:27-31, emphasis supplied).

“For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them; and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.” (Jn. 17:8).

The words “proceeded forth,” “come out,” “came forth,” “came forth” and “came out” all have the same Greek translation. The reference number in the Strong’s is #1831 which means “to issue from” or “to come out of.” What a mysterious yet glorious truth! Jesus said, I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world” (Jn. 16:28). Undoubtedly, the beloved disciple John took Christ’s words seriously because he states the same truth in these words, “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.” (1 Jn. 4:9).

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE?

The early Adventist Pioneers not only believed that the Father had a literal Son prior to the incarnation at Bethlehem, but they also realized this concept to be the foundational belief upon which the rest of the gospel is built.65—For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” (1 Cor. 3:11).

Notice that this foundation is not just an affirmation that Jesus is the anointed one (or Christ), but that He is the “Son” of the living God. “And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Jesus replies to Peter, “flesh and blood hath not revealed it [this concept] unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven,” “and upon this rock [confession of the concept that Jesus is the “Son of the living God”] I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” (Mt. 16:16-18; emphasis supplied).

This was the foundation of the gospel message that Jesus preached to Nicodemus: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, whomsoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (Jn. 3:16). Some might be tempted to say, “that verse is saying Jesus is God’s Son after His incarnation, not before He came to this world.” Yet the next verse emphasizes the point even more clearly. “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world” (vs. 17). It is very simple and designed to be understood. God the Father did have a Son to send into the world!

FAITH IN GOD’S “SON”

Who is this lost world presented as the great object of faith? Jesus, only a good man (J.W.’s & Unitarians)? Jesus, the supreme God (Trinitarians)? Or Jesus, the “only begotten Son of God” (the Scriptures)?
“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.” (John 3:36).

“Jesus...said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God?” (John 9:35). “And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” (Acts 8:37).

“And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God.” (Acts 9:20). “But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.” (John 20:31). “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.” (1 Jn. 4:15). “These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.” (1 Jn. 5:13).

God the Father Himself presents the great object of our faith in these words, “I will send my beloved Son: it may be they will reverence him when they see him.” (Lk. 20:13). “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.” (Mt. 17:5).

Please notice that in all these confessions of faith, one is not required to acknowledge “Jesus as the second member of the adorable Trinity,” or “Jesus the supreme God.” The true confession of faith in Christ’s divinity is consistently expressed in terms denoting His highest and most exalted nature, “the only begotten Son of God.”

Why is it so important to believe that Jesus is really the Son of God the Father before He came to this earth? During His rebellion, Lucifer accused God the Father of being selfish and unjust for not permitting him to attend the secret councils between Him and His Son.66 The human race believed Satan’s accusations about God.

God the Father responds to Satan’s accusations and the sinful rebellion of humanity by demonstrating the righteous attributes of His character (Self-sacrificing love and justice). When this demonstration of God’s love and justice is accepted by faith, it produces the true and only effectual motivation for consistent repentance and obedience. This heart response is a deep appreciation, gratitude and love for what God has done for us.67

How did God the Father manifest His great redemptive character of love toward us?

“In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” (1 Jn. 4:9,10).

How did God manifest His great love for you? He gave you His only begotten Son! When God gave His only begotten Son to forever become a part of humanity, to pay the penalty of our sins by dying a cruel death, He gave you the greatest manifestation of His love He could ever give. The infinite love of the Father as manifested through the life and death of His only Son, is the Father’s greatest argument against the false accusations of Satan.68

The Father gave up His most valuable, precious relationship. He was willing, and even happy to go through all the suffering and trauma of giving up His only begotten Son so we can live with Him forever. The apostle Paul explains the Father’s great sacrificial love in these words:

“He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?” (Rom. 8:32). Why was our heavenly Father willing to give such a great sacrifice? The only answer must be that the Father’s love for us is proportionate to His love for Christ.

More than anything else, Satan does not want us to understand the true relationship between God the Father and His only begotten Son (both before and after the incarnation). Why? Because our estimated value of the gift given, determines the amount of appreciation and gratitude toward its giver. Our hearts respond to God with gratitude, love, appreciation, and obedience; in proportion to our estimated value of His sacrifice and price paid in order to redeem us.69 The following is a simple illustration of this principle.

- If God gave %100 = Our appreciation is %100
- If God gave %75 = Our appreciation is %75
- If God gave %25 = Our appreciation is %25

When we understand more clearly the relationship between God the Father and His only begotten Son, then we will better understand and appreciate the infinite sacrifice they were willing to make for our redemption. Let us now examine the two popular false concepts of the Father/Son relationship and the devastating effects of both.

**A CREATED “SON”**

If the “Son” of God had no pre-existence prior to the incarnation, or was merely a created angelic being, if He was inferior in nature to the Father; then what did God the Father give or sacrifice as our redemption price? He gave His beloved inferior created being, someone less than Himself. Since this created “Son” would be not only inferior to the God the Father but inferior to the law of the Father as well, His sacrificial death on the cross would be of insufficient value to pay the penalty for sin. It would be a human sacrifice only.70 If this is true, then God the Father did not risk a thing!

**A TRINITARIAN “SON”**

The doctrine of the Trinity completely negates, confuses, and prevents people from obtaining a proper understanding of the Father’s infinite sacrifice in giving His only begotten Son.

If the “Son” of God prior to the incarnation was not really a literal Son at all, but rather a co-eternal “Partner.” If the “Son” of God had no literal origin of existence from His Father in any sense of the term, then what did God the Father give or sacrifice as our redemption price? He gave nothing!

Although this “Son” would be equal in character and nature with the Father, the Father would be giving someone other than Himself. It would be the Father’s co-eternal, co-equal “Partner” that would be doing all the sacrificing and giving. Yet, since the eternal God can’t die, then only a human body died on the cross while the Father’s co-eternal “Partner” retained a separate existence until He resurrected himself. Again, if this be true, it would be a human sacrifice only.71 God the Father did not risk a thing!

**THE “ONLY BEGOTTEN SON”**

If the “Son” of God prior to His incarnation was actually a literal Son in relation to His Father, born with the very substance, nature and Spirit of His Father; then what did God the Father give or sacrifice for our redemption price? He Gave Himself! God the Father had in His Son denied Himself, giving Himself for the sins of the world be- cause He loved mankind.72

Understanding and believing this truth is God’s ordained remedy and eternal solution to the great sin problem. This simple truth is the argument disproving Satan’s countless accusations against God the Father.73 All Satan’s temptations fall powerless against the people who are founded and built upon this rock.74

If the Son of the Father had not been a literal Son, (an actual division of the very person of God the Father), but rather a co-equal, co-eternal “Partner,” or an inferior created “Son” (or angel), then the Father could not, and would not have demonstrated His willingness to deny Himself, suffer Himself, and give Himself as a sacrifice. At the cross, God demonstrated His willingness to lay
down His own immortal life in order to redeem his fallen creation. This type and quality of love could only be demonstrated through the gift of His only begotten Son.

This was the only way the Father could:

- 1) Satisfy the demands of His broken law, while providing pardon for its transgressors.
- 2) Redeem back the supreme love, loyalty, and allegiance from His creatures forever. With this understanding, the dreadful, yet glorious reality begins to dawn upon our consciousness: God the Father was willing to save us at any cost to Himself. He placed the eternal success or failure of His entire government upon the shoulder of His Son (Isa. 9:6). The Father risked eternal separation from His only begotten Son. He was willing to give and risk all, His throne, all creation, His universe, EVERYTHING ...for you!

“He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” (Rom. 8:32).

“The Lord God of heaven collected all the riches of the universe, and laid them down in order to purchase the pearl of lost humanity. The Father gave all His divine resources into the hands of Christ in order that the richest blessings of heaven might be poured out upon a fallen race. God could not express greater love than He has expressed in giving the Son of His bosom to this world. This gift was given to man to convince him that God had left nothing undone that He could do, that there is nothing held in reserve, but that all heaven has been poured out in one vast gift. The present and eternal happiness of man consists in receiving God's love, and in keeping God's commandments. Christ is our Redeemer. He is the Word that became flesh and dwell among us. He is the fountain in which we may be washed and cleansed from all impurity. He is the costly sacrifice that has been given for the reconciliation of man. The universe of heaven, the worlds unfallen, the fallen world, and the confederacy of evil cannot say that God could do more for the salvation of man than He has done. Never can His gift be surpassed, never can He display a richer depth of love. Calvary represents His crowning work. It is man's part to respond to His great love, by appropriating the great salvation the blessing of the Lord has made it possible for man to obtain. We are to show our appreciation of the wonderful gift of God by becoming partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. We are to show our gratitude to God by becoming a coworker with Jesus Christ, by representing His character to the world.”

ABRAHAM AND ISAAC

The classic illustration of the above stated principles was the fearful test given to Abraham. Isaac was Abraham's pride and joy, his love for his son surpassed his love for all other human beings. Abraham watched Isaac grow from a child to a youth and then to a young adult. Then one day God spoke to Abraham and said, “Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.” (Gen 22:2). Had not God promised him this son? Did not God promise that Isaac's children would be “a great and mighty nation?” (Gen. 18:18). Then why would God ask him to sacrifice and give up his only son of promise?

Grief and pain pierced Abraham's heart. How could he give up his most valuable, precious relationship in the whole world? How could he give up his only son? How could he watch him suffer and die? Abraham's test was the most severe that could come to a human being. After the last words of love are spoken, the last tears are shed, the last embrace is given. The father lifts the knife to slay his son, believing “that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead” in order to fulfill the promises to him (Heb. 11:19). Then, Abraham's hand is stopped by a voice from heaven saying, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from Me."

If Abraham were asked to sacrifice his nephew "Lot," “Ishmael” or anyone else, would his mental and emotional anguish have been the same? Would his “self-sacrificing” love toward God have been tested and demonstrated to the same degree, if anyone other than “Isaac” was bound under the shadow of that dreadful knife clutched in his quivering hand? By experiencing this agonizing trial, Abraham better understood the great love and the infinite sacrifice made by our heavenly Father in giving His only begotten Son.

Like Abraham, the Father in heaven suffered tremendous mental and emotional anguish when He decided to give His only begotten divine Son to become a man, suffer humiliation, pain and death— at the risk of eternal loss. The Father was willing to sacrifice and risk all of heaven in order to pay the penalty for our sins and unite us back into the heavenly family once again. He gave all that He could give!

This type of self-sacrificing love, and the quality of its demonstration, could not have been revealed if the “Son” of God was merely an inferior creation, or an absolute co-eternal “Partner” and therefore not really His “Son” at all. Either of these two extremes greatly depreciates our estimated value of the Father’s sacrificial gift, and our corresponding appreciation of it.

THE CROSS AND THE REVELATION OF GOD THE FATHER

Paul clearly understood the Son of God to be the perfect representative and reflection of the thoughts, feelings, and actions of God the Father. Because of this, when Paul beheld Jesus lifted up on the cross, he didn’t just see Jesus, but the Father Himself crucified with His Son. Not that the Father died physically, but rather His message on the cross was a revelation of the eternal, unselfish principles of His character. God through Christ has declared that He will serve even the creatures He has made, no matter what the personal inconvenience, pain and suffering to Himself. He is willing to serve and save man at any cost to Himself.

God had declared before sin ever entered, that this was what He would do as the outworking of His nature. When rebellion arose, then that declaration was tested to the uttermost. God the Father in Christ has demonstrated that He is true, that He is motivated by the principle of unselfish service to others no matter what the cost to Himself. Not only on Calvary, but at every step towards that pivotal point in eternity, Jesus lived out the principle of serving with no regard of the cost to Himself. Therefore, the crucifixion was nothing new to Him. It was but the ultimate confirmation of what He had lived from eternity and the way He would live forever more.

THE CROSS AND THE REVELATION OF SATAN

Just as Calvary was nothing new for Christ, it was nothing new for Satan either. At the cross Satan manifested the principles that were the foundation of his rebellious thinking in heaven. At the cross we beheld the character of Satan and sin for what it really is. We see that there is no length to which he will not go, no suffering he will not cause, no price that he will not exact, even taking the life of the very one who gave him life and everything he ever had. Satan made the life of Christ as costly as possible through personal inconvenience, suffering, pain, humiliation, rejection, deprivation of comfort, security, and merchandise. On Calvary, Satan demonstrated to every creature in the universe what he would do to them if they did not pay the price whereby he could have the best for himself. Every person, system, and organization which has followed his leadership operates under the same principles to whatever extent they have the power to enforce their will.
The new theology (as defined in the 27 fundamental beliefs), has redefined the Biblical term “one God” to actually mean three coexistent, co-equal and supreme beings—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.

This initial false premise has consequently caused an even greater error, which in turn distorts and confuses the entire plan of redemption: A denial of the literal Father Son relationship. The new theology believes that the terms “Father” and “Son” are not reflective of any literal Father/Son relationship because: Father, Son and Holy Spirit are the exact same age. Therefore, One did not derive any existence or divine attributes from the other. The following is a description of the logical conclusions resulting from this false definition of the “one God.”

The “new theology” teaches that if there are three “co-eternal” beings in the absolute sense of the term; then each of these three are exactly the same age.

“...the first advent of Christ gives us a much clearer insight into the triune God. John’s Gospel reveals that the Godhead consists of God the Father (see chapter 3 of this book), God the Son (chapter 4), and God the Holy Spirit (Chapter 5), a unity of three co-eternal persons having a unique and mysterious relationship...” (S.A.B. p. 23).

The “new theology” teaches that if each are the exact same age, then they must also be absolutely “co-existent”- one did not exist before the other.

“...Sinners will never comprehend what Jesus’ death meant to the Godhead. From eternity He had been with His Father and the Spirit. They had lived as co-eternal, coexistent in utter self-giving and love for one another...” (S.A.B. p. 23).

The “new theology” teaches that if each did not exist before the other, then each must have always been absolutely “self-existent;” they did not depend upon, nor derive any existence or divine attributes from the other.

“The Father, Son, and Spirit are equally self-existent.” (S.A.B. p. 61).

The “new theology” teaches that if each of these three are the exact same age, one did not exist before the other, they did not depend upon, nor derive any existence or divine attributes from the other; then they all must be absolutely “co-equal;” each innately possessing all the attributes and authority of divinity.

“Though each is equal, an economy of function operates within the Trinity (see chapter 2 of this book).” (S.A.B. p. 61).

In conclusion to the false premises stated above: If Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all absolutely “co-eternal,” “co-existent,” “self-existent,” and “co-equal,” then the titles Father, Son, and Holy Spirit must merely reflect roles or functions which they decided to act out in order to fulfill the redemption plan.

“The term Trinity is applied to the Christian doctrine of God...It may be inferred from the Scriptures that when the Godhead laid out the plan of salvation at some point in eternity past, They also took certain positions or roles to carry out the provisions of the plan.”

Do you realize what the above statement is saying? It is saying that before sin ever existed, “a divine committee” of three decided who would act out, or pretend to be the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The following quotation is another accurate example of this false and deadly theology.

“Within the Godhead an economy of function exists...The Father seems to act as source, the Son as mediator, and the Spirit as actualizer or applier...In the economy of function, different members of the Godhead perform distinct tasks in saving man.” (S.A.B. p. 24, emphasis supplied).

In other words, the “new theology” teaches that the biblical terms “Father” and “Son” are merely titles to help us understand the “economy of function” or role which deity acted out. Therefore, the Father seems to “act” as source [although all three are really the source], the Son seems to “act” as mediator [although any or all could be mediator].

This false concept leads one to the logical conclusion that: The “Divine Committee of equals” chose the titles Father, Son, and Holy Spirit between themselves, and one could have just as easily filled any of the titles, roles and positions as the other. If this is true, it is nothing less than a divine deception!

“To me this signifies the interchangeableness of the members of the Godhead since they are one in action and purpose.”

This concept of “role” playing and “interchangeableness” of function would logically lead one to believe that the “Trinity” had a counsel meeting where they not only decided “who” was going to assume each “title,” but also which co-equal, co-eternal member would become incarnated and die for us. “Should you be called the Son who sacrifices His life for humanity, and I the Father who gives His only begotten Son to redeem man? Or do you want to be called the Father and I’ll one day become incarnate and die?” Blasphemy! What a degradation of the plan of redemption and the Atonement!

The new theology (as stated in the 27 fundamental beliefs), concludes that the “Father” and “Son” pretended or acted out an implied parent/child relationship. This belief implies that God is virtually deceiving mankind by using terminology intentionally designed not to reflect His actual relationship with Christ.

This theology also teaches that the title “Son” is only applicable after the incarnation. In other Words, before Jesus was born of Mary, there was no “Son” of God, rather three co-eternal, co-equal “PARTNERS” as the following quotation implies:

“The Father-Son relationship in the New Testament must always be understood in the light of the event of Bethlehem. The only child born into this world with a divine, rather than a human, father is Jesus. The title, ‘Son,’ refers to His entry into time and does not deny at all His eternal origin. There are references in the Old Testament to Sonship, but these are always in anticipation of the Incarnation.”

This new philosophy entirely confuses and obscures the glorious love of God the Father as expressed in the most memorized text in the entire Bible:

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (Jn. 3:16).

“IT WAS ALL AN ACT,”
SAYS ANTICHRIST

Since the beginning of his rebellion in heaven, Satan has always tried to cast doubt upon the literal Sonship of Christ prior to His incarnation. An example of this doubt is seen in his temptation of Christ in the wilderness. “And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God...Then the devil saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God...” (Mt. 4:3-6).

Even though the devil didn’t succeed with Christ, he has succeeded in casting doubt through those who assert that the relationship between the “Father” and “Son” is merely an act or role play. Those who make this assertion do in reality deny the true relationship between God the Father and His only begotten Son. The Scriptures call this the spirit of antichrist. “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the
Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father” (1 Jn. 2:22, 23).

It is readily admitted that Catholicism has historically proven itself to be the major Antichrist power. So how does the papacy deny the “Father” and the “Son”? If you ask any priest, bishop, cardinal or pope, don’t they readily admit that Jesus is the Son of God? Yes they do. Yet, through the creedal authority of the Papacy, the doctrine of the Trinity was established. This doctrine teaches that the titles “Father” and “Son” are not merely titles in a role play, hence a blatant denial of the Father and His Son.

“The mystery of the Trinity is the central doctrine of Catholic faith. Upon it are based all the other teachings of the Church.”

Sadly enough, most churches have adopted this anti-Christ doctrine from Catholicism as the foundational belief of their denomination. As a result of this change in theology, many churches have also changed from using biblical terminology such as “the Son of God,” to the Trinitarian phrase “God the Son.” Throughout the entire Bible the term is always “the Son of God” and never “God the Son.” The book, “Seventh-day Adventists Believe...” uses the incorrect and confusing term “God the Son” dozens of times.

**SUMMARY**

The new theology has taken the position that: There are three separate supreme beings (God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit). These three are called “one” because they are united in character, purpose, and action. This initial false premise (three beings the exact same age, one did not exist before nor derive any attributes from the other), has consequently resulted in another false conclusion which denies that Christ is the Son of God prior to His incarnation. This false conclusion is stated thus:

“The Bible speaks of Christ as the ‘Son’ of God, but that’s only after He came to this earth. The Son didn’t become a Son until after he was incarnated.” With this understanding, people are left without the knowledge of the supreme sacrifice and love of our heavenly Father. Therefore, hearts respond to God according to this improper estimation of the value of His gift to them.

**THE BIBLE TRUTH ABOUT THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD**

**SUMMARY**

The early Adventist pioneers understood the biblical term, “Holy Spirit of God,” to refer to His life or inner nature, (His thoughts, feelings, mind, personality, omnipresence etc.). They understood that God’s Spirit was a contradiction to His outer body, physical form and features.

They understood the Holy Spirit of God to be a personal influence or power from God. They also understood the Holy Spirit to be a “person,” when referred to in the context of the “divine nature,” “personality,” or “presence” of God the Father and/or His Son—but never as a separate divine being (i.e. God the Holy Spirit).

The pioneer understanding about the Holy Spirit concludes with the belief that when God gives us His Spirit, instead of giving us someone other than Himself; He is giving us His very self, His inner divine nature. This realization opens our understanding—standing to the grand and glorious privileges offered us as the “sons of God.”

The new theology teaches the Holy Spirit to be a separate and distinct God, other than the Father and His only begotten Son (S.A.B. p. 61). When Adventist leaders teach people to ascribe honor to this other God, not the Father nor His Son, they are inadvertently teaching people to honor Satan. Satan has always wanted to be worshipped and now he attains worship though this clever doctrinal deception.

Adventists are ascribing the power and mighty acts performed by the Spirit of the Father and/or His Son, through the holy angels, as actually performed by another God. Thus, Satan has exalted himself in the minds of God’s professed people as the third co-equal, co-eternal god of the Trinity. We are never told anywhere in scripture to pray to the Holy Spirit. But rather, to pray to God the Father, that He will give us His Spirit (Lk. 11:13). Yet, contrary to direct biblical revelation, Seventh-day Adventists are told to pray too and worship “god the holy spirit.”

If people really believe this “Holy Spirit” to be a separate being other than the Father and His Son, if they are surrendering their lives, even praying to this other “God” for light, wisdom and power—who is going to answer these prayers?

**TWO EXTREMES**

The early Adventist pioneers avoided the two major doctrinal extremes concerning the Holy Spirit:

- **1) PANTEHIS---**Degrating the "Spirit of God" to an impersonal power or force like electricity (dwelling in every living thing).
- **2) TRITHEISM/TRINITARIANISM---**Exalting the Spirit of God as an entirely separate deity in and of himself (God the Spirit), worthy of prayer worship and adoration.

**THE SPIRIT OF GOD THE FATHER**

“Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.” (Psa. 139:7,8).

“God [the Father] is a Spirit” (Jn. 4:24, emphasis supplied).

“But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me;” (Jn. 15:26).

The Trinitarian phrase "God the Holy Spirit" is found nowhere in inspired writ. The Biblical terms are rather, “the Spirit of God” (Gen. 1:2), "My Spirit" (Gen. 6:3), "Thy good spirit" (Neh. 9:20), "Thy holy spirit" (Psa. 51:11), "the spirit of the Lord" (Isa. 11:2), "the Spirit of your Father" (Mt.. 10:20), "the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 3:16), "the Spirit of his Son" (Gal. 4:6), "the Spirit of Christ" (Pet. 1:2), and "the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:2). The non-biblical term "God the Holy Spirit" is used to infer a concept that the Bible does not teach: that the Holy Spirit is a third distinct God, co-equal and co-eternal along with the Father and His Son.

In Ephesians 4:4, Paul tells us there is only “one” Spirit. Jesus tells us in John 4:24, that God (the Father) is a Spirit. Who therefore, is the “one” Spirit? God the Father! The simple conclusion is that the Holy Spirit is the internal nature and “person” of God the Father Himself—the “Holy Spirit of God” (Eph. 1:30).

Does that mean that the Father is just a Spirit without any physical body, form or features? Not at all, for Daniel had a vision of the “Ancient of days” who had a form and sat on a throne (Dan. 7:9).

Then he saw “one like the Son of man...who came to the Ancient of days...” (vs. 13). So, the Father most certainly has a bodily form, yet He is also a spiritual being.

Does the Father possess Omnipresence? Yes. Is He bodily present everywhere in the Universe? God is omnipresent by His Spirit which is simply another name for His presence, not the outer, but the inner part of Himself.
“Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.” (Psa. 139:7-9). Here we see that the Spirit of God and His presence are synonymous terms and used interchangeably.

Is His Spirit something, or someone, separate from Himself? No. The Spirit is Himself, not His outer body, but rather His inner mind or thoughts. “For what man knoweth the things [thoughts] of a man, save the spirit [mind] of man which is in him? even so the things [thoughts] of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God [or mind which is in Him].” (1 Cor. 2:11, emphasis supplied).

Having a “bad spirit” is synonymous with having a “bad attitude.” Have you ever heard the expression, “He or she has a filthy mind?” Since there is nothing bad or filthy about God, the term “Holy” is applied when describing His Spirit, mind or presence.

**ONLY “ONE SPIRIT”**

**BOTH FATHER AND SON SHARE “ONE” HOLY SPIRIT**

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor” (Lk. 4:18).

“I was set up [anointed] from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.” (Pr. 8:23, emphasis supplied).

“I believe that thou art the Christ [anointed one], the Son of God, which should come into the world.” (Pr. 8:23, emphasis supplied).

“For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself” (Jn. 5:26).

“God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” (Heb. 1:9).

“And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” (Jn. 17:5).

Before the incarnation, the Father’s divine Son was the “brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person” (Heb. 1:3). The Son not only reflected His Father’s physical characteristics, but was also a partaker of the “Divine Nature” or Holy Spirit of His Father.

The divine unity between the Father and Son is not because they are “one” person, but because they share “one Spirit” (1 Cor. 6:17). When God’s Son was born in eternity, He was “anointed” with, and a partaker of the Holy Spirit of His Father. The Son of God partook and reflected His Father’s character to such a degree that “wherever was the presence of His Son, it was as His own presence.” 87

When the Father produced from Himself His only begotten Son, the body temple of His Son overflowed with the Holy Spirit of His Father.

“I was set up [anointed] from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.” (Pr 8:23, emphasis supplied).

The phrase “set up,” in the Strong’s concordance #5258 means “to anoint.” When did God the Father anoint His Son with His Holy Spirit? He was anointed before “the earth was.” This is why the Bible writers referred to God’s Son as the “Christ” (or anointed one) before His incarnation as a man. “I believe that thou art the Christ [anointed one], the Son of God, which should come into the world.” (Jn. 11:27, emphasis supplied).

**FATHER’S NAME:** By virtue of His literal Sonship, the Son of God “inherited” His Father’s “name” (or character). “Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.” (Heb 1:4).

**FATHER’S LIFE:** By virtue of His literal Sonship, the Son of God “inherited” His Father’s “life.” “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself” (Jn. 5:26).

**FATHER’S GLORY:** By virtue of His literal Sonship, the Son of God “inherited” His Father’s “glory.” “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” (Jn. 17:5).

**OIL OF GLADNESS:** By virtue of His literal Sonship, the Son of God “inherited” His Father’s “oil of gladness.” “God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” (Heb 1:9). Since “oil” is a symbol of the Holy Spirit, what was the Son of God anointed with?

**FATHER’S SPIRIT:** By virtue of His literal Sonship, the Son of God “inherited” His Father’s Holy Spirit without measure. “...for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.” (Jn. 3:34).

The Son of God was anointed with the Father’s “name,” “life,” “glory,” “oil of gladness,” which are all synonymous terms for the Father’s “Holy Spirit.”

**SPIRIT OF THE FATHER AND/OR SON**

At times, the Scriptures use the terms “Spirit” or “Holy Spirit” interchangeably when describing the Spirit of the Father, and/or His Son. “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God [the Father] dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him [the Father] that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit [the Father] that dwelleth in you.” (Rom. 8:9-11, emphasis supplied). In this text, the Spirit is used interchangeably to refer both to the Father and the Son.

**THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST**

Since the Son of God shares the same Holy Spirit as His Father, the term “Spirit” or “Holy Spirit can rightly be applied the Him as well. The following is a Bible text that calls Jesus the (Holy) Spirit: “Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty...are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as of the Lord the Spirit.” (2 Cor. 3:17,18, with marginal emphasis). Jesus, as the second Adam, “was made a quickening spirit” (1 Cor. 15:45). Words are expressions of thoughts.

The Son is called the “word of God” (Jn. 1:1-3,14), because He is the physical manifestation, expression, and personification of His Father’s thoughts. Since “God (the Father) is a Spirit” (Jn. 4:24), and since the Fathers’ words “are spirit, and they are life.” (Jn. 6:63), the “person” called the “Word” of God may be rightly called the “Spirit of God” as well.

Why could Jesus say that the Father was in Him, and He was in His Father? (Jn. 17:21; 14:10). Jesus could truthfully make this statement because this same “Word” or “Holy Spirit” was dwelling in the body temples of both the Father and His Son.

This is why the Scriptures refer to the Father and/or His Son as the “Holy Spirit.”

**SPIRIT IN THE WILDERNESS:** The divine Son of God as a representative of His Father is depicted as “the Angel” who led the children of Israel throughout their wilderness journey. He is also described as the “good spirit” who instructed them (Neh. 9:19,20; Hag. 2:5).
The divine Son of God was that “spirit” that went with Caleb because “he hath followed me fully” saith the Lord.

The Son of God was the “angel of his (Father’s) presence;” the one who “saved,” “redeemed,” and “carried” his people when they trusted in Him (Isa. 63:9). So also, when they rebelled, He became the “holy Spirit” whom they grieved and “vexed” (Isa. 63:10).

SPIRIT IN THE TEMPLE: Yes, the divine Son of God as a representative of His Father, was the “Holy Spirit” who dwelt between the two cherubim in the wilderness tabernacle (1Sam. 4:4).

Christ was the one who talked with Moses “face to face” (Ex. 33:11).

Christ was the “glory of the Lord” that filled up Solomon’s temple (2Chron. 5:12- 6:1; 7:1-3). Christ was the “greater” “glory” of Herod’s temple, when He went in and cleansed it from corruption (Hag. 2:9; Jn. 2:16).

Christ was the comforter of His disciples while on earth (Jn. 14:1,27). Christ was the same “comforter” in “another” form when He descended upon, and filled His disciples on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4; Jn. 14:17-21; Acts 3:26).

Christ is the one who promised: “I will not leave thee, nor forsake thee” (Heb. 13:5). “For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” (Mt. 18:20). “I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” (Mt. 28:20).

Christ is the one knocking at the door of your mind seeking entrance, “Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him” (Rev. 3:20).

He is the same one promised to come to His people as the “latter rain,” the final outpouring of the Spirit of God (Joel 2:23, margin emphasis; Psa. 72:6; Hos. 6:3).

The Apostle Paul understood and used the following expressions to mean one and the same thing: “ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you;” “your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you;” “ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them;” “Christ in you, the hope of glory;” and, “Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.” (1 Cor. 3:16,17; 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:16,17; Col. 1:26,27; Phil. 2:5).

Throughout both the old and new testimonies it was the Spirit of God the Father “in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself” (2 Cor. 5:19).

THE HOLY SPIRIT PROCEEDS FROM CHRIST

“Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink.” (Ex. 17:6). “And that Rock was Christ.” (1 Cor. 10:4).

“Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink.” (Jn. 7:37).

“...the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.” (Jn. 6:63).

“For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.” (Jn. 12:49).

“Believeth thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.” (Jn. 14:10).

IS JESUS REALLY OUR “COMFORTER”?

“Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth...the Spirit of truth...shall be words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.” (Jn. 14:6,17,18,20,21).

“And unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.” (Acts 3:26).

“I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee” (Heb. 13:5).

“For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” (Mt. 18:20).

“I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” (Mt. 28:20).

“Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him” (Rev. 3:20).

“God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” (Gal. 4:6).

“Christ in you, the hope of glory.” (Col. 1:27).

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND
THE MINISTRY OF ANGELS

When the Father and Son created the angelic beings, they were created to be representatives, vehicles or messengers of their Holy Spirit throughout the universe. When Lucifer and one third of God’s angels rebelled and sinned; they became representatives ormessengers for the unholy spirit of Satan. Just as God’s Holy angels bring people His personal presence, words, thoughts and feelings (His Holy Spirit), so Satan’s angels bring people his mind or spirit.

The question is, who is going to possess your mind? God’s Spirit through His angels, or Satan’s spirit through his angels? “Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience” (Eph. 2:2). These angels (messengers) are described in the Bible by the following symbols.

CHARIOTS

Elijah the prophet was taken to heaven by angels under the symbol of a “chariot of fire” (2Kings 2:11). These angelic “chariots” are symbolic of God’s method of travel and communication. “The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place.” (Ps 68:17). King David recognized God’s method of travel and communication when he wrote: “And he rode upon a cherub, and did fly: yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind.” (Ps 18:10; the translation for “wind” is Spirit). These angel messengers are symbolically described as transporting God’s throne—His very presence. “And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it.” (Ez. 1:26). “This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar; and I knew that they were the cherubims.” (Ez. 10:20).

CLOUD

Similar to the symbolism of a Chariot, the Lord is said to travel by a cloud. “Behold, the LORD ride upon a swift cloud” (Isa. 19:1). It was actually the divine Son of God who led the children of Israel in a cloud of angels while in the wilderness. “And the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night.” In the new testament a “cloud” of angels overshadowed Jesus at His transfiguration. Notice carefully what comes out of this cloud of angels. “While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.” (Mt. 17:5; Mk. 9:7; Lk. 9:34).
Jesus ascended into heaven by a “cloud” of angels. “And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.” (Acts 1:9). He assures us that he will come again with a cloud of angels, resurrec
t His saints, and take them to heaven for 1000 years. “And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.” (Lk. 21:27). “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels” (Mt. 16:27; Rev. 14:14,15).

EYES

Another symbolic term for angels is “eyes.” “For the eyes of the LORD run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him.” (2 Ch.16:9; Zech. 4:10). In other words, God’s angels are sent throughout the whole world to guard and “watch” His people. Angels give people strength, help, guidance, protection, messages of rebuke and comfort. “I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will guide thee with mine eye.” (Psa. 32:8).

Who sends these angels? These “eyes” are referred to as Christ’s “eyes” because He has always been their commander and chief (the “Lord of Hosts”). Christ is the one who sends them on mission to “watch” and faithfully record every human thought and event. “...a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.” (Rev. 5:6). The “seven eyes,” “seven lamps,” “seven Spirits” and “seven angels” are all synonymous with the “seven” or complete number of heavenly angels. “His [Christ’s] eyes were as a flame of fire” (Rev. 19:12). The symbolism “flame of fire” refers to the ministry of angels. “And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire...Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” (Heb. 1:7,14).

It was these same angels who were miraculously manifested on the day of Pentecost. “And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.” (Acts 2:2-4).

This sound “of a rushing mighty wind,” was the same as Ezekiel heard: The sound of angels or cherubim. “I heard also the noise of the wings of the living creatures that touched one another, and the noise of the wheels over against them, and a noise of a great rushing.” (Ez. 1:24; 3:13).

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.” Who was the “Holy Ghost” that the disciples were all filled with? As the Father’s representative, the Son of God and His angels filled the wilderness temple with His Shekinah glory and presence. As the Father’s representative, the Son of God came down from heaven with His angels and filled Solomon’s temple with His Shekinah presence. As the Father’s representative, the Son of God came down from heaven to become a man, emptied himself in order that His human body temple could be filled with His Father’s glory and presence.

In like manner, the personal Shekinah presence of the Father and His Son came down with, and through holy angels, and filled the body temples of the disciples on the day of Pentecost. The two angels, one on each side of the ark and the Shekinah glory between them symbolized the ministry of God’s Spirit and angels “within” the “most holy place” of the human mind.

POSSESSION AT PENTECOST?

We all believe in demon possession, don’t we? Demons are evil angels. They can speak through human voices with utterances so vulgar and vile it would make you tremble. They work through human hands to corrupt, destroy, hurt and kill. What happened on the day of Pentecost? Just the opposite of demon possession. Through humbling their hearts, confessing their faults to one another and their sins to God, the disciples had come into a unity of mind with God and with each other. It was while in this attitude that they were ready to become “possessed.” By Satan’s’ spirit through his fallen angels? No. But by the sweet and powerful Holy Spirit of the Father and His Son through His ministering angels (Rev. 1:1). Holy angels were speaking through the disciples’ lips and working miracles through their hands. Heaven was speaking and working directly through humanity in an unbroken chain of communication. The Son of God, in a spiritual form, was the apostolic church’s counselor, guide and leader throughout the entire book of Acts, and in every generation thereafter.

SPIRIT

Just as the complete number of angels is referred to in the plural, “seven Spirits of God”; so an individual angel is sometimes referred to as “a Spirit.” Satan’s angels are referred to in the singular as an “evil spirit,” 53 also as a “familiar spirit.” 94 God’s holy angels are sometimes referred to as a “spirit.” 85 Jesus told his disciples, “a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” (Lk. 24:39). Bible writers sometimes used the words “angel” and “spirit” as synonyms. A classic example of this is found in the following story of Philip and the Eunuch. “And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip...Then the Spirit said unto Philip...And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more...” (Acts 8:26,29,39). The “Spirit” who took Philip “away,” was the same “angel” that told him to go into the wilderness to begin with.

The following is another example of how the words “angel” and “spirit” are sometimes used synonymously and interchangeably.

“For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both both [both “resurrection” and “angel/spirit”] And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God.” (Acts 23:8,9; emphasis supplied).

THE "THREE POWERS OF HEAVEN"

God is a God of order. There is order in heaven and specific procedures of work and communication. The Scriptures have revealed the divinely ordained method of communication between heaven and earth—God and man.

“The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and revealed the divinely ordained method of communication between heaven and earth—God and man.

“The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified by it by his angel unto his servant John.” (Rev. 1:1). Here we have the order of divine procedure: 1) God the Father, 2) Jesus Christ, 3) Christ’s angel, 4) John the apostle and prophet, 5) the church.

God the Father initiates the message or revelation; He gives it to His Son Jesus Christ; Jesus commissions His heavenly angels to carry the message to earth; the angel messengers inspire the human agent (through a dream, vision, audible voice or conscious impression). The human agent then relays the message by voice, pen, telephone,...etc. to others.

The apostle John obviously recognized the important work and ministry of the angels in faithfully representing the message of God the Father and His Son. In the following text, John relays a greeting to the church from the three powers of heaven:

“John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from [1] him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and
[2] from the seven Spirits which are before his throne, And [3] from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness” (Rev. 1:4,5; emphasis supplied).

In other words, John is writing to the seven churches and giving them greetings or salutations on behalf of 1) God the Father, 2) The “seven,” or complete number of heavenly angels, and 3) Jesus Christ. John recognizes these three to be the representative-atives of all heavenly power and authority. John also recognizes that God the Father and Jesus are communicating with him through the “seven Spirits which are before his throne.”

Once this biblical principle is recognized, the apostle Paul’s farewell statement is more easily understood. “The grace of (1) the Lord Jesus Christ, and (2) the love of God, and (3) the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.”(2 Cor. 13:14; emphasis supplied).

This parting farewell statement is not a Trinitarian affirmation as some would have us believe. Paul is not telling the Corinthians that three Gods love them. He is stating rather, that the “communion of the Holy Ghost” is the “grace” of Jesus and “the love of God;” the comforting words and presence of the Father and His Son, ministered by and through the “seven Spirits which are before his throne.”

THE THREEFOLD BAPTISM

The three representative powers of heaven are also seen in the single most famous (or infamous) Bible text in support of the Trinitarian doctrine.

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (1) the name of the Father, and (2) of the Son, and (3) of the Holy Ghost...and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” (Mt. 28:18-20; emphasis supplied).

NAME OF THE FATHER

Notice first, that Jesus commands His disciples to baptize (or immerse), people in the “name,” (singular) not “names.” The term “name” also signifies character or authority. Jesus is telling His disciples to “immerse” people from all nations in the true understanding of the “name” (or character) of His Father. Jesus revealed or manifested His Father’s name (or character) during His entire life and ministry. The disciples were to extend his work by continuing to immerse or baptize people in the same way Christ did.

“I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me...While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name...And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.” (Jn. 17:6, 12, 26).

No one understood who and what the character of God the Father was really like. The only one who had this perfect understanding, who also perfectly revealed it through all His words and actions, was the Son of God. “...neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” (Mt. 11:27).

NAME OF THE SON

Therefore, the only way the disciples could baptize people into the character of God the Father, was to immerse, plunge, bury or baptize them into an understanding and acceptance of the character of Christ. What kind of character was this? Oh, the disciples marveled at it. His was the type of character that: “emptied himself,” “humbled himself,” “delighted to do God’s will,” “loved his enemies,” “did good to those that hated him,” “blessed those that cursed him,” “prayed for those who despitefully used and persecuted him,” “became obedient unto death,” “even the death of the cross.” And all this for what? To give ungodly sinners an opportunity to change their mind (repent) about the wonderful character of His loving Father in heaven.

As the disciples preached Christ, the Son God as a representative of the character of His Father, those who accepted this message by faith, were baptized into the “name” (or character) of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 8:12). Whoever had faith in, and were baptized into the “name” of Jesus, were automatically baptized into the name of the Father. Faith toward Jesus Christ caused people to be repentant (have a change of mind) toward God the Father (Acts 20:21).

But, whoever rejected the Son, rejected the Father as well. “Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also,” (Wis. 3:19). “Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.” (1Jn. 2:23; 2Jn. 1:9).

NAME OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

As already stated above, the mission of Christ’s disciples after he left them, would be to immerse, plunge, bury or baptize “all nations” into an understanding and acceptance of the “name” of God the Father. This could only be accomplished through immersing, plunging, burying people into an understanding and acceptance of the “name” of “the Son.”

Yet, in order to “baptize” all nations in the “name of the Son,” they needed special help and power. They needed to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Jesus understood this, so before ascending to heaven He told them to: “tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” (Lk. 24:49). “For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” (Acts 1:5).

For what purpose was this power given? “But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.” (Ac. 1:8).

What was this “power” they received on the day of Pentecost? “lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” (Mt. 28:20). “I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you...my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” (Jn. 14:18,23). The Father and His Son came down to strengthen, enlighten, help and encourage the disciples on the day of Pentecost.

Did the Father and His Son come down bodily? They came down to the disciples in the same way they came down to the Apostle John on the island of Patmos. “The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John” (Rev. 1:1).

The personal messages, power and presence of the Father and His Son came down with and through holy angels (“the seven Spirits”), and filled the body temples of the disciples on the day of Pentecost. In many instances, the term “Holy Ghost” or “Holy Spirit” was understood and defined by Bible writers as to include the ministry of holy angels. Not that angels are the “Spirit of God” the Father, or the “Spirit of Christ” His Son, but rather, the agency and representative of their love, presence and power to humanity.

When the disciples baptized people in the “name” of the Holy Spirit, they immersed them in the thought that Christ’s very life, His personal power and presence was with, and in them. That even though they could not behold Christ with their eyes, by faith they would recognize His words and presence faithfully ministered through the guardian angel by their side.
THE NEW THEOLOGY ABOUT THE HOLY SPIRIT

The new theology misinterprets certain passages of Scripture in order to prove something the Bible does not teach: That the Holy Spirit is a separate and distinct God, other than the Father and His only begotten Son. The following is an example of this false concept:

“The Bible teaches that the Holy Spirit is a separate Being. He is not simply an influence, an extension of the other members of the Godhead, such as the spirit of God or the spirit of Christ. Instead, He is the third Person of the Godhead, a separate person who is as fully God as God the Father and God the Son...So the Holy Spirit is a member of the Trinity, equal with the Father and the Son.” Morris Venden. 97

In combating those who believe the holy Spirit to be just an impersonal force or power (which is truly erroneous), 98 Trinitarians will cite passages in the New Testament where the Holy Spirit “strives,” “teaches,” “convicts,” “directs church affairs,” “helps and intercedes,” “inspires,” and “sanctifies.” Then they falsely conclude and misinterpret these passages to mean that the leader of the New Testament Church is not God the Father, nor His Son working with and through the ministering angels; but rather another separate and distinct being altogether—“God the Holy Spirit.” The following quotation is an example of this false theology:

“Who is the Holy Spirit? The Bible reveals that the Holy Spirit is a person, not an impersonal force... Scriptures referring to the triune God describe the Spirit as a person (Mt.. 28:19; 2 Cor. 13:14). The Holy Spirit has personality. He strives (Gen. 6:3), teaches (Luke 12:12), convicts (John 16:8), directs church affairs (Acts 13:2), helps and intercedes (Rom. 8:26), inspires (2Peter 1:2). These activities cannot be performed by a mere power, influence, or attribute of God. Only a person can do them.” (S.A.B. p. 60).

Scriptures readily agree that only a person can perform all these ministries and functions. The question is not, “what is the Holy Spirit?” But rather, “Who is the Holy Spirit?” If the Holy Spirit is not the personal “Spirit of your Father” (Mt. 10:20); if the Holy Spirit is not the personal “Spirit of Christ” (1Pet. 1:11); then who do Trinitarians and Tri-theists say this Spirit is? The Fundamental Belief (# 5) of the entire Seventh-day Advent-ist denomination is: The Holy Spirit is “another” God, someone other than the Father or His only begotten Son.

“From eternity God the Holy Spirit lived within the Godhead as the third member.” (S.A.B. p. 61).

“God the eternal Spirit was active with the Father and the Son in Creation, incarnation, and redemption. He inspired the writers of Scripture. He filled Christ’s life with power. He draws and convicts human beings; and those who respond He renews and transforms into the image of God. Sent by the Father and the Son to be always with His children, He extends spiritual gifts to the church, empowers it to bear witness to Christ, and in harmony with the Scriptures leads it into all truth. Fundamental Beliefs, 5” (S.A.B. p. 58).

Just one simple question; if “God the Holy Spirit” does all of the above, what is left for God the Father and His Son to do? This teaching clearly tends to put the Father and Son in the background, while exalting the Spirit as the supreme being in the universe.

WHAT DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH?

- It is the Spirit of the Father through His Son that created every living thing, not another god the spirit.99
- God the Father was the real Father of Jesus, not another God the spirit.100
- It is the Spirit of God the Father working in and through His only begotten Son who redeems us, not another god the spirit.101
- It was the Spirit of Christ who inspired all the Old and New Testament Scriptures, not another god the spirit.102
- It was the Spirit of His Father dwelling in Him that gave Christ the power to resist temptation, and to perform all His miracles, not another god the spirit.103
- It is the Spirit of the Father and Son working through ministering angels who draws, convicts and converts us, not another god the spirit.104
- It is the Spirit of the Son of God who renews and transforms us, not another god the spirit.105
- It is the personal presence and Spirit of Jesus Christ who will always be with us, not another god the spirit.106
- It is the Spirit of God the Father and His only begotten Son who gives spiritual gifts to men, not another god the spirit.107
- It is the Spirit of God the Father working in and through His only begotten Son who leads us into all truth, not another god the spirit.108
- The Holy Scriptures do warn us however about another spirit:

“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” (1.Jn. 1:4). “For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.” (2 Cor. 11:4).

WORSHIPPING “GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT”

The apostle Paul rightly describes this modern exaltation of “God the Holy Spirit” in these words: “Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars’ hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.” (Acts. 17:22,23). Satan has inspired men to separate the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son; then by making the Spirit “another” god, professed Christians become “ignorant” of “who” they really worship, pray to, and have faith in. Whenever the spiritual focus is turned away from the Father and Son, Satan interposes himself as a “deity” worthy of honor and worship in their place.

Just as the men of Athens worshipped the “Unknown God” along with their other pagan deities, Trinitarians (in general) are worshipping the “unknown” “God the Spirit” along with the Father and His dear Son. There is not a single passage in Scripture where we are told to worship, pray to, or love the Holy Spirit. Some may ask, “Seventh-day Adventists don’t worship the Holy Spirit, do they?” Notice the following bold admission:

“Do Seventh-day Adventists believe in the Trinity? They do. Reverently they worship Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. ‘three Persons in one God.’ And they do so because they believe this to be the teaching of the Bible concerning God in His relation to this world and the human race.” 109

Satan has exalted himself in the minds of God’s professed people as the third co- equal, co-eternal god of the Trinity. When we ascribe honor to another God, someone other than the Father and His dear Son, we are inadvertently ascribing honor to Satan.

Satan has always wanted to be worshipped and now he attains worship though a clever doctrinal deception. Adventists are ascribing the power and mighty acts performed by the Spirit of the Father and/or His Son through the holy angels, as actually performed by another God.

"Satan's aim had been to reproduce his own character in human beings...He desired to usurp the throne of God. Failing in this, he has worked in darkness, in crookedness, in deception, to usurp his place in the
hearts of men. He has set up his throne between God and man, to appropriate the adoration that belongs to God alone." (6BC p. 1119).

"The Father and the Son alone are to be exalted." (Sons and Daughters of God p. 58).

PRAYING TO "GOD THE SPIRIT"

We are never told anywhere in scripture to pray to the Holy Spirit. But rather, we are told to pray to God the Father, that He will give us His Spirit (Lk. 11:13). Yet contrary to direct biblical revelation, Seventh-day Adventists are told to pray to "god the holy spirit."

"I am a fledgling Christian and am mystified by the doctrine of the Trinity. To whom should I address my prayers?" The term Trinity is applied to the Christian doctrine of God...Although the Triune God is above human comprehension and explanation, the Bible gives us clear directives on how Christians are to relate to Him..."Since the Trinity is active in behalf of man’s redemption, it is really not out of place to address any member of the Deity in prayer." 110

Adventist author Garrie Williams encourages people to pray to the Holy Spirit in his book entitled "Welcome Holy Spirit."

"A Prayer for Today. Holy Spirit, help me be one of your agents in this world for the powers of the age to come." p. 343. "A Prayer for Today. Holy Spirit, I give You permission to take possession of every part of me and use me as You choose." p. 316. 111

If people really believe this "Holy Spirit" to be a separate being other than the Father and His Son, if they are surrendering their lives, even praying to this other "God" for light, wisdom power and "possession"-- who is going to answer these prayers? In the following vision by Mrs. White, we are told who will answer these prayers:

"Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, 'Father, give us Thy Spirit.' Satan would then breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy, and peace. Satan’s object was to keep them deceived and to draw back and deceive God’s children." (EW p. 55,56).

"They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger. They sacrificed not unto devils; to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not. Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee." (Dt. 32:16-18).

WHEN DID THE ADVENTIST CHURCH BECOME TRINITARIAN?

Most Adventists simply believe that the church has always taught the doctrine of the Trinity. Some Adventists realize there has been a change in theology, but figure it all happened when Ellen White was around to supervise. Most haven’t thought too much about it one way or another. So when did the Adventist Church change its beliefs to become a Trinitarian church? This doctrinal change did not happen overnight. It was a gradual process which occurred over many years. Therefore, the best way to answer this question is to ask, “when was the Seventh-day Adventist Church not Trinitarian?”

“THE DESIRE OF AGES” DIDN’T CHANGE US

The majority of all Seventh-day Adventist scholars, theologians, and church historians generally attribute the cause of this doctrinal change to the writings of Ellen G. White (i.e. The Desire of Ages). (see appendix entitled, Ellen White Changed Us, p. 59). Their main theory teaches that Adventists were non-Trinitarian until Ellen White received “light from God” that the Catholic and Protestant teaching concerning the Trinity was the truth after all. They falsely believe that she corrected the entire denominational teaching regarding the Sonship of Christ and the personhood of the Holy Spirit through the book “The Desire of Ages.” Therefore, according to this theory, it was Ellen White herself who initiated the doctrinal change and endorsed the pro-Trinitarian emphasis of the denomination today. Several variations of this theory are as follows:

- 1) Ellen White always believed and taught the Trinitarian doctrine. She was never in harmony with all the non-Trinitarian church leaders (including her husband).
- 2) While the pioneers were most assuredly anti-Trinitarian, Ellen White remained neutral. She didn’t believe or teach anything at all about God until the Lord told her (in 1898) that the Catholic and Protestant view of the trinity was correct after all and the pioneers were wrong.
- 3) During most of her life Ellen White did not believe nor teach the Trinity doctrine. She believed and taught the same as her non-Trinitarian colleagues. Yet, near the end of her life she changed her mind, accepted the Trinitarian doctrine, then encouraged everyone else to do the same.

She makes many statements that are plainly contradictory to Trinitarian theology. Any Trinitarian would consider these statements “erroneous and heretical.”

If she believed all the pioneers were wrong by teaching the non-Trinitarian position, wouldn’t she have specifically written or told them so? No such statement is to be found! There is no evidence to conclude that Ellen White was not in harmony with the non-Trinitarian teachings of all her friends and co-workers.

If Ellen White disbelieved the Trinity doctrine like the rest of the church and then later changed her mind, or received greater light, wouldn’t she have told or written someone of this change? No manuscript or private letter written by Ellen White even hints that she changed her mind.

If these statements contained in “The Desire of Ages” (1898) represent a change in Ellen White’s understanding about the Trinity, if these statements represent her desire to promote Trinitarianism; would she later endorse and promote the denominational publishing and worldwide distribution of blatant anti-Trinitarian publications?

Ellen White endorsed and promoted Uriah Smith’s book entitled “Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation” till the day she died (1915).
This book is still being sold by Adventist colporteurs around the world. This book contained over eighteen non-Trinitarian statements before they were all deleted in the 1944 revision. Ellen White knew what this book taught regarding Christ and the Holy Spirit, yet endorsed and promoted its sale for many years after she wrote “The Desire of Ages.” She did this because she was in complete harmony and agreement with Uriah Smith’s non-Trinitarian teachings. (see Colporteur Ministry p. 123 (1899; 1903); RH Feb. 16, 1905).

WHY ARE ALL THESE THEORIES WRONG?

All these theories are proven to be erroneous for the following reasons.

• If Ellen White always believed and taught the Trinitarian doctrine, these teachings would be reflected in her writings, which they are not.

• She never used the term “Trinity.” If Ellen White believed the Trinity doctrine, why did she avoid using the term even once? This cannot be just coincidental.

• If Ellen White was really trying to promote and endorse the Trinity doctrine, why did none of her relatives, friends or other church leaders repent of their doctrinal error, change beliefs, and accept this teaching? James White (her husband) remained non-Trinitarian till the day he died. Both of Ellen White’s sons, James Edson and William C. White, remained non-Trinitarian as well.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH?

• Ellen White never changed her previous understanding concerning the Sonship of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Nor did she receive additional or correcting light from God on these subjects which she didn’t have before.

• The controversial statements found in “The Desire of Ages” do not represent her attempt to publicly acknowledge any change and/or clarification in her thinking, but rather, represent a manipulation and/or misinterpretation of her writings of which she had no conscious part. Adventists back then did not interpret these Ellen White statements according to the Trinitarian mind-set of today.

• It is a demonstrated fact that Ellen White was in perfect unity with the non-Trinitarian position of her colleagues. Also, that there has been a deeply laid plot and conspiracy to distort history and facts in order to make it appear that Ellen White endorsed this great doctrinal change to the pro-Trinitarian position, when in reality she did not.

J.H. KELLOGG AND THE TRINITY

The Adventist Church did not accept nor believe the Trinity doctrine by 1903. This is shown by the great opposition of denominational leaders against Kellogg’s teachings about the Trinity and personality of the Holy Spirit. In correspondence with G.I. Butler, Kellogg admits that the whole problem with his book “Living Temple” is his teaching regarding the personality of the Holy Spirit.112 G.I. Butler and several other church leaders plead with Dr. Kellogg to give up his erroneous belief about the Trinity.113

THE 1919 BIBLE CONFERENCE

In the summer of 1919, “the church called its leading ministers and college teachers together for a Bible conference, to be followed by a Bible and History Teachers Council.”114 Anyone who has read the minutes of the 1919 Bible conference must come to the conclusion that the Seventh-day Adventist denomination had not become Trinitarian as yet. During the 1919 Bible Conference there were lively discussions between prominent church leaders who felt that some were trying to bring the false doctrine of the trinity into the Adventist Church. A.G. Daniells had to cool the discussions down by emphatically asserting that: “We are not going to take a vote on trinitarianism or arianism, but we can think.”

This fact, categorically disproves the false notion that Ellen White (through “Desire of Ages”), corrected the prevailing anti-Trinitarian position of the Adventist Pioneers. If that was her intention, certainly most did not understand or accept that message while she was still alive.

Anyone who candidly reads the discussions about the trinity during the 1919 Bible Conference, clearly recognizes that any type of denominational unity and acceptance of the Trinitarian doctrine was still a long way off. The next Bible conference was not held until 1952.

LEROY FROOM: BIGGEST TRINITY PROMOTER

In 1928, Leroy Froom wrote a book about the Holy Spirit and trinity entitled “The Coming of the Comforter.” In this book he affirms the false doctrine of the trinity many times while using quotations from E.G. White to sustain his position.

“The Coming of the Comforter” has proven itself to be the springboard which has gradually bounced most Seventh-day Adventists into accepting the false doctrine of the Trinity. Ironically enough, like the “alpha,” so the “omega” theology focuses its teachings upon the personality of the Holy Spirit.
What Froom does not mention in his book is that many apostate Protestant writers helped him come to these false conclusions. Only years later did Leroy Froom confess that he learned the "truth" about the Trinity from these apostate Protestant ministers. Why did he have to go to Babylonian theological works to research and substantiate the "truth" about the Holy Spirit? Because none of the Adventist pioneer writers had presented the Trinitarian position! Hand in hand, Froom and the Protestant theologians paved the way for all future Trinitarian positions within the S.D.A. Church. Froom still remains the scholar most quoted by Seventh-day Adventists when discussing this subject.

When "The Coming of the Comforter" was first printed in 1928 it was not generally accepted by Adventists at the time. LeRoy Froom received a great amount of opposition from church leaders opposing his Trinitarian teaching regarding the personality of the Holy Spirit. This in itself proves that the church had not accepted the Trinity teaching by 1928.

In his efforts to justify and substantiate this new doctrine, Froom became the greatest advocate and defender of Trinitarianism within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

**FIRST “TRINITY” STATEMENT (1931)**

Many church historians believe that the S.D.A. denomination accepted the doctrine of the Trinity in 1931. Yet, the facts reveal this not to be true. Until 1931, every statement of Adventist beliefs was non-Trinitarian. In 1931, one man (F.M. Wilcox) drafted a statement of fundamental beliefs and included the term trinity as item number two. "That the Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father...the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father...the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead..." 117

It should be noted that while the term "Trinity" is used, the full doctrinal explanation of that term is not to be found within this statement.

The statement regarding the Trinity, as well as the other twenty one beliefs, was submitted to three other men. His draft was returned to him unaltered and without the approval or review of anyone else. This statement appeared in the yearbook of 1931 and in the subsequent revisions. In 1932 it was placed in the first Church Manual and subsequent revisions. This was the first time the trinity appeared in print as an official Adventist belief.

As a primary result of the 1931 statement of beliefs the doctrine of the Trinity gradually came into greater acceptance. Yet, did the entire denominational membership vote for a pro-Trinitarian position? No. Did church representatives vote in favor of "the Trinity during a General Conference session? No. Did any committee anywhere vote to approve the doctrine of the Trinity as it appeared in the 1931 statement of belief? No. You mean one man wrote up a statement including the term Trinity, called it the "Fundamental Beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists" and people just went along with it because they thought it was "official?" Yes!

If 1931 was the year the Seventh-day Adventist denomination changed its doctrinal position on the Trinity; this change occurred in absolute secrecy through an arbitrary and dictatorial decree from a handful of church leaders. It was simply this handful of influential church leaders (encouraged by L.E. Froom) who by 1931 had accepted the Trinity doctrine and not the great majority of Seventh-day Adventists. How many church members ever read the S.D.A. "yearbook" or "church manual"?

**TRINITY BAPTISMAL VOW**

In 1941 a uniform baptismal covenant or vow was recommended for adoption which would include an affirmative statement of the candidates belief in the Trinity. 119 Why did the denomination need a "uniform baptismal covenant?" Because all previous baptismal vows did not include the doctrine of the Trinity. Interesting enough, L.E. Froom and R.A. Anderson (of the 1955 Evangelical Conferences fame) were two of the thirteen member committee who drafted the Trinitarian vow. In 1946, the General Conference session “gave a sort of offhand imprimatur to the statement, by voting that changes could be made only by the general Conference delegates in official session.” Therefore, the new baptismal vow affirming the doctrine of the Trinity, was formulated in much the same way that the 1931 statement of beliefs was—a few key and leading men working in relative secrecy! 120

**DELETE ALL NON-TRINITY STATEMENTS FROM BOOKS**

LeRoy Froom was bold enough to admit that: “The next logical and inevitable step in the implementing of our unified ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ involved revision of certain standard works so as to eliminate statements that taught, and thus perpetuated, erroneous views on the Godhead. Such sentiments were now sharply at variance with the accepted ‘Fundamental Beliefs’ set forth in the Church Manual, and with the uniform ‘Baptismal Covenant’ and ‘Vow’ based thereon, which, in certificate form, was now used for all candidates seeking admission to membership in the church.” 121

In other words, we have to repudiate the non-Trinitarian teaching of the Adventist pioneers by cutting out all the non-Trinitarian statements from their books. To accomplish this, a committee of eleven was appointed in 1942 to review and revise the book "Daniel and the Revelation." It just so happened that F.M. Wilcox (who wrote the 1931 statement of beliefs), and W. E. Read (one of the five who dialoged with Martin and Barnhouse in 1955), were on this committee. 122

In (1945), a compilation of Ellen White quotations declaring the absolute “eternity of Christ” was published in “The Ministry” magazine (of which Froom was editor). This compilation, the first of its kind, was said to have “guided and confirmed the work of the committee” when they deleted the non-Trinitarian statements from “Daniel and the Revelation.” By Uriah Smith. 123

The fallacy and deception of compiling a batch of Ellen White quotes as justification for deleting the non-Trinitarian statements from Uriah Smith’s book is easily seen. Although Ellen White knew what this book taught regarding Christ and the Holy Spirit, she publicly endorsed and promoted it’s sale and distribution till the day she died (1915).

This book contained over eighteen non- Trinitarian statements before they were all deleted in the 1944 revision. Ellen White never wrote a single letter to Uriah Smith telling him that his views regarding the Son-ship of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit were erroneous. Either Ellen White endorsed and promoted a book she never read, or she was in complete harmony and agreement with Uriah Smith’s non-Trinitarian teachings. 124

The Seventh-day Adventist denomination had not accepted the Trinitarian doctrine by 1945 because the committee to revise “Daniel and the Revelation” candidly admitted to the “difference of view among us on this point.” The deletion of these non-Trinitarian statements from “Daniel and the Revelation” provoked many Adventists to question “as to whether this decision did not constitute the settling of a doctrine for the church by a small group of men.” 125

Who would ever believe that a significant doctrine could be entirely deleted from a book after the author was dead; let alone be republished, and sold again as the original? Then again, who would ever believe that one man could secretly formulate a statement of faith, have it approved by three other men, and then call it the
fundamental beliefs of an entire denomination? Isn’t there a pattern here?

TRINITARIAN “EVANGELISM”

In order to give an apparent “prophetic” credence to the new theology, some of Ellen G. White’s writings must be compiled in such a way as to apparently endorse the Trinitarian position. The compilation entitled “Evangelism” (1946) neatly fulfills this purpose. The book “Evangelism” contains quotations which give the Trinity doctrine just such an apparent prophetic promotion. It just so happened that Leroy Froom was on the Editorial staff for its compilation. As part of the editorial staff, and since he was also considered a pioneer of the Trinitarian doctrine, Froom was in an opportune situation to manipulate E.G. White quotations to seemingly support the Trinitarian position taken in “The Coming of the Comforter.” In a letter to R.A. Anderson, Froom brags about how the Ellen White quotations he put in “Evangelism” helped to change the denominational position on the Trinity. 126

LABELED A “CULT” BECAUSE WE WERE NON-TRINITARIAN

At this point, the question could be asked, “If there was really some sort of conspiracy to accept the doctrine of the Trinity, what motivated these church leaders to work so hard for this change?” From the beginning of the Advent movement, Adventists have been verbally abused by Catholics and apostate Protestants because of their non-Trinitarian belief.

The Adventist pioneers received abusive letters all the time from Protestants regarding this teaching. As the Pioneers died away however, there arose other leaders who were not similarly convicted. As the verbal abuse over the issue of the trinity continued, church leaders sought for better and more convenient ways to eliminate it altogether.

In 1951, an article was published in a Protestant newspaper entitled “Mrs. E.G. White’s Confusion on the Trinity.” This article is a classic example of how Adventists were ridiculed because of the non-Trinitarian beliefs of Ellen White and the pioneers. 127 This article also sets the stage for the “Evangelical Conferences” that would occur only a few years afterward.

EVANGELICAL CONFERENCES ABOUT THE TRINITY

In 1955 and 1956, two prominent Evangelicals, Walter R. Martin and Donald G. Barnhouse held a series of secret conferences with four prominent Adventist leaders: LeRoy E. Froom, Walter E. Read, T. Edgar Unruh and R. Allan Anderson. L.E. Froom, if you will remember, wrote the Trinitarian book entitled “The coming of the Comforter” (1928), and also helped misinterpret and manipulate E.G. White quotes for the compilation entitled “Evangelism” (1946). R.A. Anderson was on the committee to include a Trinitarian affirmation in the “uniform baptismal vow” (1941). Walter E. Read was the same one who helped “penknife” the anti-Trinitarian statements from the book “Daniel and the Revelation” (1945).

The Evangelical theologian Walter Martin was soaring to the reputable position in the Protestant world as the “authority” on non-Christian cults. In the first printing of his book “Rise of the Cults,” he included a chapter about Seventh-day Adventists. This, of course disturbed some Adventist leaders (to be classified as a “cult”). Therefore, arrangements were made to thoroughly discuss the issue.

The major purpose for the conferences between the Evangelicals and Adventists were:

1. For these four Adventist leaders to prove that the S.D.A. denomination should not be classified by the Evangelical Protestant world as a “non-Christian cult.”

2. For the Evangelicals to re-classify the Seventh-day Adventist denomination from a non-Christian “Cult,” to one of the Evangelical “brethren.” However, in order to be in harmony with the Evangelical Protestant “brethren,” the Adventist beliefs concerning the Trinity, Attonement, and Nature of Christ must be in harmony with the early Catholic and Protestant creeds.

CLASSIFIED A “CULT” BECAUSE OF THE NON-TRINITARIAN PIONEERS

The emphasis of the Evangelical conferences centered around past non-Trinitarian statements published by the Adventist Pioneers and Ellen G. White. These statements, according to Protestant theology, denied the fundamental beliefs of the early Catholic creeds (325 A.D. 381 A.D.) and were the primary reason why Adventists had been labeled a “cult.” 128

During the meetings, Walter Martin produced a “suitcase” full of such quotations for the committee to look over. The Adventist committee of four admitted that the statements were authentic, but that the modern Adventists plainly and flatly renounce all such erroneous beliefs. 129

One point was clear: If there was going to be unity at all, Adventists leaders had to officially and publicly repudiate all prior non-Trinitarian teachings as being erroneous and false; no matter whose pen they came from, E.G. White not excluded.

“QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE” PRO-TRINITY AFTERMATH OF THE EVANGELICAL CONFERENCES

The book “Questions on Doctrine” (written primarily by LeRoy Froom) was supposedly the official S.D.A. answer to the Evangelical’s questions regarding Adventist beliefs. The doctrine of the trinity, was the primary emphasis in this book. Like the 1931 statement of beliefs, like the revised baptismal vow (1941), like the “Daniel and the Revelation” revision; “Questions on Doctrine” was formulated by a handful of leaders in relative secrecy. This book made major changes in Adventist doctrine without the knowledge or consent of its members.

Walter Martin wanted a public denial of the historic Adventist position regarding the Trinity. This public refutation is the primary purpose of the book. 130 Years later Walter Martin wrote LeRoy Froom expressing his appreciation that Adventist leaders had repudiated the non-Trinitarian beliefs of the pioneers. 131

Not only did Q.O.D. officially repudiate the scriptural teachings of the pioneers, but it went so far as to say that anyone holding the same views (non-Trinitarian) could not even be a member in the denomination. 132 Not content with that, Adventist leaders threatened to disfellowship anyone who did not believe the Trinity doctrine as stated in the fundamental beliefs and church manual. 133 Needless to say, all the Seventh-day Adventist Pioneers would be excluded from church fellowship today because of their non-Trinitarian belief.

“MOVEMENT OF DESTINY” ANOTHER PRO-TRINITY RE-EMPHASIS

In 1971 LeRoy Froom wrote a book entitled “Movement of Destiny.” This book was designed to be a historical sketch of the theological progress of denominational Adventism since the death
of Ellen White. In reality it documents the "omega" of apostasy: fifty years of doctrinal compromise with apostate Protestantism.

A major emphasis in this book is directed toward refuting, in an apologetic sort of way, the earlier non-Trinitarian views of the church. In this book, Froom makes statements regarding the history of Adventism's non-Trinitarian beliefs which are totally unfounded, at least, and outright lies, at most. The following is an example of such:

“A majority of our own founding fathers were likewise evidently Trinitarian.” 134 LeRoy Froom knew that none of the Seventh-day Adventist founding fathers were Trinitarian, yet because of his great desire to win the Evangelicals' favor and approval, he outright lied to them. Froom's correspondence with Walter Martin reveals this fact clearly. 135

27 FUNDAMENTAL BELIEFS

The year 1980 stands as a landmark in Seventh-day Adventist Church history. This year was the first time the Trinitarian doctrine was accepted as an official Adventist belief. Delegates from around the world convened in Dallas Texas for the quinquennial General Conference Session of the World Church. The significant event at this session was voting in the 27 Fundamentals beliefs statement. Never before had any statement of Adventist beliefs been voted on during a General Conference Session.

The 1931 Statement was written by one man F.M. Wilcox, no revision, no vote, no authority, no creed! Yet because it appeared in so many yearbooks and church manuals, it gradually became accepted by tradition as "official" if not "authoritative."

The 1931 statement of beliefs remained without any major revisions until the 1980 Dallas Texas G.C. Session. During this meeting the 27 fundamental beliefs were officially approved and voted as the "church's understanding and expression of the teaching of Scripture" 136

The discussion, contention, and disagreements about the "Trinity" section of the statement caused no little confusion among many of the delegates. 137 The doctrine of the trinity was pushed through however and remains today as the official Adventist Dogma concerning God.

Some categorically assert that the 27 fundamentals are not a "creed" but rather a simple statement of beliefs. With a simple statement of beliefs one can find no fault. Yet, if in disagreement with that statement of beliefs Church members can be censured, disciplined and even disfellowshipped; that statement is a creed, no matter what you want to call it. Faithful Adventists have no creed but the Bible.

DISFELLOWSHIPPING CHURCH MEMBERS OVER THE TRINITY

True to the threats in "Questions on Doctrine," faithful Adventist Church members have been disfellowshipped for not adhering to the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. 138 After the Trinity was accepted as the official doctrinal position of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, Adventist pastors could more easily begin to disfellowship members who still held to the historic non-Trinitarian belief of the Pioneers. The very fact that our Adventist pioneers could not subscribe to the 27 fundamental beliefs and would be disfellowshipped from the church today, is the greatest evidence that the Trinity teaching is the "omega" of doctrinal apostasy within the Seventh-day Adventist denomination.

BOOKS OF A "NEW ORDER"

In 1988, the book entitled, “Seventh-day Adventists Believe...A Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines” was written as a modern sequel to “Questions on Doctrine.” Not only is this book an exposition of the 27 fundamental beliefs, it also reveals how the Trinitarian doctrine has adversely affected every other fundamental teaching of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It can be clearly demonstrated that through accepting false views of the Trinity as the foundational concept of God, the following doctrines have been confused, distorted, and in some cases entirely rejected:

- The One God
- The Son of God
- The Holy Spirit of God
- Ministry of Angels
- Origin of Evil
- Creation
- Nature of man
- Marriage
- The Sabbath
- Law of God
- Nature of Sin
- Christ as mediator
- The Sanctuary
- The Atonement
- Who is the Church
- Nature of Christ
- Life of Christ
- Death of Christ
- State of the Dead
- Resurrection of Christ
- Righteousness by Faith
- Character Perfection
- Three angels’ messages
- The Millennium

HALF A CENTURY OF COVER UP

The conclusion is simple: LeRoy Froom and all the other theologians that have taken a pro-Trinitarian position since the death of Ellen White have a difficult decision to make. They must admit that the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is wrong and the pioneers were right. Or, justify the modern pro-Trinitarian position by distorting history, twisting facts, and even making outright lies to validate the many modern Adventist publications containing the pro-Trinitarian position. A brief historical sketch of the pro-Trinitarian position is as follows:

- 1903- The pro-Trinitarian position advocated by J.H. Kellogg.
- 1919- Debate over the Trinity during the teachers Bible Conference.
- 1931- First time the term “Trinity” appears in any statement of Adventist beliefs and yearbook.
- 1932- The pro-Trinitarian statement of beliefs added to the first church manual and all succeeding Adventist yearbooks.
- 1941- The pro-Trinity revision of the Baptismal Vow.
- 1945- Removal of all non-Trinitarian statements from “Daniel and the Revelation.”
- 1946- The compilation of “Evangelism” containing the apparently pro-Trinitarian E.G. White statements.
The Bible clearly teaches us that men and women are not absolutely equal. Just because men and women are not absolutely equal does not necessarily imply that one is “inferior” or “superior” to the other. By the term “equal” we mean: God did not create male and female exactly the same, (no differences). Because we are created different, male and female role distinctions result from the Creator’s original intention and not merely from one’s cultural influence.

There are a tremendous number of ways in which men and women are absolutely equal, yet it is not within the purpose nor scope of this article to demonstrate all of these. Let us now examine what the Bible has to say about how men and women were not created absolutely equal.

**NOT CREATED THE SAME AGE**

The most obvious difference between the creation of man and woman is that the man was created first (Gen. 2:6). If God wanted to imply the absolute equality between man and woman, then He would have created them both at the exact same time. The very fact that He did not create man and woman at the exact same time gives us some valuable insights into the role distinctions God intended when He created Adam first.

**THE FIRST BIRTHRIGHT.** A birthright is a certain right or privilege belonging to the firstborn son in a family, and not shared by his younger brothers. This right included succession to the father’s position as head of the family (Gen. 43:33).

God gave to Adam the “birthright” of being the head or leader of the entire human family. The reason why Adam was given the role of being the head or leader of his wife and family is because he was created first in time, “...the head of the woman is the man...” (1 Cor. 11:3). “For the husband is the head of the wife...” (Eph. 5:23).

**THE FIRST ELDER.** Because the man was created first in time, God intended Eve to respect and lovingly submit to Adam as her “elder.” “Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder.” (1 Pe 5:5). “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.” (Eph. 5:22; Col. 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:1).

**THE FIRST TEACHER**

Because the man was created first in time, Adam had gained knowledge and experience prior to the creation of Eve (Gen. 2:15-20). Because of this fact, God intended Eve to seek wisdom, counsel, and knowledge from Adam as her “teacher.” If God had not intended Eve to respect Adam as her teacher, counselor and guide, then He would have given both Adam and Eve the same knowledge at the same time.

The very fact that God did not do this demonstrates His original and intentional role of the women in relation to her husband. The Apostle Paul clearly recognized this principle when He counseled the church of Corinth. “And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home” (1 Cor. 14:35).

**NOT CREATED FOR THE SAME PURPOSE**

If God wanted to convey the idea of absolute equality between men and women, not only should He have created them at the exact same time but also in the exact same way. Yet Adam was created from the dust of the ground, while Eve was created from a living rib from Adam’s side. What was the purpose of Eve’s creation? We read, “And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him” (Gen. 2:18).

The woman was created by God to fulfill the role of companion and helper to man. “For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.” (1 Cor. 11:8,9).

**NOT CREATED WITH EQUAL PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS**

Needless to say, men and women were not created with exactly the same physical characteristics. The man’s body was intentionally designed by the Creator to fulfill the role of provider, guardian and protector of the wife and family. The woman’s body was intentionally designed by the creator to fulfill the role of a helper to her husband, while mother and nurturer to her children.

The very fact that God made men and women with permanent physical, mental, and emotional differences, proves His intention of permanent role distinction as well. If God wanted the roles of male and female to be interchangeable depending on a particular cultural influence or environment; He could have created us with the ability to physically change from female to male and visa versa as easily as getting a sun tan.

**SUPERIORITY AFTER SIN**

After Adam and Eve sinned, God told Eve very plainly that: “thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.” (Gen. 3:16). “In the creation God had made her the equal of Adam. Had they remained obedient to God—in harmony with His great law of love—they would ever have been in harmony with each other; but sin had brought discord, and now their union could be maintained and harmony preserved only by submission on the part of the one or the other. Eve had been the first in transgression; and she had fallen into temptation by separating from her companion, contrary to the divine direction. It was by her solicitation that...
Adam sinned, and she was now placed in subjection to her husband. Had the principles joined in the law of God been cherished by the fallen race, this sentence, though growing out of the results of sin, would have proved a blessing to them; but man’s abuse of the supremacy thus given him has too often rendered the lot of woman very bitter and made her life a burden.

“Eve had been perfectly happy by her husband’s side in her Eden home; but, like restless modern Eves, she was flattered with the hope of entering a higher sphere than that which God had assigned her. In attempting to rise above her original position, she fell far below it. A similar result will be reached by all who are unwilling to take up cheerfully their life duties in accordance with God’s plan. In their efforts to reach positions for which He has not fitted them, many are leaving vacant the place where they might be a blessing. In their desire for a higher sphere, many have sacrificed true womanly dignity and nobility of character, and have left undone the very work that Heaven appointed them.” (PP 58, 59; see 3T. p. 484; AH 115).

The divinely ordained role for all women is clearly stated in Scriptures. The Godly wife should be taught “to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.” (Titus 2:4,5).

“The husband is the head of the family, as Christ is the head of the church; and any course which the wife may pursue to lessen his influence and lead him to come down from that dignified, responsible position is displeasing to God. It is the duty of the wife to yield her wishes and will to her husband. Both should be yielding, but the word of God gives preference to the judgment of the husband. And it will not detract from the dignity of the wife to yield to him whom she has chosen to be her counselor, adviser, and protector. The husband should maintain his position in his family with all meekness, yet with decision.” (1 T. p. 307, 308).

INTERCHANGING OF ROLES

The radical feminist and equal rights movement has stated in effect that there is no difference in the roles and positions of men and women, fathers and mothers. According to this philosophy, not only is it a women’s right to fulfill the role of father and husband, but in most cases she can do a better job! Yet, not only do feminists believe this about family leaders but church leaders as well. Adventist author U.J. Underwood says:

“Women in Protestant churches are performing in a splendid fashion as ordained ministers, heads of departments, and even leaders of whole denominations? Some congregations rate their female pastors as better preachers than their male counterparts! In all types of ministry, Protestant denominations demonstrate that women perform exception-ally well, not just as well as the average male, but better!...Women are entering the ministry in droves in most denominations.” Women in Their Place pp. 398, 399.

WOMEN SHOULD BE CHURCH HUSBANDS

Ironically enough, many church leaders fail to recognize the next and only logical conclusion after the biblical male/female family role distinctions are discarded. If it is wrong to make sex distinctions in the home government, it can only be wrong to make sex distinctions in the church government. Why? Because the church is simply a representative extension of the family. The apostle Paul clearly understood the relationship between the family government and the church government and makes a direct comparison between the responsibility of family home leadership and new testament church leadership in the following texts.

“For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?” (1 Tim. 3:5). “For the husband is the head of the wife; even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.” (Eph. 5:23,24). “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” (1 Cor. 11:3).

These texts clearly illustrate that as the wife is subject to her husband in the home; the symbolic wife (the church) is subject to her husband (Christ). As the husband carries the responsibility and role of “father” in the home; the church elder carries the responsibility of a “fatherly minister” to the church (as the representative of Christ).

The following texts clearly illustrate how an elder is viewed as a father figure by the church. “Unto Timothy, my own son in the faith” (1T. 1:2). “Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father” (1T. 1:1). “Even though you have ten thousand guardians in Christ, you do not have many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel.” (1 Cor. 4:15 NIV).

Encouraging and endorsing the ordination of women is the same in principle as encouraging wives to fulfill the role and function of their husbands in the family (be the head of the home). If it is right and proper for women to fulfill the role of “father” and “husband” to the family; then it is clearly hypocritical not to recognize and ordain women to fulfill the representative role of “father” and “husband” to the church. If it is Biblically wrong for the woman to be the representative leader of the home, it is also Biblically wrong for the women to be the representative leader of the local church.

It is clearly the God ordained position, role, job, function, duty and responsibility of the male to be the head or leader of the home family and the church family. God intended this to be so or He would never have created Adam first. The apostle Paul clearly recognizes this principle when He said: “But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.” (1 Tim. 2:12,13).

Any wife who is seeking the leadership responsibility of the family; any woman seeking the pastoral responsibility of the church, is seeking to “usurp authority over the man” by doing so. Even though many women may attain to that which they are seeking, (leader of the family or leader of the church), this gain will result in untold harm for both family and church.

“As for my people...women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths” (Isa. 3:12).

ORDAINED MALE PRIESTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

God gave specific instructions as to the gender of the priests ministering in the sanctuary. All priests were male. In the patriarchal days the head of the family was also its local priest; he did the ministering for the family, before the Lord. The father of the family was supposed to represent the great High Priest before his household.

After the Israelites left Egypt, Aaron and his posterity (tribe of Levi), were chosen by God to be His priests (Ex. 28:1,30). All the male children of Aaron were to be priests (Nu. 30:10). There is no record that God ever instructed his people to have female or Women priests.

Some may inquire, “but wasn’t the male gender of the Old Testament priesthood simply a Jewish or cultural distinction?” Please remember it was God Himself and not men who “ordained” Aaron’s sons and not his daughters to be priests. If God wanted a mixed gender priesthood, He would have ordained it so.

Ancient Israel did not always follow God’s order for the priesthood. Jeroboam and his sons fired the Levites from the ministry and ordained priests after the manner of the heathen nations (2Ch 11:14, 15; 13:9).
Interestingly enough, while God's people had only male priests, the heathen nations had both male and female priests to minister in their temples, groves and high places. The female priests were merely temple prostitutes serving to gratify the lusts of the temple worshipers.

ORDAINED MALE ELDERS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Some people may use the argument, "but that was the Old Testament Church order, the Christian church is completely different today, it doesn't have priests and sex distinctions anymore." Then they will quote this verse to "prove" their position. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:28).

In context, this text is not saying that in the family or church government there are no role distinctions between male or female. This text is not saying that in the new earth we will be re-created into a race which has no sex distinctions at all, "neither male nor female."

This text clearly teaches us that God's gift of salvation is freely offered and promised to all who believe. Regardless of race, social status, and sex, all who have been born again and "baptized" are the "children of God," "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:26–29).

It is true that the New Testament Christian Church did not observe the ceremonial sacrificial laws, including the need for the mediation of earthy priests. Yet to conclude that Christ "nailed to the cross" all the Old Testament sex distinctions regarding family responsibility and church leadership is not only speculative but presumptive. Christ didn't come to do away with any principles of truth which He had established through patriarchs and prophets, but rather He reaffirmed them all within their proper context.

The number and gender of the disciples Jesus ordained into the gospel ministry was not just coincidental (Mt. 10:1-5; Lk. 6:13). Jacob had twelve sons (Gen. 35:22). These twelve patriarchs stand as the head of their respective families (tribes), and representatives of the character and religion of Israel their father. Jesus ordained twelve disciples (Mt. 10:1-20). Christ's twelve disciples were figurative of these twelve patriarchs. Like Jacob's twelve sons, the disciples stood as representatives of the character and religion of Christ and the Christian Church.

After the twelve, Jesus ordained seventy disciples and commissioned them to go two by two and preach the gospel message. These seventy were figurative of the seventy elders ordained to help Moses judge the people in the wilderness (Nu. 11:16,17,24, 25).

The seventy elders as well as Christ's twelve ordained disciples were men. Christ's ordination of the twelve and seventy clearly reveals his respect and endorsement of Old Testament church leadership as it relates to gender. He did not ordain any women as elders (bishops or pastors) of the Christian Church. Yet this is not to say that many women were not an important and vital part of church ministry then and today. Yet, these Godly women of Bible times did not seek to usurp the authority of the Christian male in family or church leadership.

PRIOR TO THE DEATH OF ELLEN G. WHITE, SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS WERE NON-TRINITARIAN

1) Many Seventh-day Adventist scholars, theologians, and church historians candidly admit that early Adventism did not believe, nor teach, the doctrine of the Trinity.

The following are quotations from a variety of church leaders and historians verifying the fact that the early Adventist pioneers were definitely non-Trinitarian.

"Dear Brother Froom, From my personal knowledge the doctrine of the "Trinity-Godhead," was not taught by Seventh-day Adventists during the early days of my ministry." H. Cottrell, 1931.

"Replying to your letter of October 13 regarding the doctrine of the Trinity, I will say that Seventh-day Adventists do not and never have accepted the dark, mysterious Catholic doctrine of the Trinity." Letter from B.G. Wilkinson, 1936.

"I understand that some of our leading men in the beginning were opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity, at least as expressed by certain Trinitarians." A.W. Spalding, 1947.

"Most assuredly our people were anti-Trinitarians, when we (the Lacey family) accepted the 'truth' in 1888." H.C. Lacey, 1947.

"Dear Brother Froom: Mrs. Soper calls to our attention the fact that you are seeking information as to the positions held by our early workers concerning the Trinity, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the pre-existence of Christ as this may be revealed in their writings. I think we will have to concede that our early workers were not Trinitarians." Arthur L. White, 1955.

"As shown in chapter III, Seventh-day Adventist pioneers held generally an anti-Trinitarian position. Although it can be argued that 'this was largely a matter of words,' we have proven that it also was a matter of doctrine. Nevertheless, what cannot be contested is that in the first four or five decades of the Seventh-day Adventist movement there was in its ranks a widespread rejection of the term 'Trinity.' And whenever an Adventist writer declared on the nature of God, the declaration was anti-Trinitarian." Nestor Alberro, 1983.

ELLEN WHITE'S SON WAS NON-TRINITARIAN

LETTER FROM H.W. CARR TO W.C. WHITE


Dear Elder White:

"...In the first pages of Great Controversy it is stated that the 'Father had an associate.—A co-worker...The only being that could enter into all the councils and purposes of God.' The Father wrought by His son in the creation of all heavenly beings...He holds supremacy over them all.' 'Sin originated with Satan, who next to Christ had been most honored of God, and was highest in power and glory among the inhabitants of heaven Next to Christ he was first among the hosts of God.' 'The Son of God had wrought the Fathers will in the creation of all the hosts of heaven.' 'The Son of God was exalted above Satan as one in power and authority with the Father.' Christ created Satan. Ez. 28:15.

"It is urged by some of our leaders now that The Holy Spirit is a third person of the same nature of the Father and Son, a member of the heavenly trio, cooperative in creation and personally active with the Father and Son. For many years I have used these statements of Sr. White in combating false teachings relative to defining the Holy Spirit.

"Will you kindly tell me what you understand was your mother's position in reference to the personality of the Holy Spirit?... [questions asked on other topics].

"I know Brother White you would not depart from your mother's teachings, and that you have as perfect an understanding of them as any one. I shall appreciate your opinion very much.

"Assuring you of the high esteem and respect I have had from my childhood in your father, mother and family.

"I am very truly yours in this blessed faith. H.W. Carr"
LETTER FROM WILLIE C. WHITE
(E.G. WHITE’S SON) TO H.W. CARR

April 30, 1935.

Dear brother Carr,

"I hold in my hand your letter of January 24. For some months I have been so heavily pressed with work connected with manuscripts which we were preparing for the printer that my correspondence has had to wait.

"In your letter you request me to tell you what I understand to be my mother’s position in reference to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

"This I cannot do because I never clearly understood her teachings on the matter. There always was in my mind some perplexity regarding the meaning of her utterances which to my superficial manner of thinking seemed to be somewhat confusing. I have often regretted that I did not possess that keenness of mind that could solve this and similar perplexities, and then remembering what Sister White wrote in ‘Acts of the Apostles,’ pages 51 and 52, regarding such mysteries which are too deep for human understanding, silence is golden,’ I have thought best to refrain from discussion and have endeavored to direct my mind to matters easy to be understood.

"As I read the Bible, I find that the risen Saviour breathed on the disciples (John 20:22) ‘and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’ The conception received from this Scripture, seems to be in harmony with the statement in ‘Desire of Ages’, page 669, also Gen. 1:2; with Luke 1:4; with Acts 2:4 and also 8:15 and 10:44. Many other texts might be referred to which seem to be in harmony with this statement in ‘Desire of Ages.’

"The statements and the arguments of some of our ministers in their effort to prove that the Holy Spirit was an individual as are God the Father and Christ, the eternal Son, have perplexed me and sometimes they have made me sad. One popular teacher said ‘We may regard Him, (the Holy Spirit) as the fellow who is down here running things.’

"My perplexities were lessened a little when I learned from the dictionary that one of the meanings of personality, was Characteristic. It is stated in such a way that I concluded that there might be personality without bodily form which is possessed by the Father and the Son.

"There are many Scriptures which speak of the Father and the Son and the absence of Scripture making similar reference to the united work of the Father and the Holy Spirit or of Christ and the Holy Spirit, has led me to believe that the spirit without individuality was the representative of the Father and the Son throughout the universe, and it was through the Holy Spirit that they dwell in our hearts and make us one with the Father and with the Son...[answers to other subjects] "With kind regards, I remain sincerely your brother,

W.C. White” (emphasis supplied).

LETTER BY J.S. WASHBURN

In 1939, J.S. Washburn wrote a paper/letter in protest of a sermon where W.W. Prescott apparently affirmed the Trinitarian doctrine. One conference president was so impressed with Washburn’s letter that He distributed 32 copies of it to his ministers. The following is a portion of J.S. Washburn’s letter.

"The doctrine of the Trinity is regarded as the supreme test of orthodoxy by the Roman Catholic Church. Many of the councils of that church during its development were almost entirely given over to the discussion of the Trinity, the Arian and Trinitarian controversy.

"Was Christ of the same substance of the Father, or of like substance?’ Very naturally the nature of the personality of God was the center, the core, the key of the teachings of Roman theology, Satan’s crowning masterpiece of apostate Counterfeit Christianity.

"The leading doctrines of the Roman papacy were taken directly from heathenism, the sign of the cross, Holy water, monks, nuns, the celibacy of the priesthood, the Sunday Sabbath, etc., etc. So this Catholic doctrine of the Trinity comes from heathenism. In India we have Brahma, Shiva, Vishnu, vengeful, unforgiving trinity..."

"The doctrine of the Trinity is a cruel heathen monstrosity, removing Jesus from his true position of Divine Savior and Mediator. It is true we cannot measure or define divinity. It is beyond our finite understanding, yet on this subject of the personality of God the Bible is very simple and plain. The Father, the Ancient of Days, is from eternity. Jesus was begotten of the Father. Jesus speaking through the Psalmist says: ‘The Lord (Jehovah) hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.’ - Psalm 2:7.

"Again in Proverbs (where Jesus is spoken of under the title of wisdom, See 1 Cor. 1:24), we read: ‘The Lord (Jehovah) possessed me in the beginning of his way’. v.22.

"Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth.’ -V.24.

"The Son says he was brought forth, begotten, born, of His Father (Jehovah)..."

"Satan has taken some heathen conception of a three-headed monstrosity, and with deliberate intention to cast contempt upon divinity, has woven it into Romanism as our glorious God, an impossible, absurd invention. This monstrous doctrine transplanted from heathenism into the Roman Papal Church is seeking to intrude its evil presence into the teachings of the Third Angel’s Message...

"And the fact that Christ is not the mediator in the Roman Church demonstrates that the Trinity destroys the truth that Christ is the one, the only mediator.

"The so-called Christian Church, the Papacy, that originated the doctrine of the Trinity, does not recognize him as the only mediator but substitutes a multitude of ghosts of dead men and women as
mediators. If you hold the Trinity doctrine, in reality, Christ is no longer your mediator...

“The whole Trinity doctrine is utterly foreign to all the Bible and the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy. Revelation gives not the slightest hint of it. This monstrous heathen conception finds no place in all the free universe of our Blessed Heavenly Father and His Son, our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ...

“The heathen doctrine of the Trinity, supreme in the Catholic Church, Roman and Greek, blots out the light of God given liberty, fills the world with darkness and blood, either when it is logically enforced as the only religion, or, when men filled with the same spirit, revolt and take revenge in the same way that they have suffered, and set up another government on the same principle, despotism, dictatorship.

“No one living can deny that where the Trinity was the supreme doctrine there has come horrible bondage, destruction, ruin; liberty utterly lost. Look at Italy, Spain, Russia; Hitler an Austrian Catholic, Stalin studied for the priesthood, Franco in Spain, Mussolini in Italy. The world is in torment from action and reaction of the blasphemous doctrine of the Trinity...

“The Catholic heathen doctrine of the Sunday Sabbath is just as sacred as the Catholic pagan doctrine of the Trinity and no more so...

“Seventh-day Adventist claim to take the word of God as supreme authority and to have ‘come out of Babylon’, to have renounced forever the vain traditions of Rome. If we should go back to the immortality of the soul, purgatory, eternal torment and the Sunday Sabbath, would that be anything less than apostasy? If, however, we leap over all these minor, secondary doctrines and accept and teach the very central root, doctrine of Romanism, the Trinity, and teach that the son of God did not die, even though our words seem to be spiritual, is this anything else or anything less than apostasy? and the very Omega of apostasy?

“Thank God for the Spirit of Prophecy! In the printed copy of Eld. Prescott’s sermon, I note that he quotes profusely from the teachings of Sunday-keeping ministers of other churches... If He would read the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy more and the teachings of popular Sunday-keeping ministers less, if he would in simple faith take the teachings of the Testimony of Jesus, he would not make the mistake of teaching the heathen doctrine of the Trinity or bringing in any other arguments to overthrow the established settled faith of the people who believe the great closing message...

“However kindly or beautiful or apparently profound his sermons or articles may be, when a man has arrived at the place where he teaches the heathen Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and denies that the Son of God died for us, is he a true Seventh-day Adventist.? Is he even a true preacher of the Gospel? And when many regard him as a great teacher and accept his unscriptural theories, absolutely contrary to the Spirit of Prophecy, it is time that the watchmen should sound a note of warning...

“The false teaching of the personality of God making him simply an essence and not a personality was the ‘Alpha of Apostasy’. Another phase of false doctrine on the personality of God, might become the ‘Omega of deadly apostasy’, Series B., No. 2, page 16...The apostasy in the days of Dr. Kellogg was in regard to the personality of God. Then He was regarded as an ESSENCE pervading all nature. Being checked by the powerful Testimony of the Prophet of God, it is bound to come back later in a modified form. The Spirit of Prophecy has plainly indicated this. ‘THE RESULTS OF THIS INSIDIOUS DEVISING WILL BREAK OUT AGAIN AND AGAIN’, and it HAS BROKEN OUT AGAIN, and is still on the personality of God.”

The above quotations should be sufficient to reveal the fact that even by 1939, prominent leaders of the Seventh day Adventist denomination had not accepted the Trinitarian doctrine as is taught today (in the 27 fundamental beliefs).

• 2) Every statement of Adventist belief was distinctly non-Trinitarian prior to the 1931 statement of beliefs and the 27 fundamental beliefs voted in 1980.

The fact and reality that the SDA denomination did change its position on the Trinity can be proven by simply comparing the 1872/1874 [non-Trinitarian] statement of beliefs with the 1980 [pro-Trinitarian] 27 fundamental beliefs as follows:

1872 STATEMENT

1. That there is one God, a personal, spiritual Being, the Creator of all things, omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal, infinite in wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, truth, and mercy; unchangeable, and everywhere present by His representative, the Holy Spirit. Psalm 139:7.

2. That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, and Son of the Eternal Father, the One by whom God created all things...’

1980 STATEMENT

“There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity of three co-eternal Persons. God is immortal, all-powerful, all-knowing, above all, and ever present. He is infinite and beyond human comprehension, yet known through His self-revelation. He is forever worthy of worship, adoration, and service by the whole creation.- Fundamental Beliefs, 2” (S.A.B. p. 16)

The following quotations from the book ‘ISSUES’ also clearly admits of this great doctrinal change as well.

“After the 1952 Bible Conference, for example, Nichol wrote in the Review of the ‘impressive fact that we have not changed our theology.’ To be sure, the qualifiers that Nichol adds to that statement tend to temper its intensity. He seems to be speaking of Adventism’s major doctrines. But even then it would seem that the shift to a Trinitarian theology is a significant ‘change’ in Adventist thinking...In addition to the missing preamble, the 1931 statement differs most dramatically from the 1872 statement in that it fully Trinitarian...The 1980 statement is like the 1931 statement in that it is fully Trinitarian...” ISSUES p. 46.

“The nonbinding, noncreedal status of the statement [1872 statement of Beliefs] is of special interest. Even more significant, however, is the fact that the statement is distinctly non-Trinitarian. Jesus is described as Creator and Redeemer but is nowhere identified as God or as eternal. He simply is ‘the Son of the Eternal Father’...”

“Are the modern defenders of so-called historic Adventism really prepared to return to a non-Trinitarian position?...”

“According to the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, James White and Uriah Smith were ‘the two leading anti- Trinitarians,’ though Joseph Bates, J.H. Waggoner, E.J. Waggoner, and W.W. Prescott were also so inclined.” ISSUES p. 39. [emphasis supplied].

It is a fair question: “Are the modern defenders of so-called historic Adventism really prepared to return to a non-Trinitarian position?” What is the point behind the question? Modern denominational leaders recognize that most Independent Ministries are definitely not willing to return to the anti-Trinitarian position of the pioneers because of the resulting cultic stigma and financial loss that such a change would incur. Therefore, the question is an attempt to “force” Independent Ministries to recognize that the pioneers statement of belief contained “serious errors” and cannot therefore be considered as any type of standard of truth for today.
WHY WERE THE EARLY ADVENTIST PIONEERS NOT TRINITARIAN?

The seventh-day Adventist pioneers did not believe the Trinity doctrine for the following reasons:

• 1) The Trinity doctrine is unscriptural.
• 2) The Trinity doctrine is of Pagan origin.
• 3) The Trinity doctrine is of Catholic origin.

THE TRINITY DOCTRINE IS UNSCRIPTURAL

• The pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church clearly recognized the Trinity doctrine to be unscriptural.

The following are a few examples of this belief.

JAMES WHITE

“The way spiritualizers this way have disposed of or denied the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ is first using the old unscriptural Trinitarian creed” The Day Star, Jan. 24, 1846.

J.H. WAGGONER

“The great mistake of Trinitarians, in arguing this subject, seems to be this:

They make no distinction between a denial of a Trinity and a denial of the divinity of Christ. They see only the two extremes, between which the truth lies; and take every expression referring to the pre-existence of Christ as evidence of a Trinity. The Scriptures abundantly teach the pre-existence of Christ and his divinity; but they are entirely silent in regard to a Trinity.” The Atonement, 1872, chapter 4, “Doctrine Of A Trinity Subversive Of The Atonement” p. 165.

A.J. DENNIS

“What a contradiction of terms is found in the language of a Trinitarian creed: ‘In unity of this Godhead are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’ There are many things that are mysterious, written in the word of God, but we may safely presume the Lord never calls upon us to believe impossibilities. But creeds often do.” Signs of the Times, May 22, 1879.

R.F. COTTRELL

“My reasons for not adopting and defending it, are 1. Its name is unscriptural - the Trinity, or the triune God, is unknown to the Bible; and I have entertained the idea that doctrines which require words coined in the human mind to express them, are coined doctrines. 2. I have never felt called upon to adopt and explain that which is contrary to all the sense and reason that God has given me. All my attempts at an explanation of such a subject would make it no clearer to my friends...” Review and Herald, June 1, 1869.

J.N. LOUGHBOROUGH

“The word Trinity nowhere occurs in the Scriptures. The principal text supposed to teach it is 1 John 5:7, which is an interpolation. Clarke says, ‘Out of one hundred and thirteen manuscripts, the text is wanting in one hundred and twelve. It occurs in no MS. before the tenth century. And the first place the text occurs in Greek, is in the Greek translation of the acts of the Council of Latern, held A.D. 1215.’—Com. on John 1, and remarks at close of chap.” Review and Herald, Nov. 5, 1861.

THE TRINITY DOCTRINE IS PAGAN

• The pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church clearly recognized the Pagan origin of the Trinity doctrine. The following quotations are examples of their willingness to speak against this pagan doctrine.

J.B. FRISBIE

“We will make a few extracts, that the reader may see the broad contrast between the God of the Bible brought to light through Sabbath-keeping, and the god in the dark through Sunday-keeping.

Catholic Catechism Abridged by the Rt. Rev. John Dubois, Bishop of New York. Page 5. ‘Q. Where is God? Ans. God is everywhere. Q. Does God see and know all things? A. Yes, he does know and see all things... Q. Are there more Gods than one? A. No; there is but one God. Q. Are there more persons than one in God? A Yes; in God there are three persons. Q. Which are they? A. God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost. Q. Are there not three Gods? A. No; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, are all but one and the same God... These ideas well accord with those heathen philosophers... We should rather mistrust that the Sunday God [the Trinity] came from the same source that Sunday-keeping did.” Review and Herald, Feb. 28, 1854, The Sunday God, p.50. [emphasis supplied].

J.N. LOUGHBOROUGH

“Questions for Bro. Loughborough.

Bro. White: The following questions I would like to have you give, or send, to Bro. Loughborough for explanation. W. W. Giles, Toledo, Ohio

Question 1. What serious objections is there to the doctrine of the Trinity? ANSWER. There are many objections which we might urge, but on account of our limited space we shall reduce them to the three following: 1. It is contrary to common sense. 2. It is contrary to scripture. 3. Its origin is pagan and fabulous...

Instead of pointing us to scripture for proof of the Trinity, we are pointed to the trident of the Persians...This doctrine of the Trinity was brought into the church about the same time with image worship, and keeping the day of the sun, and is but Persian doctrine remodeled. It occupied about three hundred years from its introduction to bring the doctrine to what it is now. It was commenced about 325 A.D., and was not completed till 681. See Milman’s Gibbon’s Rome, vol. iv, p. 422. It was adopted in Spain in 589, in England in 596, in Africa in 534.—Gib. vol. iv, pp. 114, 345; Milner, vol. i, p. 519.” RH-Nov. 5, 1861.
THE TRINITY DOCTRINE IS CATHOLIC

• The pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church clearly recognized the Catholic origin of the Trinity doctrine, classifying this teaching as “the wine of Babylon.”

J.H. WAGGONER

“Who can distinguish between this form of expression and that put forth by the council of Constantinople in A.D. 381, wherein the true faith is declared to be that of ‘an uncreated and consubstantial and co-eternal Trinity?’ The truth is that we find the same idea which is here described by Bingham running through much of the orthodox literature of the second and third centuries. There is no proper ‘relation of Father and Son’ to be found in the words of the council, above quoted...Bingham says this error in regard to a Trinity of three co-ordinate and self-originated and independent beings arose in the church very early; and so we find it in the earliest authors after the days of the apostles.” Thoughts on Baptism, 1878.

R.F. COTTRELL

“That one person is three persons, and that three persons are only one person, is the doctrine which we claim is contrary to reason and common sense. The being and attributes of God are above, beyond, out of reach of my sense and reason, yet I believe them”: But the doctrine I object to is contrary, yes, that is the word, to the very sense and reason that God has himself implanted in us. Such a doctrine he does not ask us to believe. A miracle is beyond our comprehension, but we all believe in miracles who believe our own senses. What we see and hear convinces us that there is a power that effected the most wonderful miracle of creation. But our Creator has made it an absurdity to us that one person should be three persons, and three persons but one person; and in his revealed word he has never asked us to believe it. This our friend thinks objectionable...

“But to hold the doctrine of the Trinity is not so much an evidence of evil intention as of intoxication from that wine of which all the nations have drunk. The fact that this was one of the leading doctrines, if not the very chief, upon which the bishop of Rome was exalted to the popedom, does not say much in its favor. This should cause men to investigate it for themselves; as when the spirits of devils working miracles under- take the advocacy of the immortality of the soul. Had I never doubted it before, I would now probe it to the bottom, by that word which modern Spiritualism sets at nought...
“Revelation goes beyond us; but in no instance does it go contrary to right reason and common sense. God has not claimed, as the popes have, that he could ‘make justice of injustice,’ nor has he, after teaching us to count, told us that there is no difference between the singular and plural numbers. Let us believe all he has revealed, and add nothing to it.” Review and Herald, July 6, 1869.

A.T. JONES

“Another, and most notable opponent, was Servetus who had opposed the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and also infant baptism.” Review and Herald, June 17, 1884.

D.W. HULL

“The inconsistent positions held by many in regard to the Trinity, as it is termed, has, no doubt, been the prime cause of many other errors. Erroneous views of the divinity of Christ are apt to lead us into error in regard to the nature of the atonement...

“The doctrine which we propose to examine, was established by the council of Nice, A.D., 325, and ever since that period, persons not believing this peculiar tenet, have been denounced by popes and priests, as dangerous heretics. It was for a disbelief in this doctrine, that the Arians were anathematized in A.D., 513...

“As we can trace this doctrine no further back than the origin of the ‘Man of Sin,’ and as we find this dogma at that time established rather by force than otherwise, we claim the right to investigate the matter, and ascertain the bearing of Scripture on this subject.” Review and Herald, Nov.10, 1859.

WHAT DID THE ADVENTIST PIONEERS BELIEVE ABOUT GOD THE FATHER?

The early Adventist Pioneers understood the biblical definition of “one God” (Dt. 6:4; Mk. 12:32; Rom. 3:30; 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 4:6; 1 Tim. 2:5; 6:14-16; Jas. 2:19), to refer to the one supreme being in the universe, namely—God the Father.

The Adventist Pioneers believed that while the Son of God shares an equality of nature (divinity), glory and honor with His Father, these attributes were conferred upon, or inherited by, the Son from His Father by virtue of His literal Sonship. In this respect the Son of God always has been, and always will be subject unto His Father, even after the millennium and throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity (Jn. 5:19; 6:57; 14:28; 1 Cor. 11:3; Heb. 1:9; 1 Cor. 15:23-28).

JAMES WHITE

James White clearly recognized the biblical term “one God” as applying not to Christ, nor to the Holy Spirit, but rather to God the Father.

“To assert that the sayings of the Son and his apostles are the commandments of the Father, is as wide from the truth as the old Trinitarian absurdity that Jesus Christ is the very and eternal God.” Review and Herald, Aug. 5, 1852, p.52.

J.N. ANDREWS

J.N. Andrews reiterated the common Adventist understanding that God the Father is the supreme source of all life in the universe. In 1874 he writes:

“That God is the fountain and source of immortality is plain from the statement of Paul. He speaks thus of God the Father: ‘Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting; Amen.’ 1 Tim. 6:16. This text is evidently designed to teach that the self-existent God is the only being who, of himself, possesses this wonderful nature. Others may possess it as derived from him, but he alone is the fountain of immortality.

“Our Lord Jesus Christ is the source of this life to us. ‘For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.’ John 5:26. ‘As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.’ John 6:57. The Father gives us this life in His Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.’ 1Jn 5:11,12. These Scriptures do clearly indicate that Christ is the source of endless life, and that those only have this who have Christ.” Review and Herald, Jan. 27, 1874 p.52.

D.M. CANRIGHT

D.M Canright wrote a series of articles in the “Review” about the subject of the Trinity. These articles clearly articulate the Seventhd-day Adventist position of the “one God” in contrast to the Trinitarian position.

“Text: ‘But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things.’ 1 Cor.8:6...

“At the time when the Bible was written, nearly the whole world had adopted either Polytheism or Pantheism. Polytheism taught that there were many gods...In opposition to that, Moses and the prophets set forth the grand fact that this doctrine of many gods was a lie, and that there was but one God, Jehovah the living God...

“The inconsistent positions held by many in regard to the Trinity, was established by the council of Nice, A.D., 325, and ever since that period, persons not believing this peculiar tenet, have been denounced by popes and priests, as dangerous heretics. It was for a disbelief in this doctrine, that the Arians were anathematized in A.D., 513..."Man of Sin," and as we find this dogma at that time established rather by force than otherwise, we claim the right to investigate the matter, and ascertain the bearing of Scripture on this subject.” Review and Herald, July 6, 1869.

-Col. 2:3; Rom. 3:30; 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 4:6; 1 Cor. 15:23-28; 2Kings 19:15; Neh. 9:6; Psa. 86:10; Isa. 43:10; Isa 44:6,8; Isa. 45:5,22; quoted]

No comments of ours can make these declarations plainer. There is just one eternal God and no more,—one who is the Author and Father of all things.

“Turning to the New Testament, we find the same doctrine taught just as plainly as in the Old. Neither Moses nor the prophets ever set forth the unity of God more strongly than Jesus himself. He taught it and reiterated it many times. Thus he says: ‘The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel. The Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul...And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou..."Man of Sin," and as we find this dogma at that time established rather by force than otherwise, we claim the right to investigate the matter, and ascertain the bearing of Scripture on this subject.” Review and Herald, July 6, 1869.
hast said the truth; for there is one God; and there is none other but he. Mark 12:29-32.

"The scribe said, 'There is one God, and there is none other but he.' To this declaration Jesus assented. 'And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' John 17:3 Jesus says his Father is the only true God. But Trinitarians contradict this by saying that the Son and Holy Ghost are just as much the true God as the Father is...

[1 Cor. 8:4-6 quoted] ‘Says the great apostle, ‘There is none other God but one,’ and ‘there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things.’ He tells us who this one God is. It is not the Holy Ghost; it is not Jesus Christ, but it is the Father. Gal. 3:20; 1 Tim. 1:17. There is, then, only one wise God. 1 Tim. 2:5; Dt. 6:4. Those who are familiar with the Bible will see that I have selected only a few of the plainest texts upon this doctrine. How the doctrine of the Trinity, of three Gods, can be reconciled with these positive statements I do not know. It seems to me that nothing can be framed which more clearly denies the doctrine of the Trinity, than do the Scriptures above quoted.

"And then the Bible never uses the phrases, 'Trinity,' 'triune God,' 'three in one,' "the holy three," 'God the Holy Ghost,' etc. but it does emphatically say there is only one God, the Father. And every argument to prove three Gods in one person, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, all of them of one substance, and every way equal to each other, and all three forming but one, contradicts itself, contradicts reason, and contradicts the Bible...

"God is self-existent, and the source and author of all things,—of angels, of men, of all the worlds,—of everything. Thus Paul says, 'For of him and through him and to him, are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen.' Rom. 11:36.

"He is the source of all life and immortality. Thus, speaking of the Father, Paul says, 'Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto.' 1 Tim. 6:16. Notice that this glorious God is the only one who, in himself, possesses immortality. That is, he is the fountain-head, the source of all life and immortality...

"'For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.' John 5:26. This statement is unequivocal. The Father has life in himself, and in his great love for his Son he bestows the same gift upon him; but it will be noticed that the Father is the one from whom the gift came...

"How carefully Paul distinguishes between the Father and the Son. He says, 'The Father, of whom are all things,' and 'Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.' The Father is the source of everything. Jesus is the one through whom all things are done. All the authority, the glory, and the power of Christ he received from his Father...

"A belief in this doctrine is very important. Indeed, it cannot be too strongly insisted upon. Jesus even declares that the knowledge of this truth is necessary to eternal life. 'And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' John 17:3.

"We must know the Father as the only true God. Then there is no true God besides the Father. But we must also know his Son Jesus Christ, whom he has sent. How simple and plain is this doctrine, and how abundantly sustained by the Holy Bible." Review and Herald, Aug. 29, 1878; (emphasis supplied).

A.T. JONES

A.T. Jones, (like White, Andrews and Canright), applies 1 Tim. 6:15-16 to God the Father as the supreme being in the universe. In 1890 Jones writes:

"Again, speaking of the appearing of Jesus Christ, the Word says: 'In His times He shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, the Lord of Lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see.' 1 Tim. 6:15-16. Christ has brought this immortality to light. Now as immortality is to be sought for, and as God is the only one who has it, and as Christ is the only one who has brought it to light, it follows that immortality must be sought of God, through Christ." Bible Questions and Answers Concerning Man, pp. 3-4.

E.J. WAGGONER

In 1892, E.J. Waggoner penned the following words in his classic book "Christ and His Righteousness."

"We are mindful of Paul's words, that 'to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by Him' (1 Cor. 8:6); just as we have already quoted, that it was by Him that God made the worlds. All things proceed ultimately from God, the Father; even Christ Himself proceeded and came forth from the Father..." Christ and His Righteousness p. 19.

Both E.J. Waggoner and A.T. Jones were in agreement in their anti-Trinitarian understanding. This leads us to the simple question, "Is it possible to preach the '1888' message of Jones and Waggoner with a pro-Trinitarian emphasis?" There is enormous evidence to conclude, that whatever date you want to attach to a message today, if it is pro-Trinitarian, it's not the same one Jones and Waggoner preached in 1888, and the years thereafter.

WHAT DID THE ADVENTIST PIONEERS BELIEVE ABOUT THE SON OF GOD?

The Adventist Pioneers believed that there was a time in the eons of eternity when the Father had a Son. Not a son by creation, nor by adoption but a Son begotten in the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of the Father's person (Heb. 1:3), a duplication of Himself. The Adventist pioneers did not try to explain when or how this process of begetting or birth occurred, yet emphatically maintained the literal Sonship of Jesus prior to his incarnation and birth in Bethlehem. They were not two Fathers; they were not two Sons. The Father was the literal Father of His Son, and the Son was the literal Son of His Father. The Father had a real Son!

JAMES WHITE

"The Father is the greatest in that He is first. The Son is next in authority because He has been given all things." Review and Herald, Jan. 4, 1881.

J. N. ANDREWS

AND AS TO THE SON OF GOD, he would be excluded also, for he had God for his Father, and did, at some point in the eternity of the past, have beginning of days. So that if we use Paul's language in an absolute sense, it would be impossible to find but one being in the universe, and that is God the Father, who is without father, or mother, or descent, or beginning of days, or end of life." Review and Herald Sept. 7, 1869.

C.W. STONE

"The Word, then, is Christ. This text speaks of his origin. He is the only begotten of the Father. Just how he came into existence, the Bible does not inform us any more definitely; but by this expression and several of a similar kind in the Scriptures, we may believe that Christ came into existence in a manner different from that in which other beings first appeared; that he sprang from the Father's being in a way not necessary for us to understand" The Captain Of Our Salvation, 1886, p. 17.
E.J. WAGGONER

"In arguing the perfect equality of the Father and the Son, and the fact that Christ is in very nature God, we do not design to be understood as teaching that the Father was not before the Son. It should not be necessary to guard this point, lest some should think that the Son existed as soon as the Father; yet some go to that extreme, which adds nothing to the dignity of Christ, but rather detracts from the honor due him, since many throw the whole thing away rather than accept a theory so obviously out of harmony with the language of Scripture, that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God. He was begotten, not created. He is of the substance of the Father, so that in his very nature he is God; and since this is so 'It pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.' Col. 1:19...While both are of the same nature, the Father is first in point of time. He is also greater in that he had no beginning, while Christ's personality had a beginning." Signs of the Times, April 8, 1889 p. 214.

"The Word was in the beginning." The mind of man cannot grasp the ages that are spanned in this phrase. It is not given to men to know when or how the Son was begotten; but we know that He was the Divine Word, not simply before He came to this earth to die, but even before the world was created...[Micah 5:2 quoted] We know that Christ "proceeded forth and came from God" (John 8:42), but it was so far back in the ages of eternity as to be far beyond the grasp of the mind of man." Christ And His Righteousness, 1890, p. 9.

"As the Son of the self-existent God, he has by nature all the attributes of Deity. It is true that there are many sons of God; but Christ is the 'only begotten Son of God,' and therefore the Son of God in a sense in which no other being was, or ever can be. The angels are sons of God, as was Adam (Job 38:7; Luke 3:38), by creation; Christians are the sons of God by adoption (Rom. 8:14; 15); but Christ is the Son of God by birth." ibid. p. 12.

"All things proceed ultimately from God, the Father, even Christ Himself proceeded and came forth from the Father..."ibid. p. 19.

"The Scriptures declare that Christ is "the only begotten Son of God." He is begotten, not created. As to when He was begotten, it is not for us to inquire, nor could our minds grasp it if we were told. The prophet Micah tells us all that we can know about it, in these words: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from old, from the days of eternity." Micah 5:2, margin. There was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father (John 8:42; 1:18), but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite comprehension it is practically without beginning." ibid. p. 21, 22; (emphasis supplied).

W.W. PRESCOTT

"As Christ was twice born, once in eternity, the only begotten of the Father, and again here in the flesh, thus uniting the divine with the human in that second birth, so we, who have been born once already in the flesh, are to have the second birth, being born again of the Spirit, in order that our experience may be the same, the human and the divine being joined in a life union." Review and Herald, April 14, 1896 p. 232.

A.T. JONES

"He was born of the Holy Ghost. In other words, Jesus Christ was born again. He came from heaven, God’s first-born, to the earth, and was born again, But all in Christ’s work goes by opposites for us: he, the sinless one, was made to be sin, in order that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. He, the living one, the prince and author of life, died that we might live. He whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity, the first-born of God, was born again, in order that we might be born again.

If Jesus Christ had never been born again, could you and I have ever been born again? No. But he was born again, from the world of righteousness into the world of sin; that we might be born again, from the world of sin into the world of righteousness. He was born again, and was made partaker of the human nature, that we might be born again, and so made partakers of the divine nature. He was born again, unto earth, unto sin, and unto man, that we might be born again unto heaven, unto righteousness, and unto God." Review and Herald, Aug. 1, 1899 (Lessons on Faith p. 154.)

WAS THE SON OF GOD A CREATED BEING?

Contrary to categorical assertions by modern Adventist theologians, the early Adventist Pioneers did not teach that the pre-existent Son of God was a created being in any regular sense of the term, or that He was not fully divine (or “God”). Even Arthur L. White understood that: “To say that James White was an Arian is a misnomer.”

The Adventist Pioneers were purposefully labeled “Arian,” (i.e. Son was created from nothing) by apostate Protestants (i.e. Walter Martin) as a “cultic” label scare tactic. L.E. From and other modern theologians also labeled them as such, in order to stigmatize their beliefs and effect a denominational change conforming to the Evangelical, pro-Trinitarian view. Notice the Following quotations by some of the pioneers:

JAMES WHITE

“Paul affirms of the Son of God that he was in the form of God, and that he was equal with God. 'Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God.' Phil. 2:6. The reason why it is not robbery for the Son to be equal with the Father is the fact that he is equal...

The inexplicable Trinity that makes the godhead three in one and one in three, is bad enough; but that ultra Unitarianism that makes Christ inferior to the Father is worse. Did God say to an inferior, 'Let us make man in our image?'” Review and Herald, Nov. 29, (1877), p. 172.

JAMES EDSON WHITE

“Both angels, therefore, are created beings, necessarily of a lower order than their Creator. Christ is the only being begotten of the Father.” Past, Present and Future, 1909, p. 52.

J.M. STEPHENSON

"To be the only begotten Son of God must be understood in a different sense than to be a Son by creation; for in that sense all the creatures he has made are sons. Nor can it refer to his miraculous conception, with the virgin Mary, by the Holy Ghost; because he is represented by this endearing title more than four thousand years before his advent in the village of Bethlehem. Moreover, he is represented as being exalted far above the highest orders of men and angels in his primeval nature. He must therefore be understood as being the Son of God in a much higher sense than any other being. His being the only begotten of the Father supposes that none except him were thus begotten; hence he is, in truth and verity the only begotten Son of God; and as such he must be Divine; that is, be a partaker of the Divine nature. This term expresses his highest, and most exalted nature...

“The idea of Father and Son supposes priority of the existence of the one, and the subsequent existence of the other. To say that the Son is as old as his Father, is a palpable contradiction of terms. It is a natural impossibility for the Father to be as young as the Son, or the Son to be as old as the Father. If it be said that this term is only used in an accommodated sense, it still remains to be accounted for, why the Father should use as the uniform title of the highest, and most endearing relation between himself and our Lord, a term which, in its uniform signification, would contradict the very idea he
wished to convey. If the inspired writers had wished to convey the idea of the co-etaneous existence, and eternity of the Father and Son, they could not possibly have used more incompatible terms. And of this, Trinitarians, had the honesty to acknowledge, in the conclusion of his work on the Son-ship of Christ, that, ‘in the order of nature, the Father must have existed Before the Son.” Review and Herald, Nov. 14, 1854.

D.M. CANRIGHT
“‘For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son,’ &c. According to this, Jesus Christ is begotten of God in a sense that no other being is; else he could not be his only begotten Son. Angels are called sons of God, and so are righteous men; but Christ is his Son in a higher sense, in a closer relation, than either of these. God made men and angels out of materials already created. He is the author of their existence, their Creator, hence their Father. But Jesus Christ was begotten of the Father’s own substance. He was not created out of material as the angels and other creatures were. He is truly and emphatically the ‘Son of God,’…Heb.1:1-8 quoted.

“By this we see that a very plain and great distinction is made between the Son and all the angels. They are all commanded to worship him. No created being can ever be worthy of worship, however high he may be, neither would it be right nor just for God to bid one order of his creatures to worship another. Divinity alone is worthy of worship, and to worship anything else would be idolatry. Hence Paul places Christ far above the angels, and makes a striking contrast between them.” Review and Herald, June 18, 1867.

R.F. COTTRELL
“Men have gone to opposite extremes in the discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity. Some have made Christ a mere man, commencing his existence at his birth in Bethlehem; others have not been satisfied with holding him to be what the Scriptures so clearly reveal him, the pre-existing Son of God, but have made him the ‘God and Father’ of himself.” Review and Herald, July 6, 1869.

“But if I am asked what I think of Jesus Christ, my reply is, ‘I believe all that the Scriptures say of him. If the testimony represents him as being in glory with the Father before the world was, I believe it. If it is said that he was in the beginning with God, that he was God, that all things were made by him and for him, and that without him was not anything made that was made, I believe it. If the Scriptures say he is the Son of God, I believe it. If it is declared that the Father sent his Son into the world, I believe he had a Son to send…

“It may be objected, If the Father and the Son are two distinct beings, do you not, in worshipping the Son and calling him God, break the first commandment of the decalogue?

“No; it is the Father’s will ‘That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.’ We cannot break the commandment and dishonor God by obeying him. The Father says of the Son, ‘Let all the angels of God worship him.’ Should angels refuse to worship the Son, they would rebel against the Father. Children inherit the name of their Father. The Son of God ‘hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than the angels. That name is the name of his Father. The Father says to the Son, ‘Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.’ Heb.1. The Son is called ‘The mighty God.’ Isa. 9:6. And when he comes again to earth his waiting people will exclaim, ‘This is our God.’ Isa. 25:9. It is the will of the Father that we should thus honor the Son. In doing so we render supreme honor to the Father. If we dishonor the Son, we dishonor the Father; for he requires us to honor his son.

“But though the Son is called God yet there is a ‘God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ’ 1Pet. 1:3. Though the Father says to the Son, ‘Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever,’ yet, that throne is given him of his Father; and because he loved righteousness and hated iniquity, he further says, ‘Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee.’ Heb. 1:9. ‘God hath made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ.’ Acts. 2:36. The Son is ‘the everlasting Father,’ not of himself, nor of his Father, but of his children. His language is, ‘I and the children which God hath given me.’ Heb. 2:13.” Review and Herald, June 1, 1869.

JOHN MATTESON
“Christ is the only literal son of God. ‘The only begotten of the Father.’ John 1:14. He is God because he is the Son of God; not by virtue of His resurrection. If Christ is the only begotten of the Father, then we cannot be begotten of the Father in a literal sense. It can only be in a secondary sense of the word.” Review and Herald, Oct. 12, 1869, p. 123.

URIAH SMITH
“The Scriptures nowhere speak of Christ as a created being, but on the contrary plainly state that he was begotten of the Father. (See remarks of Rev. 3:14, where it is shown that Christ is not a created being.) But while as the Son he does not possess a coeternity of past existence with the Father, the beginning of his existence, as the begotten of the Father, antedates the entire work of creation, in relation to which he stands as joint creator with God. John 1:3, Heb 1:2. Could not the Father ordain that to such a being worship should be rendered equally with himself, without its being idolatry on the part of the worshiper? He has raised him to positions which make it proper that he should be worshipped, and has even commanded that worship should be rendered him, which would not have been necessary had he been equal with the Father in eternity of existence. Christ himself declares that ‘as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.’ John 5:26. The Father has ‘highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.’ Phil. 2:9. And the Father himself says, ‘Let all the angels of God worship him.’ Heb. 1:6. These testimonies show that Christ is now an object of worship equally with the Father; but they do not prove that with him he holds an eternity of past existence.” Thoughts on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation 1882, p. 430.

“God alone is without beginning. At the earliest epoch when a beginning could be,-- a period so remote that to finite minds it is essentially eternity,--appeared the Word. ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’ John 1:1. This uncreated Word was the Being, who, in the fullness of time, was made flesh, and dwelt among us. His beginning was not like that of any other being in the universe. It is set forth in the mysterious expressions, ‘his [God’s] only begotten Son’ (John 3:16; 1John 4:9), ‘the only begotten of the Father’ (John 1:14), and ‘I proceeded forth and came from God.’ John 8:42. Thus it appears that by some divine impulse or process, not creation, known only to Omnisience, and possible only to Omnipotence, the Son of God appeared.” Looking Unto Jesus, 1898, p. 10.

THE TRINITY DENIES THE FATHER / SON RELATIONSHIP
The early Adventist pioneers understood the doctrine of the Trinity to virtually deny the Father / Son relationship, and thus distort the plan of redemption.

JOSEPH BATES
“My parents were members of long standing in the Congregational church, with all of their converted children thus far, and anxiously hoped that we would also unite with them. But they embraced some points of faith which I could not understand. I will name two only: their mode of baptism, and doctrine of the Trinity. My father, who had been a deacon of long standing with them, labored to convince
me that they were right in points of doctrine...I said to my father, ‘If you can convince me that we are one in this sense, that you are my father, and I your son; and also that I am your father, and you my son, then I can believe in the Trinity.’...In a few days I was immersed and joined the Christian church.” The Autobiography of Elder Joseph Bates, 1868, pp. 204, 205.

JAMES WHITE

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for THE faith which was once delivered unto the saints...’Jude, 3-4...The exhortation to contend for the faith delivered to the saints, is to us alone. And it is very important for us to know what the apostle meant, that we may know what for and how to contend. In the 4th verse he gives us the reason why we should contend for THE faith, a particular faith; ‘for there are certain men,’ or a certain class who deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ...The way spiritualizers this way have disposed of or denied the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ is first using the old unscriptural Trinitarian creed, viz., that Jesus Christ is the eternal God, though they have not one passage to support it, while we have plain scripture testimony in abundance that he is the Son of the eternal God.” The Day Star, Jan. 24, 1846.

“Here we might mention the Trinity, which does away with the personality of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ...” Review and Herald, Dec. 11, 1855 p.85.

D.W. HULL

“The inconsistent positions held by many in regard to the Trinity, as it is termed, has, no doubt, been the prime cause of many other errors. Erroneous views of the divinity of Christ are apt to lead us into error in regard to the nature of the atonement.” Review and Herald, Nov.10, 1859.

WHAT DID THE ADVENTIST PIONEERS BELIEVE ABOUT THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD

“The Spirit of God is spoken of in the Scriptures as God’s representative- the power by which he works, the agency by which all things are upheld. This is clearly expressed by the Psalmist...’Psa. 139:7-10. We learn from this language that when we speak of the Spirit of God we are really speaking of his presence and power.” Review and Herald, Sept. 13, 1898, p. 690.

M.C. WILCOX

“God is the source of all life...God’s life is eternal life, even as He is ‘the eternal God’...’But God is a person; how can His life be everywhere present?’ God is everywhere present by His Spirit...The presence of God is therefore His Holy Spirit; and the Holy Spirit is therefore the life of God. And so we read of ‘the Spirit is life because of righteousness’ (verse 10); that ‘the Spirit giveth life’ (2 Cor. 3:6).” Signs of the Times, June 2, 1898.

E. J. WAGGONER

“Finally, we know the Divine unity of the Father and the Son from the fact that both have the same Spirit. Paul, after saying that they that are in the flesh cannot please God, continues: “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” Rom. 8:9. Here we find that the Holy Spirit is both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ.” Christ And His Righteousness, 1892, p.23.

A.J. MORTON

“The Holy Spirit is divine because it proceeds from divinity. You can no more separate divinity from the Spirit of God and Christ than you can separate divinity from God and Christ. It is, therefore, the presence of the Spirit in the words of God’s promises which enable us to receive the divine nature from those promises.” Signs of the Times, Oct. 26, 1891, p.342.

UIRATH SMITH

“J.W.W. asks: ‘Are we to understand that the Holy Ghost is a person, the same as the Father and the Son? Some claim that it is, others that it is not.’

“Ans.-The terms ‘Holy Ghost,’ are a harsh and repulsive translation. It should be ‘Holy Spirit’ (hagion pneuma) in every instance. This Spirit is the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ; the Spirit being the same whether it is spoken of as pertaining to God or Christ. But respecting this Spirit, the Bible uses expressions which cannot be harmonized with the idea that it is a person like the Father and the Son. Rather it is shown to be a divine influence from them both, the medium which represents their presence and by which they have knowledge and power through all the universe, when not personally present. Christ is a person, now officiating as priest in the sanctuary in heaven; and yet he says that wherever two or three are gathered in his name, he is there in the midst. Mt. 18:20. How? Not personally, but by his Spirit. In one of Christ’s discourses (John, chapters 14, 15, and 16) this Spirit is personified as ‘the Comforter,’ and as such has the personal and relative pronouns, ‘he,’ ‘him,’ and ‘whom,’ applied to it. But usually it is spoken of in a way to show that it cannot be a person, like the Father and the Son. For instance, it is often said to be ‘poured out’ and ‘shed abroad.’ But we never read about God or Christ being poured out or shed.
THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

J.H. WAGGONER

“There is one question which has been much controverted in the theological world upon which we have never presumed to enter. It is that of the personality of the Spirit of God. Prevailing ideas of person are very diverse, often crude, and the word is differently understood; so that unity of opinion on this point cannot be expected until all shall be able to define precisely what they mean by the word, or until all shall agree upon one particular sense in which the word shall be used. But as this agreement does not exist, it seems that a discussion of the subject cannot be profitable, especially as it is not a question of direct revelation. We have a right to be positive in our faith and our statements only when the words of Scripture are so direct as to bring the subject within the range of positive proof.

“We are not only willing but anxious to leave it just where the word of God leaves it. From it we learn that the Spirit of God is that awful and mysterious power which proceeds from the throne of the universe, and which is the efficient actor in the work of creation and of redemption.” The Spirit Of God; Its Offices And Manifestations, 1877.

MRS. S.M.I. HENRY

“Q. Do you think the Spirit of God is a person, or is it simply the power by which God works, and which he has given to man for his use?

“A. The pronouns used in connection with the Spirit must lead us to conclude that he is a person—the personality of God which is the source of all power and life.” THE ABIDING SPIRIT, 1899.

M.C. WILCOX

“28. THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT Ques. 1. Some say the Holy Spirit is a person; others say He is a personality; and others, a power only. Till how long should this be a matter of discussion?

Ans. 1. The personality of the Holy Spirit will probably be a matter of discussion always. Sometimes the Spirit is mentioned as being ‘poured out,’ as in Acts 2. All through the Scriptures, the Spirit is represented as being the operating power of God...The reason why the Scriptures speak of the Holy Spirit as a person, it seems to us, is that it brings to us, and to every soul that believes, the personal presence of our Lord Jesus Christ...

“Because of the lack of faith, it was ‘expedient,’ necessary, that He should go away; for He declared, ‘If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send Him unto you.’ John 16:7. His disciples could not realize the presence of the Spirit of God as long as Christ was with them personally. In that sense, He could be with those only who were in His immediate presence. But when He went away, and the Spirit came, it could make Christ present with everyone, wherever that one was with Paul in Athens, Peter in Jerusalem, Thomas in India, John in Patmos.

“These are simply illustrations. Wherever God’s children are, there is the Spirit—not an individual person, as we look upon persons, but having the power to make present the Father and the Son. That Spirit is placed upon God’s messengers, the angels; but the angels are not the Spirit. That Spirit is placed upon God’s servants, His human messengers; but the human messengers are not the Spirit. They are possessed by the Spirit, and used by the Spirit, and have within them the power of the Spirit; but they are not the Spirit. The Spirit is independent of all these human or material agencies. Why not leave it there? Why not know that the Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Deity, goes out into all the earth, bringing the presence of God to every heart that will receive it?” Questions And Answers Vol.11, 1919, 1938 editions, p.37-39. In the 1945 edition p.33-35.

M.C. WILCOX

“Ques. 187. The Holy Spirit and Ministering Spirits

“What is the difference between the Holy Spirit and the ministering spirits (angels), or are they the same?

“Ans. The Holy Spirit is the mighty energy of the Godhead, the life and power of God flowing out from Him to all parts of the universe, and thus making a living connection between His throne and all creation. As is expressed by another: ‘The Holy Spirit is the breath of spiritual life in the soul. The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life of Christ.’ It thus makes Christ everywhere present. To use a crude illustration, just as a telephone carries the voice of a man, and so makes that voice present miles away, so the Holy Spirit carries with it all the potency of Christ in making Him everywhere present with all His power, and revealing Him to those in harmony with His law. Thus the Spirit is personified in Christ and God, but never revealed as a separate person. Never are we told to pray to the Spirit; but to God for the Spirit. Never do we find in the Scriptures prayers to the Spirit, but for the Spirit.” Questions and Answers Gathered From The Question Comer Department Of The Signs Of The Times, Pacific Press, 1911 p. 181-182. “And yet there is order observed in God’s working; there is the regular channel through which His life force flows to the children of men, and by which His blessed Spirit does its work. We read; ‘The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass; and He sent and signified it by His angel unto His servant John; who bare record and signified it by His angel unto His servant John; who bare record...’ Rev. 1:1.2. Here we have the order of divine procedure: (1) The Father; (2) Jesus Christ; (3) Christ’s angel; (4) John the apostle and prophet; (5) the church. And as respects the latter, the messages to the church are given through the ministers, or watchmen, of that church.

“God in His wisdom can work and does work in other ways, because conditions of men demand it, but this is the regular way.

“The glory supreme and insupportable of the Godhead is represented in the Father. 1 Tim. 6:16. Jesus Christ has forever blended the divine with the human, and from Him flows out the Spirit of life to all His children. The angels are the mediums, the ganglia, on these great currents of God’s life to re-enforce, to speak, these life currents. They can bear without exaltation God’s Spirit and its outshining glory, and in themselves bring the presence of God to His children, and drive back the angels of evil which seek to destroy them.” M.C. WILCOX, Signs of the Times, Feb. 26, 1908.

“ELLEN WHITE CHANGED US!”

The majority of all Seventh-day Adventist scholars and theologians falsely attribute the doctrinal change from anti to pro-trinitarianism to the writings of Ellen G. White (i.e. “The Desire of Ages”). This is a particularly interesting argument, especially since Ellen White never wrote one testimony or letter to any of the pioneers reproving their anti-Trinitarian positions.
“Adventist beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of ‘present truth.’ Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Savior and Lord. Many of the pioneers, including James White, J.N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and J. H. Waggoner, held to an Arian or semi-Arian view—that is, the Son at some point in time before the Creation of our world was generated by the Father. Only gradually did this false doctrine give way to the biblical truth, and largely under the impact of Ellen White’s writings in statements such as: ‘In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived’ (The Desire of Ages, p. 530).” Adventist Review, Jan. 6, 1994 p. 10, W.G. Johnson.

“The Position was solidified by Ellen G. White’s clear statement in The Desire of Ages, in 1898, calling the Spirit the ‘third person of the Trinity.’ From this time on the doctrine of the Trinity was accepted with very little, if any, Arian influences prevailing.”  Andrews University B.A. thesis, 1953 p.50. Christy Mathewson Taylor. [Notice the above misquote; the word “Trinity” is not found in the “The Desire of Ages” or any of the writings of Mrs. White.]

“1890-1900. Roughly within this period, the course of the denomination of the trinity was decided by statements from Ellen G. White... The spirit of Prophecy came out unequivocally on the side of the trinity, and of course, this view ultimately won out. 1900-1930. This period saw the death of most of those pioneers who had championed and held the anti- Trinitarian position. Their places were being taken by men who were changing their thinking, or had never opposed the doctrine. The trinity began to be published, until by 1931 it had triumphed and become the standard denominational position. Isolated stalwarts remained who refused to yield, but the outcome had been decided.” A.U. term paper, 1969 p. 25, Russell Holt.

“What changed the prevailing Seventh- day Adventist view from Arianism to Trinitarianism? The evidence would indicate that it was the publication of the Trinitarian declarations of Ellen G. White in the last decades of the nineteenth century that initiated the change.” A.U.M.A. thesis, 1963, p. 108, Erwin R. Gane.

“Let the missionaries of the cross proclaim that there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, who is Jesus Christ the Son of the Infinite God. This needs to be proclaimed throughout every church in our land. Christians need to know this, and not put man where God should be, that they may no longer be worshipers of idols, but of the living God. Idolatry exists in our churches.” 1888 Materials, p. 886.

Ellen White also understood God the Father to be the source of all life and power to the universe. And that the Father communicated His life to all created beings through His Son.

“All things Christ received from God, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: through the beloved Son, the Father’s life flows out to all; through the Son it returns, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, to the great Source of all.” DA p. 21.

“Jehovah, the eternal, self-existent, uncreated One, Himself the Source and Sustainer of all, is alone entitled to supreme reverence and worship. Man is forbidden to give to any other object the first place in his affections or his service.” PP-305.

“As a priest, Christ is now set down with the Father in His throne. Upon the throne with the eternal, self-existent One, is He who “hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows” ( Isa. 53:4), who “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15)." Amazing Grace p. 69.

“As Jehovah, the supreme Ruler, God could not personally communicate with sinful men, but He so loved the world that He sent Jesus to our world as a revelation of Himself.” MR-#708 (1900) p. 122.

“He pointed His hearers to the Ruler of the universe, under the new name, ‘Our Father.’...’Heathenism teaches men to look upon the Supreme Being as an object of fear rather than of love—a malign deity to be appeased by sacrifices, rather than a Father pouring upon His children the gift of His love.

“Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Mt. 6:9. To hallow the name of the Lord requires that the words in which we speak of the Supreme Being be uttered with reverence.” AG-94.

“‘And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.’ To render acceptable service to God, it is essential that we should know God, to whom we belong, in order that we may be thankful and obedient, contemplating and adoring him for his wonderful love to men. We could not rejoice in and praise a being of whom we had no certain knowledge; but God has sent Christ to the world to make manifest his paternal character.

“It is our privilege to know God experimentally, and in true knowledge of God is life eternal. The only begotten Son of God was God’s gift to the world, in whose character was revealed the character of him who gave the law to men and angels. He came to proclaim the fact, ‘The Lord our God is one Lord, and him only shalt thou serve. He came to make it manifest that, ‘Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.’...Unless men shall know God as Christ has revealed him, they will never form a character after the divine similitude, and will therefore never see God.” RH-03- 09-97.

COMMENTS OF ELLEN G. WHITE
CONCERNING GOD THE FATHER

Ellen G. White was in perfect agreement with the other pioneers and clearly understood God the Father to be the “one” supreme being in the universe:

“Let the missionaries of the cross proclaim that there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, who is Jesus Christ the Son of the Infinite God. This needs to be proclaimed throughout every church in our land. Christians need to know this, and not put man where God should be, that they may no longer be worshipers of idols, but of the living God. Idolatry exists in our churches.” 1888 Materials, p. 886.

Ellen White also understood God the Father to be the source of all life and power to the universe. And that the Father communicated His life to all created beings through His Son.

“All things Christ received from God, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: through the beloved Son, the Father’s life flows out to all; through the Son it returns, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, to the great Source of all.” DA p. 21.

“Jehovah, the eternal, self-existent, uncreated One, Himself the Source and Sustainer of all, is alone entitled to supreme reverence and worship. Man is forbidden to give to any other object the first place in his affections or his service.” PP-305.

“As a priest, Christ is now set down with the Father in His throne. Upon the throne with the eternal, self-existent One, is He who “hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows” ( Isa. 53:4), who “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15)." Amazing Grace p. 69.

“As Jehovah, the supreme Ruler, God could not personally communicate with sinful men, but He so loved the world that He sent Jesus to our world as a revelation of Himself.” MR-#708 (1900) p. 122.

“He pointed His hearers to the Ruler of the universe, under the new name, ‘Our Father.’...’Heathenism teaches men to look upon the Supreme Being as an object of fear rather than of love—a malign deity to be appeased by sacrifices, rather than a Father pouring upon His children the gift of His love.

“Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Mt. 6:9. To hallow the name of the Lord requires that the words in which we speak of the Supreme Being be uttered with reverence.” AG-94.

“‘And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.’ To render acceptable service to God, it is essential that we should know God, to whom we belong, in order that we may be thankful and obedient, contemplating and adoring him for his wonderful love to men. We could not rejoice in and praise a being of whom we had no certain knowledge; but God has sent Christ to the world to make manifest his paternal character.

“It is our privilege to know God experimentally, and in true knowledge of God is life eternal. The only begotten Son of God was God’s gift to the world, in whose character was revealed the character of him who gave the law to men and angels. He came to proclaim the fact, ‘The Lord our God is one Lord, and him only shalt thou serve. He came to make it manifest that, ‘Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.’...Unless men shall know God as Christ has revealed him, they will never form a character after the divine similitude, and will therefore never see God.” RH-03- 09-97.

COMMENTS OF ELLEN G. WHITE
CONCERNING THE SON OF GOD

Ellen G. White was in harmony with the Scriptures and early Adventist Pioneers concerning the Sonship of Christ before His incarnation. There is not one letter or manuscript to be found where she reproved or corrected any pioneer for believing and teaching that Christ was the literal Son of His Father prior to His birth in Bethlehem. The following quotations by Ellen White demonstrate that she applied Proverbs chapter eight to the pre-incarnation birth of the Son of God.

“And the Son of God declares concerning Himself: “The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old...Proverbs 8:22-30.” PP-34.

“The Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Son of God, existed from eternity, a distinct person, yet one with the Father. He was the surpassing glory of heaven. He was the commander of the heavenly intelligences, and the adoring homage of the angels was received by Him as His right. This was no robbery of God.
‘The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way,’ He declares, ‘before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth; while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth’ (Pro. 8:22-27).

“There are light and glory in the truth that Christ was one with the Father before the foundation of the world was made. This is the light shining in a dark place, making it resplendent with divine, original glory. This truth, infinitely mysterious in itself, explains other mysterious and otherwise unexplainable truths, while it is enshrined in light, unapproachable and incomprehensible.” 1 SM-247,248.

“In his humanity He was a partaker of the divine nature. In His incarnation He gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God…While the Son of a human being, He became the Son of God in a new sense. Thus He stood in our world-the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race.” SBC-1114, 1115.

“The dedication of the first-born had its origin in the earliest times. God had promised to give the First-born of heaven to save the sinner.” DA-51.

“The Eternal Father, the unchangeable one, gave his only begotten Son, tore from his bosom Him who was made in the express image of his person, and sent him down to earth to reveal how greatly he loved mankind.” RH- July 9, 1895.

“Who could bring in the principals ordained by God in His rule and government to counterwork the plans of Satan, and bring the world back to its loyalty? God said, ‘I will send My Son.’ ‘God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.’ John 3:16.” GT-236, 237.

MISINTERPRETED E.G. WHITE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE SONSHIP OF CHRIST

“EVANGELISM”

In order to sustain and give credence to the newly adopted Trinitarian position (1931 statement of beliefs), a compilation of Ellen G. White’s writings must be written which would apparently endorse the Trinitarian position. The compilation entitled “Evangelism” (1946), neatly fills this purpose. In the book “Evangelism,” are compiled quotations which give the Trinity doctrine just such an apparent prophetical credence. In 1966 Leroy Froom wrote a letter to R.A. Anderson bragging how they both had a part in compiling the E.G. White quotations in “Evangelism” in order to com¬bat the Columbian Union Conference leaders who were still non-Trinitarian at the time (1946). Notice the following statement from “Evangelism.”

“Christ is the pre-existent, self-existent Son of God…In speaking of his pre-existence, Christ carries the mind back through dateless ages. He assures us that there never was a time when He was not in close fellowship with the eternal God. He to whose voice the Jews were then listening had been with God as one brought up with Him.” Ev-615.

There is no need for comment on Christ’s pre-existence. Some people try to prove that Christ was not begotten from the Father in any literal way by the fact that He is called the “self-existent Son of God.” In context, this quotation is referring to Christ as “self-existent” before His incarnation. If He were “self-existent” during His incarnation He would not have been fully human.

It is true that the only begotten Son of God prior to His incarnation was not dependent upon the Father for His existence as are created beings. When the self-existent Father begot a Son, this Son by virtue of “inheritance” (Heb. 1:4), possessed all the attributes of His Father including “self-existence.” Also, that this self-existence which Christ now innately possesses, was ultimately “inherited” from the Father and was not possessed in any way separate from the Father. “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the son to have life in himself” (Jn. 5:26).

Some people use the following quotation in attempting to disprove the literal Father Son relationship: “He assures us that there never was a time when He was not in close fellowship with the eternal God.” This quotation is misinterpreted to mean: “there was never a time when Christ was “brought forth” or begotten from His Father.” This quotation is not saying He isn’t a literal Son, but rather, as a Son, He was always in close fellowship with His Father.

Interestingly enough, the same quotation proves there was a time when Christ was “brought forth” from the Father before the earth was formed. Notice this portion of the same quotation: “He to whose voice the Jews were then listening had been with God as one brought up with Him.” This phrase is found in Proverbs chapter eight, the biblical description of the pre-incarnation birth of God’s Son. “The Lord (Father) possessed me (His Son) in the beginning of his way, before his (creative) works of old…When there were no depths, I was brought forth (born); when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth (born)...Then I was by him, as one brought up with Him.” This phrase is found in Proverbs chapter eight, the biblical description of the pre-incarnation birth of God’s Son. “The Lord (Father) possessed me (His Son) in the beginning of His way, before His (creative) works of old…When there were no depths, I was brought forth (born); when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth (born)...then I was by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him” (Pro. 8:22,24,25,30; emphasis supplied).

The above E. G. White quotation is simply saying that after the Son was “brought forth” from the Father, He possessed the same “self-existent” eternal life that the Father had. That after the son was “brought forth” from the Father, He was “brought up with” the Father, and there never was a time when the Son of God wasn’t “rejoicing always before him.”

“THE ETERNAL, SELF-EXISTENT SON”

Here is another misinterpreted quotation from the compilation “Evangelism:” “He was equal with God, infinite and omnipotent…He is the eternal, self-existent Son.” Ev.615.

Christ is called the eternal, self-existent “Son” of God and not the eternal, self-existent “God” and Father of Himself. It is true that prior to His incarnation the Son of God was “equal” with His Father, “infinite and omnipotent.” Yet, He possesses all these divine qualities and exalted honors by virtue of His literal Sonship: they were ALL conferred upon Him by His Father. The modern Trinitarian position asserts that the divine equality and honor the “Son” shares with His Father was never in any way, or sense of the term “given” to Him by God the Father. Let us first read a few quotations concerning “how” Christ is equal with His Father.

“God is the Father of Christ; Christ is the Son of God. To Christ has been given an exalted position. He has been made equal with the Father. All the counsels of God are opened to His Son.” 8T-268.

“The Father then made known that it was ordained by Himself, that Christ His Son should be equal with Himself, that wherever was the presence of the Son, it was as His own presence. The word of the Son was to be obeyed as readily as the word of the Father. His Son He had invested with authority to command the heavenly host.” Story of Redemption, p. 13.”
Please notice that the “Evangelism” quotation, in its proper context, is contrasting the pre-existent nature of Christ before His incarnation with the nature of angels (not God the Father). It is in this context that she speaks of Christ as “the eternal, self-existent Son, on whom no yoke had come.” The quotation in its original context without the ellipsis reads thus:

“Christ was not compelled to endure this cruel treatment. The yoke of obligation was not laid upon Him to undertake the work of redemption. Voluntarily He offered Himself, a willing, spotless sacrifice. He was equal with God, infinite and omnipotent. He was above all finite requirements. He was Himself the law in character. Of the highest angels it could not be said that they had never borne a yoke. The angels all bear the yoke of dependence, the yoke of obedience. They are the appointed messengers of Him who is Commander of all heaven.

“No one of the angels could become a substitute and surety for the human race, for their life is God’s; they could not surrender it. On Christ alone the human family depended for their existence. He is the eternal, self-existent Son, on whom no yoke had come. When God asked, “Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?” Christ alone of the angelic host could reply, ‘Here am I; send me.’” MR #999-11.

ETERNAL The Son of God is eternal with His Father, yet He is only eternal by virtue of His literal Sonship from His Father. No created being in the universe can claim eternal existence as the Son can. Yet if He is a literal Son, His eternal existence would be in a different sense than that of His Father. If not, then He would not be a “Son” in any sense of the term!

C. S. Longacre, a prominent S.D.A. religious liberty leader for many years, interprets and explains the above quotation as follows: “Christ is the pre-existent, self-existent Son of God...This statement has been used by some to convey the idea that the Son of God was co-existent with the Father and self-existent in His own right without deriving His existence in the beginning from the Father. We must interpret this statement in harmony with other statements Sister White has made in connection with the Deity of Christ, and how and when He obtained it.

“Sister White’s statements when taken as a whole and altogether are in perfect harmony with what Christ Himself and all the prophets have said and written about His self-existent state and how He acquired it from the Father in the beginning before anything was created that afterwards was created. John the apostle said: ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the Father in the beginning before anything was created that afterwards was created.’ Jn. 1:18.

“Christ always existed in the bosom of the Father, even before He was Begotten as the Son of God, and God and His prophets counted ‘things which are not,’ as though they were even before they were manifested. Thus we read that Christ was ‘the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,’ and that ‘Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot...was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times.’ So Christ existed in the bosom of the Father from all eternity but was manifested when He was begotten by the Father and was His Son, as the apostle Paul says, ‘before all creation.’

SELF-EXISTENT—The Son of God is truly self-existent prior to his incarnation by virtue of His literal Sonship. This self-existent life was given to Him from His Father when He was born in heaven. He says, “As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He (the Father) given to the Son to have life in Himself.” (John 5:26).

MISINTERPRETED E.G.W. STATEMENTS IN DESIRE OF AGES

“LIFE, ORIGINAL, UNBORROWED, UNDERIVED”

Probably the most frequently misinterpreted and misquoted statement cited in order to “prove” that Jesus is not really the Son of God, is this one from Desire of Ages:

“Jesus declared, ‘I am the resurrection, and the life.’ In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived. ‘He that hath the Son hath life.”

The divinity of Christ is the believer’s assurance of eternal life.” DA-530.

People misinterpret this quotation to mean, “The life of the Son is, and has always ‘originated’ from Himself, and was never at anytime ‘borrowed’ or ‘derived’ from His Father.” In context, this quotation is simply emphasizing His ability to resurrect and give life, in a way which no created being can.

Many Adventist Pioneers did not interpret the above quotation the way modern Adventists interpret it today. Again, C.S. Longacre expresses the correct interpretation of this E.G. White quotation as follows:

“For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will...that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father...For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.” John 5:21-27.

“What kind of life did the Father have in Himself? In God ‘is life original, unborrowed, underived,’ ‘immortal,’ ‘independent.’ ‘He is the source of life,’ Christ says, ‘As the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given’—the same life, original, unborrowed, underived life to the Son. It was ‘given’ to Him by His Father. Christ made the source of life just as the Father was the source of life. Christ had the same life the Father had in Himself in His own right. He did not have to derive or borrow it, it was independent of the Father, hence not dependent, derived, or borrowed. He could bestow and give life and create just as the Father could, but the Father gave this life to His Son.

“When this same life the Father had in Himself was given by the Father to His Son so He too had it ‘in Himself,’ we are not told. Nor does it make any difference how long it was before anything was created, the fact remains that the Son of God proceeded from the Father, that He was in the bosom of the Father, that His life, ‘underived, unborrowed’ was ‘given’ to Him by the Father, that the ‘Father ordained’ His Son ‘should be equal with Himself;’ that the Father ‘invested’ His Son ‘with authority,’ and that the Son does ‘nothing of Himself alone.’” The Deity of Christ, p. 4, 5.

Truly, Ellen G. White was in harmony with the Bible and the majority position of the early pioneers concerning the literal Sonship of Christ prior to His incarnation. It has been the “new theologians” who have “twisted” and misinterpreted some of her statements in order to be in harmony with the doctrinal positions of Babylon.
THE HOLY SPIRIT IS GOD THE FATHER “HIMSELF”

“Christ is the channel through which alone men can have access to God, and become a partaker of the divine nature. The Lord God gives light to the true, earnest seekers after him, for he giveth them himself. ‘This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.’ And why? Because God in his own mysterious way communicateth himself to the soul. ‘The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple.’ God substiu righteous his ideas for human ideas and inventions, and these ideas are great, noble, and luminous.” 1888 Mt.-981.

“The mighty power that works through all nature and sustains all things is not, as some men of science claim, merely an all-pervading principle, an actuating energy. God [the Father Jn. 4:24] is a spirit; yet he is a personal being, for man was made in His image. As a personal being, God has revealed Himself in His Son... The greatnes of God is to us incomprehensible. ‘The Lord’s throne is in heaven,’ (Psa. 11:4) yet by His Spirit He is everywhere present. He has an intimate knowledge of, and a personal interest in, all the works of His hand...

“No intangible principle, no impersonal essence or mere abstraction, can satisfy the needs and longings of human beings in this life of struggle with sin and sorrow and pain.” Ed-132,133. [emphasis supplied]

“He (Satan) knows that it (the ministry) is an agent that God has ordained to be a powerful means for the salvation of souls and is efficacious only as God, the eternal Spirit, makes it so. He knows that the treasure of the gospel is in earthen vessels, that it is God’s power alone that can make them vessels of honor.” TM-404, (emphasis supplied).

HOLY SPIRIT EMANATES FROM GOD THE FATHER

“It is His purpose that the highest influence in the universe, emanating from the source of all power, shall be theirs.” DA-679.

HOLY SPIRIT IS THE FATHER’S LIFE

“All things Christ received from God, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: through the beloved Son, the Father’s life flows out to all; through the Son it returns, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, to the great Source of all.” DA-21.

HOLY SPIRIT IS THE PRESENCE AND POWER OF GOD THE FATHER

“The divine Spirit that the world’s Redeemer promised to send, is the presence and power of God.” 2ST-451.

HOLY SPIRIT IS THE “LIFE OF CHRIST”

“Christ not only gave himself for, but to his disciples. The record declares, ‘He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’

“Jesus is waiting to breathe upon all his disciples, and give him the inspiration of his sanctifying spirit, and transfuse the vital influence from himself to his people... Christ is to live in his human agents, and work through their faculties, and act through their capabilities... Jesus is seeking to impress upon them the thought that in giving His Holy Spirit he is giving to them the glory which the Father has given him, that he and his people may be one in God.” ST-10/03/92.


“All who consecrate soul, body, and spirit to God, will be constantly receiving a new endowment of physical and mental power. The inexhaustible supplies of heaven are at their command. Christ gives them the breath of his own spirit, the life of his own life. The Holy Spirit puts forth his highest energies to work in heart and mind.” 5RH-472.

“The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the Life of Christ.” DA-805, UL-46; 5RH-471.

THE HOLY SPIRIT PROCEEDS FROM CHRIST

“The Holy Spirit, which proceeds from the only begotten Son of God binds the human agent, body, soul, and spirit, to the perfect, divine-human nature of Christ. This union is represented by the union of the vine and the branches.” 5RH-228.

“There are today many as ignorant as those men of Ephesus of the Holy Spirit’s work upon the heart. Yet no truth is more clearly taught in the word of God. Prophets and apostles have dwelt upon this theme. Christ himself calls our attention to the growth of the vegetable world to illustrate the agency of his Spirit in sustaining life.

“The juices of the vine, ascending from the root, are diffused to the branches sustaining growth, and producing blossoms and fruit. So the lifegiving power of the Holy Spirit, proceeding from Christ, and imparted to every disciple, pervades the soul and renews the motives and affections, and even the most secret thoughts, and brings forth the precious fruit of holy deeds.” Life of Paul p. 131.

SATAN DOESN’T WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT JESUS IS THE COMFORTER

“Satan has tried to prevent men from receiving a correct view of God. Our ideas of God have become perverted. The true ideas have been lost, and the mind has been thrown into confusion in regard to him. Passion has taken the place of reason. To see God as he is, to love and reverence him as supreme. To know God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent, is eternal life. Satan knows that if the attention of men is turned to Christ, they will believe on him.” 2ST-457.

“The reason why the churches are weak and sickly and ready to die, is that the enemy has brought influences of a discouraging nature to bear upon trembling souls. He has sought to shut Jesus from their view as the Comforter, as one who reproves, who warns, who admonishes them saying ‘this is the way, walk ye in it.’” 2RH-422.

“O precious possibilities and encouragement! In the human heart cleansed from all moral impurity, dwells the precious Saviour enabling, sanctifying the whole nature and making the man a temple for the Holy Spirit.

“Christ therefore is a personal Saviour... Wherever we go, we bear the abiding presence of One so dear to us; for we abide in Christ by a living faith. He is abiding in our hearts by our individual, appropriating faith. We have the companionship of the divine Jesus, and as we realize his presence our thoughts are brought into captivity to him. Our experience in divine things will be in proportion to the vividness of our sense of his companionship... Here again there is a realization of a personal, living influence dwelling in our hearts by faith.

“When his words of instruction have been received, and have taken possession of us, Jesus is to us an abiding presence, controlling our thoughts and actions.” 3ST- 321, (see also 2ST-457; 2RH-422;
Truly, these quotations reveal that the Comforter which Christ promised to send from His Father is Himself in “another” form. Not, “another” God to comfort us instead of Christ. Just as Satan led men to misinterpret “another day” (Heb. 4:8) to be Sunday; so Satan has led men to misinterpret “another comforter” (Jn. 14:16) to be someone other than Jesus. Satan has done everything He can to obscure this beautiful truth. Don’t you love our Saviour all the more with a clearer understanding of His personal abiding presence?

WHY DO SOME E.G. WHITE QUOTATIONS CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT APPARENTLY CONTRADICT EACH OTHER?

While reading thousands of E.G. White quotations concerning the Holy Spirit, several extremely perplexing questions arose. While trying to harmonize many of her seemingly contradictory statements about the Holy Spirit with hundreds of Scriptural reverences, some interesting facts have been discovered.

1. Ellen White, on many occasions refers to the Holy Spirit as the life, mind, presence, influence and power of God the Father. While searching the Bible testimony I discovered that the Scriptures do the same.

2. There are an extraordinary amount of Ellen White quotations that apply the Holy Spirit to be the "omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ," “the life of Christ,” “the Spirit of Christ,” Christ “Himself” "divested of the personality of humanity,” “Jesus the comforter,” etc. etc. While searching the Bible testimony I discovered that the Scriptures applied the Holy Spirit and Comforter to Christ also. That the Spirit was not only the “Spirit of God” the Father, but “the Spirit of His Son” as well.

3. Then, there are a lot of statements by Ellen White that categorically assert that the Holy Spirit comes to us through the ministry of holy angels. That the angels are the channel of communication between heaven and earth; that they are sent to “impress our minds,” “speak through our voices” and “work through our hands.” That the ministering angels actually bring us the personal presence, Holy Spirit or mind of Christ; that she oftentimes used the term “Holy Spirit” as referring to, or interchangeably and synonymously with the “ministry of holy angels;” we can better understand the intent of the “three” quotations. Simply, that the term “Holy Spirit” or “Ghost” in these “three” quotations, are including (not excluding) the ministering angels as the “third” power in heaven. This is why you don’t read quotations like, “The four great heavenly powers;” “four highest powers of heaven;” “fourfold powers in the heavenly world;” “four holy dignitaries of heaven;” “four great Worthies in heaven;” and the “four representatives of heavenly authority.”

Truly, Ellen G. White was in harmony with the Bible and the early Adventist pioneers in her teaching concerning the Holy Spirit. She clearly understood and taught that the Holy Spirit was the inner nature of the Father Himself, shared also by His Son, and ministered to humanity through the heavenly angels.

“After his transgression God would communicate to man through Christ and angels.” SR-51, (see also AA-495, 1SM-280).

“Christ dispatches His messengers to every part of His dominion to communicate His will to His servants. He walks in the midst of His churches.” BT-23.

“The angels of God are ascending, bearing the prayers of the needy and distressed to the Father above, and descending, bringing blessing and hope, courage, help, and life, to the children of men.

“The angels of God are ever passing from earth to heaven, and from heaven to earth. The miracles of Christ for the afflicted and suffering were wrought by the power of God through the ministration of the angels. And it is through Christ, by the ministration of His heavenly messengers, that every blessing comes from God to us...And thus Christ is the medium of communication of men with God, and of God with men.” DA-143.

DO ANGELS IMPRESS THE MIND?

“Think you that Jesus will stand in the publishing establishment to work through human minds by His ministering angels; Think you that He will make the truth coming from the presses a power to warn the world, if Satan is allowed to pervert the minds of the workers right in the institution?” 7T-167.

“From the Holy of Holies, there goes on the grand work of instruction. The angels of God are communicating to me. Christ officiates in the sanctuary. We do not follow Him into the sanctuary as we should. Christ and angels work in the hearts of the children of men. The church above united with the church below is warring the good warfare upon the earth. There must be a purifying of the soul here upon the earth, in harmony with Christ’s cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven.” MR-#396-1.

“Human agencies are the hands of heavenly instrumentalities, for heavenly angels employ human hands in practical ministry. Human agencies as hand helpers are to work out the knowledge and use the facilities of heavenly beings. By uniting with these powers that are omnipotent, we are benefited by their higher education and experience. Thus as we become partakers of the divine nature, and separate selfish-ness from our lives, special talents for helping one another are granted us. This is heaven’s way of administering saving power.” 6T-456, 457. (see also MR#788-3; 7T-149, 167; 3T-262, 264; DA- 297; YI March 3, 1908).

THE HOLY SPIRIT MINISTERED THROUGH ANGELS

“A measure of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. Through the ministry of the angels the Holy Spirit is enabled to work upon the mind and heart of the human agent, and draw him to Christ who has paid the ransom money for his soul, that the sinner may be rescued from the slavery of sin and Satan.” LT.-71-1893; TMK-157.
These angel messengers are observing all our course of action. They are ready to help all in their weakness, guarding all from moral and physical danger according to the providence of God. And whenever souls yield to the softening, subduing influence of the Spirit of God under these angel ministrations, there is joy in heaven; the Lord Himself rejoices with singing.

“Men take altogether too much glory to themselves. It is the work of heavenly agencies cooperating with human agencies according to God’s plan that brings the result in the conversion and sanctification of the human character. We cannot see and could not endure the glory of angelic ministrations if their glory was not veiled in condescension to the weakness of our human nature. The blaze of the heavenly glory, as seen in the angels of light, would extinguish earthly morals. Angels are working upon human minds just as these minds are given to their charge; they bring precious remembrances fresh before the mind as they did to the women about the sepulcher.

“A created instrumentality is used in heaven’s organized plan for the renewing of our nature, working in the children of disobedience obedience unto God.” 1 SM- 96,97.

HOLY SPIRIT (“GOLDEN OIL”) FROM ANGELS

“From the two olive trees, the golden oil was emptied through the golden pipes into the bowl of the candlestick and thence into the golden lamps that gave light to the sanctuary. So from the holy ones that stand in God’s presence, His Spirit is imparted to human instrumentalities that are consecrated to His service. The mission of the two anointed ones is to communicate light and power to God’s people. It is to receive blessing for us that they stand in God’s presence. As the olive trees empty themselves into the golden pipes, so the heavenly messengers seek to communicate all that they receive from God.” TM-510.

“God’s people are to be channels for the outworking of the highest influence in the universe. In Zechariah’s vision the two olive trees which stand before God are represented as emptying the golden oil out of themselves through golden tubes into the bowl of the sanctuary. From this the lamps of the sanctuary are fed, that they may give a continuous bright and shining light. So from the anointed ones that stand in God’s presence the fullness of divine light and love and power is imparted to His people, that they may impart to others light and joy and refreshing. They are to become channels through which divine instrumentalities communicate to the world the tide of god’s love.” 6T-11.

“Let every man who enters the pulpit know that he has angels from heaven in his audience. And when these angels empty from themselves the golden oil of the truth into the heart of him who is teaching the word, then the application of the truth will be a solemn, serious matter. The angel messengers will expel sin from the heart, unless the door of the heart is padlocked and Christ is refused admission.” TM-338.

“In all our institutions let self-seeking give place to unselfish love and labor. Then the golden oil will be emptied from the two olive branches into the golden pipes, which will empty themselves into the vessels prepared to receive it...The divine influence imparted by holy angels will impress the minds brought in contact with the workers, and from these workers a fragrant influence will go forth to all who choose to inhale it.” MM-184,185.

It is clear from the quotation above, that the ministry of the heavenly angels is intimately connected with impartation of God’s Spirit to humanity.

THE TERMS “HOLY SPIRIT” AND “ANGELS” USED INTERCHANGEABLY

SPIRIT/ANGELS “EXPEL SIN”

“It is the Holy Spirit that convinces of sin and expels it from the soul by the consent of the human agent.” ML-43. “The angel messengers will expel sin from the heart, unless the door of the heart is padlocked and Christ is refused admission.” TM-338.

SPIRIT/ANGELS “IMPRESS THE MIND”

“...souls will be convicted, because the Holy Spirit of God will impress their hearts. Arm yourselves with humility; pray that angels of God may come close to your side to impress the mind; for it is not you that work the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit must work you.” 6T-57.

“When the Spirit of God works on the mind of the afflicted one, leading him to inquire for truth, let the physician work for the precious soul as Christ would work for it. Do not urge upon him any special doctrine, but point him to Jesus as the sin-pardoning Savior. Angels of God will impress the mind.” 6T-231.

“The silent messengers that are placed in the homes of the people through the work of the canvasser will strengthen the gospel ministry in every way; for the Holy Spirit will impress minds as they read the books, just as He impresses the minds of those who listen to the preaching of the word. The same ministry of angels attends the books that contain the truth as attends the work of the minister.” 6T-316.

SPIRIT/ANGELS “MOVE UPON HUMAN MINDS”

“In the plan of restoring in men the divine image, it was provided that the Holy Spirit should move upon human minds, and be as the presence of Christ, a molding agency upon human character.” RH-02/12/95.

“There are many who desire to know the truth. The angels of heaven are moving upon human minds to arouse investigation in the themes of the Bible.” CW-140.

HOLY SPIRIT/ANGELS “BRING TO REMEMBRANCE”

“The Holy Spirit alone can cause us to feel the importance of those things easy to be understood, or prevent us from wresting truths difficult of comprehension. It is the office of heavenly angels to prepare the heart to so comprehend God’s Word that we shall be charmed with its beauty, ad- monished by its warnings, or animated and strengthened by its promises... But angels are round about those who are willing to be taught in divine things; and in the time of great necessity, they will bring to their remembrance the very truths which are needed. Thus when the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him.”

Jesus promised his disciples, ‘The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.’ But the teachings of Christ must previously have been stored in the mind, in order for the Spirit of God to bring them to our remembrance in the time of peril.” RH-01/10/07.

“Angels are watching with intense interest to see how man is dealing with his fellow men. When they see one manifest Christlike sympathy for the erring, they press to his side and bring to his remembrance words to speak that will be as the bread of life to the soul.” COL-148.

HOLY GHOST/ANGELS WATCHING “OUR COURSE OF ACTION”

“The Holy Ghost is continually engaged in beholding our course of action. We need now keen perception, that by our own practical godliness the truth may be made to appear truth as it is in Jesus. The angelic agencies are messengers from heaven, actually ascending and descending, keeping earth in constant connection with the heaven above. These angel messengers are observing all our course of action. They are ready to help all in their weakness,
guarding all from moral and physical danger according to the providence of God. And whenever souls yield to the softening, subdued influence of the Spirit of God under these angel ministries, there is joy in heaven; the Lord Himself rejoices with singing.” 1SM-96,97.

SPIRIT/ANGELS LEAVE US

“The angels never leave the tempted ones a prey to the enemy, who would destroy the souls of men if permitted to do so. As long as there is hope, until they resist the Holy Spirit to their eternal ruin, men are guarded by heavenly intelligences.” ST-06-06-95.

“As men resist the Spirit of God, His Spirit will be less and less manifested in the earth. It will be a fearful time when the angels fold their wings and cease their watchcare over those who have resisted the Spirit of God.” MR-#168-27.

CHRIST / ANGELS “UNSEEN PRESENCE”

“What saith our Saviour? ‘I will not leave thee comfortless; I will come unto you.’ ‘He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.’ When trials overshadow the soul, remember the words of Christ, remember that he is an unseen presence in the person of the Holy Spirit, and he will be the peace and comfort given you, manifest to you that he is with you, the Sun of Righteousness, chasing away your darkness.” LTW-124-1897.

“They will feel the unseen presence of heavenly angels.” MM-167.

“In every council where important decisions are made, heavenly agencies watch with intense interest. There is an unseen presence in the midst of the counselors, and the manifestation of harshness, of levity, of carelessness, of partiality, is registered as an offense against God.” RH-03/26/95.

HOLY SPIRIT / ANGELS REPRESENTATIVE

“When God’s people search the Scriptures with a desire to know what is truth, Jesus is present in the person of His representative, the Holy Spirit, reviving the hearts of the humble and contrite ones.” MR#954-6, (Ms. 158,1898).

“Since there is decided sympathy between heaven and earth, and since God commissions angels to minister unto all who are in need of help, we know that if we do our part, these heavenly representatives of omnipotent power will give help in this time of need. If we will become one in mind and heart with the heavenly intelligences we can be worked by them.” 6T-461.

SPIRIT / ANGEL BY YOUR SIDE

“The Holy Spirit is promised to all who will ask for it. When you search the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit is by your side, personating Jesus Christ.” Paulson collection-101, (1894).

“Let us rejoice that Jesus Christ has made it possible for us to lay hold upon divinity. When we feel exceedingly tried, let us remember that there is a heavenly angel by your side. This thought will help us to honor Christ, who has made it possible for us to become sons and daughters of God.” UL-242.

“Earthly comforters may do their best. They speak to the ear, but there is no comfort like Christ’s, so tender and so true. He is touched with the feelings of our infirmities. His Spirit speaks to the heart...Wherever we are, wherever we may go, he is there, always a presence, a person connected with heaven, one given us in Christ’s place, to act in His stead. He is always at our right hand, to speak to us soothing, gentle words, to support, sustain, uphold, and cheer.” MR#-#99-24.

An angel is attending you and taking record of your words and actions. When you rise in the morning, do you feel your helplessness and your need of strength from God? And do you humbly, heartily make known your wants to your heavenly Father? If so, angels mark you prayers, and if these prayers have not gone forth out of feigned lips, when you are in danger of unconsciously doing wrong and exerting an influence which will lead others to do wrong, your guardian angel will be by your side, prompting you to a better course, choosing your words for you, and influencing your actions.” 3T- 363,364.

“The Lord Jesus standing by the side of the canvasser, walking with them, is the chief worker. If we recognize Christ as the One who is with us to prepare the way, the Holy Spirit by our side will make impressions in just the lines needed.” CM- 107.

“Go forth to your canvassing work, or other lines of labor, knowing that there is a witness, an angel, by your side. If you are careless and inattentive, reckless of your words, reckless in spirit, your character is thus portrayed by the recording angel.” General Conference Daily Bulletin, 02-06- 93 par. 2.

THE THREE POWERS OF HEAVEN

If it is true that, “The Father and Son alone are to be exalted” (SD-58); that the Holy Spirit is not a third separate and distinct “God,” then why does Ellen White talk about the “three” powers of heaven? Notice the following quotes where it talks about “three,” not two.

“We are to co-operate with the three highest powers in heaven,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,—and these powers will work through us, making us workers together with God.” EV.617.

“His commission is, Go throughout the world and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost...There is to be the imprint of the sacred name, baptizing the believers in the name of the threefold powers in the heavenly world...

The three great and glorious heavenly characters are present on the occasion of baptism. All the human capabilities are to be henceforth consecrated powers to do service for God in representing the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost upon whom they depend. All heaven is represented by these three in covenant relation with the new life.” MR- #411, p.1, 1904.

Ellen White did, just what several Bible writers have done: She uses the term “Holy Spirit” on many occasions to “include” the ministry of Holy angels. If the Holy Spirit ministered through angels was NOT included under the term “Holy Ghost,” then “All heaven” would NOT be “represented by these three.” The ministry of angels would be left out. The work of the Spirit of Christ, through His ministering angels, is the third distinct “agency” working for human beings.

“Three distinct agencies, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, work together for human beings. They are united in the work of making the church on earth like the church in heaven.” MS 27 1/2,1900.

Are the heavenly angels involved in this work? “The angels of God, who minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation, will help you to make your family a model of the heavenly family.” CT-549.

ANGELS INCLUDED BY THE TERM “THREE POWERS IN HEAVEN”

“Two great armies are engaged in warfare. Satan with his great army is in conflict with Christ and God and the heavenly host.” MR- #311.

“The liberty that comes through a knowledge of truth is to be proclaimed to every creature. Our Heavenly Father, Jesus Christ, and the angels of heaven are all interested in this grand and holy work.” 3RH-272.
“In fellowship with God, with Christ, and with holy angels they are surrounded with a heavenly atmosphere...Christ gives them the breath of His own spirit, the life of His own life. The Holy Spirit puts forth its highest energies to work on heart and mind.” 6T-306.

“God and Christ and the heavenly angels are working with intense activity to hold in check the fierceness of Satan’s wrath...” 7T-14.

“The angels of God, seraphim and cherubim, the powers commissioned to cooperate with human agencies...” TM-18.

“The heavenly host are filled with an intense desire to work through human agencies to restore in man the moral image of God. They are ready and waiting to do this work. The combined power of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is pledged to recover man from his fallen state. Every attribute, every power, of divinity has been placed at the command of those who unite with the Saviour in winning men to God.” 1888 Mat-1764.

“By the power of His love, through obedience, fallen man, a worm of the dust, is to be transformed, fitted to be a member of the heavenly family, a companion, through eternal ages, of God and Christ and the holy angels. Heaven will triumph; for the vacancies made by the fall of Satan and his host will be filled by the redeemed of the Lord.” AUCR-06-01-00.

“EVANGELISM” MANIPULATED AND MISINTERPRETED QUOTES CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT

Probably the most infamous Ellen White statement quoted in order to support the idea that the Holy Spirit is a separate and distinct “God” other than the Father and His Son is the following:

“We need to realize that the Holy Spirit, who is as much a person as God is a person, is walking through these grounds.” Ev-616.

Many sincere people infer from this statement that, “God the Holy Spirit” is walking around down on earth, while “God the Father” and His Son are walking around in heaven. This “uncontextual” quotation is a classic example of bold “alteration” and “manipulation” in order to spread Trinitarian misinformation. In other words, an attempt to “force” Ellen White to endorse and approve of the modern Adventist position on the Trinity. Carefully notice the above quotation in its original context below:

“The Lord instructed us that this was the place in which we should locate, and we have had every reason to think that we are in the right place. We have been brought together as a school, and we need to realize that the Holy Spirit, who is as much a person as God is a person, is walking through these grounds, that the Lord God is our keeper, and helper. He hears every word we utter and knows every thought of the mind.” MR-#487-1.

Please notice that the word “we” in the original is in the middle of the sentence and uncapsulated, yet it is capitalized in “Evangelism” (1946). Also in the original, the comma after the word “grounds” has been changed to a period, thus making it appear as a complete sentence. The original and intended meaning of the quotation is NOT to prove the Holy Spirit to be “another God” along with the Father and His Son. But rather, that the “Lord” who “instructed us,” “the Holy Spirit” who “is walking through these grounds,” the “Lord God” who “is our keeper” and “helper” and who “hears every word” and “knows every thought,” is one and the same person—The glorified Jesus Christ. The main thought of the above quotation is taken from Psalms 139:1-6 as follows:

"O LORD, thou hast searched me, and known me...thou understandest my thought afar off...there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O LORD, thou knowest it altogether...Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there" (Psa. 139:1-8).

Ellen White is saying the same thing as the Bible. Jesus, “is as much a person” as God the Father “is a person.” Jesus “is walking through these grounds.” Jesus “is our keeper, and helper.” Jesus “hears every word we utter and knows every thought of the mind.”

Sister White is emphasizing that a real person is with us and not just an intangible force or electricity like J.H. Kellogg was teaching. In the following quotation Mrs. White makes it very clear that the “person” walking with us is:

“The Lord Jesus standing by the side of the canvasser, walking with them, is the chief worker. If we recognize Christ as the One who is with us to prepare the way, the Holy Spirit by our side will make impressions in just the lines needed.” CM-107.

“There is strength for us in Christ. He is our Advocate before the Father. He dispatches His messengers to every part of His dominion to communicate His will to His people. He walks in the midst of His churches...Who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks.” Revelation 2:1. This scripture shows Christ’s relation to the churches. He walks in the midst of His churches throughout the length and breadth of the earth. He watches them with intense interest to see whether they are in such a condition spiritually that they can advance His kingdom. Christ is present in every assembly of the church. He is acquainted with everyone connected with His service. He knows those whose hearts He can fill with the holy oil, that they may impart it to others.” 6T-418,419.

“Could our eyes have been opened, we could have seen Jesus in our midst with his holy angels. Many felt his grace and his presence in rich measure...We knew that the sin pardoning Saviour was in our midst...I knew that Jesus was in our midst.” 1888 Mat-58, 59.

“THE HOLY SPIRIT IS A PERSON AND HAS A PERSONALITY"

Another quotation commonly misquoted and taken out of context is the following: “The Holy Spirit always leads to the written word. The Holy Spirit is a person; for he beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God. When this witness is borne, it carries with it its own evidence. At such times we believe and are sure that we are the Children of God. [What strong evidence of the power of truth we can give to believers and unbelievers when we can voice the words of John, ‘We have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.’]" The Holy Spirit has a personality, else he could not bear witness to our spirits and with our spirits that we are the children of God. He must also be a divine person, else he could not search out the secrets which lie hidden in the mind of God. ‘For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man, which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.’ MS-20.1906. (brackets denote ellipsed sentences not found in Ev-616,617).

Please notice the argument of why Sr. White says the Holy Spirit is a person: “for” or because “he beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God.” Who are we the children of? Are we the children of an impersonal force, vapor, or influence? Not at all! We are the children of a personal God. If God the Father was not a personal being, but a Spirit only; if His Spirit is not a personality, (but merely an impersonal force or power), “then he could not bear witness “with” our spirits and “to” our spirits that we are the children of God.”

What was the context of the above quotation? The above testimony was a warning about Kellogg’s false pantheistic teaching: That the Holy Spirit dwelt in every living creature, degrading God’s Spirit to just an intangible force or electricity like J.H. Kellogg was teaching. Please notice the argument of why Sr. W
Holy Spirit and therefore God Himself. Notice the emphasis in the following quotations:

“In giving us His Spirit, God gives us Himself, making Himself a fountain of divine influences, to give health and life to the world.” TT-273.

“The mighty power that works through all nature and sustains all things is not, as some men of science claim, merely an all-pervading principle, an actuating energy. God [the Father Jn. 4:24] is a spirit; yet He is a personal being, for man was made in His image. As a personal being, God has revealed Himself in His Son...The greatness of God is to us incomprehensible. “The Lord’s throne is in heaven,” (Psa. 11:4) yet by His Spirit He is everywhere present. He has an intimate knowledge of, and a personal interest in, all the works of His hand...

“No intangible principle, no impersonal essence or mere abstraction, can satisfy the needs and longings of human beings in this life of struggle with sin and sorrow and pain.” Ed-132,133. [emphasis supplied].

“THREE LIVING PERSONS OF THE HEAVENLY TRIO”

Another quotation written about J.H. Kellogg (warning against his pantheistic teaching), that has been misinterpreted and misapplied is the following from “Evangelism.”

“I am instructed to say, The sentiments of those who are searching for advanced scientific ideas are not to be trusted. Such representations as the following are made: ‘The Father is as the light invisible: the Son is as the light embodied; the Spirit is the light shed abroad.’ ‘The Father is like the dew, invisible vapor; the Son is like the dew gathered in beauteous form; the Spirit is like the dew fallen to the seat of life.’ Another representation: ‘The Father is like the invisible vapor; the Son is like the leaden cloud; the Spirit is rain fallen and working in refreshing power.’

All these spiritualistic representations are simply nothingness. They are imperfect, untrue. They weaken and diminish the Majesty which no earthly likeness can be compared to. God cannot be compared with the things His hands have made. These are mere earthly things, suffering under the curse of God because of the sins of man. The Father cannot be described by the things of earth. The Father is all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and is invisible to mortal sight.

The Son is all the fullness of the Godhead manifested. The Word of God declares Him to be ‘the express image of His person.’ ‘God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.’ Here is shown the personality of the Father.

The Comforter that Christ promised to send after He ascended to heaven, is the Spirit in all the fullness of the Godhead, making manifest the power of divine grace to all who receive and believe in Christ as a personal Savior. There are three living persons of the heavenly trio; in the name of these three great powers—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, those who receive Christ by living faith are baptized, and these powers will cooperate with the obedient subjects of heaven in their efforts to live the new life in Christ...

Work will be done in the simplicity of true Godliness, and the old, old times will be back when, under the Holy Spirit’s guidance, thousands were converted in a day. When the truth in its simplicity is lived in every place, then God will work through His angels as He worked on the day of Pentecost, and hearts will be changed so decidedly that there will be a manifestation of the influence of genuine truth, as is represented in the decent of the Holy Spirit.” Ev-614,615, (Series B #7 p.62,63).

The above quotation is misinterpreted to mean: “There is a ‘trio’ of three living Gods in the “God family” (misinterpretation of “Godhead”), who all have the same qualities and divine powers.” Is this really what Ellen White is trying to say? If so, it blatantly contradicts scores of other quotations expressing an opposite sentiment. Then what is she trying to say? The following paraphrase, is the correct interpretation of the above quotation.

“God the Father is the source and the supreme fullness of the divine nature (Godhead) in and of Himself alone. He is also invisible to mortal sight (1 Tim. 1:17; Jn. 1:18).

“The Son of God came to this earth to represent, reveal, demonstrate, or manifest the full character “of the invisible God.” The Son “humbled” and “emptied himself” to become a man in order that “all the fullness” of His Father’s “Godhead” or divine character might be “manifested” to us.

“The Holy Spirit of God and Christ, working in and through the ministering angels, represents the fullness of the Father and Son’s character (divine nature) after Christ ascended to heaven.

“Here we see the three great powers of heaven who manifest, represent and personify God the Father. 1) God the Father Himself, 2) The Son of God as a representative of His Father, 3) The Holy Spirit of God and Christ working in and through holy angels, personifying their character to lost humanity.”

Ironically enough, modern Adventism has disregarded God’s counsel through Ellen White by using spiritualistic representations to explain the Trinity as did Dr. Kellogg. The following quotations are a sample of this.

“God gave us a lesson about Himself when He made clover. It’s in those three tiny leaves. Pull off one of the heart- shaped bits and look at it. It’s a perfect leaf all its own. But then look at the two that are left on the stem, and you’ll see that something is missing. It takes all three to make them whole. Each is complete in itself; yet it’s not.

“Understanding God. God is like that piece of clover. There’s the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Christians call them the Trinity. Each is an individual being, self-existent in His own right, but it takes all three to make up the whole of what we call God. In both the Old and New Testaments we learn that God is one (Dt. 6:4; John 17:21); yet He is more than one (Gen. 1:26; Mt. 28:19).”

“Christ is fully God and the Holy Spirit is fully God, then the Godhead must be a Trinity. Through the centuries untold numbers of minds have clashed over this point. Even today there are pockets of so called Christians who will not accept the triune-God concept. Still this truth furnishes the key to all the essential doctrines of the Christian faith...

“How Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three distinct personalities and yet one, how they are equal in power and authority and yet one, is beyond logic and reason...

“A simple illustration helped strengthen my faith in the doctrine of the triune God. As a high school physics lab assistant, I was always fascinated by the bottle of mercury on our stockroom shelf...

“A chemist can take three drops of mercury and describe them scientifically. The same scientific description would fit perfectly if the three drops were merged into one. The only difference would be quantity...

“So with the Godhead. If it were possible scientifically to describe the Father, the same formula could be applied to the Son and the Holy Spirit. Any adjective applied to one may be applied to the other. They are of the same essence. All possess the same qualities of unrestricted wisdom, unparalleled goodness, unmeasurable mercy, unlimited love, unsurpassed intelligence, unending power, and unbounded glory!”

The above “scientific” descriptions of God are simply sick, sick! They are worse than anything J.H. Kellogg ever thought of printing. To use the words of Ellen White, “All these spiritualistic representations are simply nothingness. They are imperfect,
untrue. They weaken and diminish the Majesty which no earthly likeness can be compared to." Ev. 614, 615.

“THE GODHEAD... GAVE THEMSELVES”

Another popular E.G. White statement people misquote in order to “prove” the Trinitarian position is the following:

“The Godhead was stirred with pity for the race, and the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit gave Themselves to the working out of the plan of redemption.” CH-222.

People misinterpret this quotation to be saying, “Three Gods gave Themselves to help mankind.” Interesting enough, people never quote this in its before and after context. Before this quotation we read: “There God decided to give human beings an unmistakable evidence of the love with which He regarded them. He ‘so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son...”

Who is the “God” who decided to give humans an unmistakable evidence of His love? In context, it is God the Father. The term “Godhead” in the above quotation is primarily referring to God the Father. Then why is “Themselves” capitalized? It is not capitalized in the original article. It was capitalized in 1957 (does the year ring a bell?) when it was included in the compilation “Counsels on Health.”

So why does it say all three gave themselves “to the working out of the plan of redemption?” The context of the letter, (which happens to be left out of “Counsels on Health”), helps explain this more clearly. Notice the quotation from the original.

“The Godhead was stirred with pity for the race, and the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit gave themselves to the working out of the plan of redemption...The inhabitants of the heavenly universe are appointed to go forth to come into close touch with human instrumentality who act as God’s helping hand. In the performance of this mission of love, angels mingle with the fallen race, ministering to those who shall be heirs of salvation. Divine and human agencies unite in the work of restoring the image of God in man. All who partake of the divine nature are appointed of God to unite with the angels in carrying forward with untiring zeal the plan of redemption.” Union Conference Record April 1, 1901 p. 2” (letter B12-1901).

The above is just another example of Mrs. White including the ministry of heavenly angels under the term “Holy Ghost.” Again, not that the Spirit of God or Christ is angels, but rather that God and Christ communicate their Holy Spirit, their thoughts, feelings, mind, personal presence, through the medium of angelic ministry.

WHO IS THE GOD-HEAD?

The term Godhead is a biblical expression widely misunderstood in religious circles today. It is only found in the following three Bible texts. “...we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device” (Acts 17:29).

“Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ...I thank my God through Jesus Christ...For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the g...” (Rom. 1:7,8,19,20).

“The Godhead was stirred with pity for the race, and the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit gave Themselves to the working out of the plan of redemption. “CH-222.

When Lucifer realized that humanity was to be created in the image and likeness of the Father and Son, his foresight envisioned the day when this new race would supersede the angelic capacity to manifest and reflect the Godhead. Jealousy began to bud in his mind when he visualized humanity as destined to one day sit beside the Son on the right hand of the Father’s throne - the third highest personification of the Father; having “all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.”

Lucifer was not content with humbling himself (along with all the angels) to one day become the fourth highest manifestation of the Godhead to the universe. He wanted his spirit to be manifested in the mind temple of humanity, in the angels, in the Son of God and even the Father Himself. He wanted his “spirit” to be manifested in, and personified through every being in the universe, thus thinking to become the Godhead Himself: “I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God...I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.” (Isa. 14:12-14).

This leads us to an interesting question. Has not Satan become “like the most High” according to Trinitarian theology? If the Holy...
Spirit is indeed another God, someone other than the Father and His Son as the new theology teaches; if this so-called “God the Holy Spirit” is dwelling in converted humanity, and humanity is “the temple of God” (1 Cor. 3:16,17 2 Cor. 6:16); then is not this “spirit” virtually sitting “in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God?” (2 Thes. 2:4). Is not this just what Lucifer wanted in heaven?

**ALTERED E.G.W. STATEMENTS IN THE DESIRE OF AGES**

“The Holy Spirit is Christ’s representative, but divested of the personality of humanity, and independent thereof. Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally. Therefore it was for their interest that He should go to the Father, and send the Spirit to be His successor on earth. The Holy Spirit is Himself divested of the personality of humanity and inde- pendent thereof. He would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the omnipresent.” MR#-1084-7.(Ms. 5a,1895, Lt.W-119-1895).

There is a big difference between saying “The Holy Spirit is Christ’s representative, but divested of the personality of humanity, and independent thereof, and saying “The Holy Spirit is (Christ) Himself divested of the personality of humanity and independent thereof.”

Some people may interpret the above quotation to mean, “God the Holy Spirit divested himself of the personality of humanity...” Yet, if the “Holy Spirit” never had the “personality of humanity,” how could he then be “divested” of it? The word “divest” means, “to rid of something,” “to strip off.” The comforter is simply the spiritual, rather than the physical part of Christ’s personality. It is readily apparent that the above quotation was significantly altered so as to change the original and intended thought of Ellen White.

“THE THIRD PERSON OF THE GODHEAD”

“Sin could be resisted and overcome only through the mighty agency of the Third Person of the Godhead, who would come with no third person of the Godhead” is none other than the personification of Christ himself in “another” or “third” form, with and through the ministry of the heavenly angels. Notice how Ellen White uses the impersonal pronouns in the original context below:

“Evil had been accumulating for centuries, and could only be restrained and resisted by the mighty power of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, who would come with no modified energy, but in the fullness of divine power...God’s Spirit would address itself to their hearts. It would convince of sin...The divine Spirit reveals its working on the human heart...Let Christ work by His Holy Spirit, and awaken you as from the dead and carry your minds along with His. Let Him employ your faculties...Are those at the heart of the work chosen vessels that can receive the golden oil, which the heavenly messengers, represented as two olive trees, empty into the golden tubes to replenish the lamps?” Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers. -- Series A, #10, pp. 25,26,29,30.

This same quotation taken from “series A” was altered again in the first (1923) and subsequent editions of “Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers.” The phrase “third person” has been capitalized as it appears on page 392.

This same quotation was altered two more times for a total of four separate alterations. Some may say, “Maybe Ellen White authorized these changes?” That may have been possible except she had been dead for decades before these changes were made.

The phrase “Third Person” is capitalized in both 2MR.p. 34, and MR #240 p. 329. Both of these quotations cite Letter 8, 1896 as the original source reference, yet the phrase “third person” is not capitalized in the original lette. The original letter can be found in Series A, #10 p. 25; and 1888 matt. p. 1493. Someone intentionally altered and manipulated these quotations in order to make it appear that this “Third Person” was actually the “Third God” of the Trinity! What a blatant manipulation and cover-up!

The following is the other “third person” quotation (not a repetitive quote). Interesting enough, this quotation classifies the “third person of the Godhead” as a “sanctifying power,” and not a separate and distinct God other than the Father and His Son.

“He determined to give His representative, the third person of the Godhead. This gift could not be excelled. He would give all gifts in one, and therefore the divine Spirit, that converting, enlightening, and sanctifying power, would be His donation.” 6BC p. 1052, (SW Nov. 28, 1905).

The following is another classic example of a blatant, intentionally altered Ellen White quotation in attempts to “prove” the Trinity doctrine. In the original letter, Ellen White referred to the Holy Spirit as “it,” yet someone has changed these pronouns to “He” and “Him” while citing the original letter as the source reference. What a conspiracy!

**ALTERED QUOTATION**

-DocID 198957 -BC- 13MR -PG- 35 -TEXT- -

“The Spirit is freely given us of God if we will appreciate and accept Him. And what is He?—the representative of Jesus Christ. He is to be our constant helper. It is through the Spirit that Christ fulfills the promise, “I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.” “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life” (John 6:47). (The bell is sounding for morning worship. I must stop here.”) Letter 38, 1896, pp. 1-4, (To S. N. Haskell, May 30, 1896.)

**ORIGINAL QUOTATION**

1888 Materials -PG- 1538 -TEXT- -

“The Spirit is freely given us of God if we will appreciate and accept it And what is it? The representative of Jesus Christ. It is to be our constant helper. It is through the Spirit that Christ fulfills the promise, “I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.” “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life” (John 6:47). (The bell is sounding for morning worship. I must stop here.”) [References to the Holy Spirit as “it” fifteen more times in the next two pages.]

**THE NATURE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS A MYSTERY**

Another quotation that is frequently taken out of context is found in “Acts of the Apostles” pages 51,52. Whenever people start studying the subject of the Holy Spirit someone will inevitably throw out the following quotation as prophetic motivation to stop studying this subject.

“It is not essential for us to be able to define just what the Holy Spirit is. Christ tells us that the Spirit is the Comforter, ‘the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father.’ It is plainly declared regarding the Holy Spirit, that in His work of guiding men into all truth, ‘He shall not speak of Himself.’”

“The nature of the Holy Spirit is a mystery. Men cannot explain it, because the Lord has not revealed it to them. Men having fanciful views may bring together passages of Scripture and put a human construction on them; but the acceptance of these views will not
strengthen the church. Regarding such mysteries, which are too deep for human understanding, silence is golden." AA-51,52.

While it is absolutely true that "It is not essential for you to know and be able to define just what the Holy Spirit is." and "the nature of the Holy Spirit is a mystery," it is also true that this counsel was written specifically for, and a warning against, those men who try to define the Holy Spirit as a completely separate being other than the Father and His Son. To such men that do this, she says, "silence is golden."

This quotation (AA pp. 51,52), was originally written as a letter of personal rebuke to a man who was teaching that the Holy Spirit was a separate being other than the Father and Son. His name was Brother Chapman. Brother Chapman was teaching that the Holy Spirit was the angel Gabriel.

A.T. Robinson and the leading brethren at the time believed that the comforter or Holy Spirit of God, was Christ Himself in a spiritual form. Ellen White was pleading with brother Chapman to accept this position held by the majority of the leading brethren at that time. In this letter she makes a definitive statement regarding her understanding of the Holy Spirit, calling the comforter, "the omnipresence of the spirit of Christ." Unfortunately, the editors who compiled "Acts of the Apostles" did not include these other statements which make it clear "Who the Holy Spirit is.

The following is the letter to Brother Chapman, from which the "Holy Spirit is a mystery" quotation, found in "Acts of the Apostles" (pp. 50,51) is taken from:

Letter written to Brother Chapman from Petoskey, Mich., June 11, 1891.

"I have received yours dated June 3. In this letter you speak in these words: 'Elder Robinson does not want me to leave, but urges that I enter the canvassing field until such time as the conference can afford to employ me in some other capacity, but states positively that I cannot be sent out to present the truth to others until some points held by me are changed or modified in order that the views regarded by us as a people should be properly set forth. He quotes as a sample, 'My idea in reference to the Holy Ghost's not being the Spirit of God, which is Christ, but the angel Gabriel, and my belief that the 144,000 will be Jews who will acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah. On all fundamental points I am in perfect agreement with the majority of the leading brethren at that time."

Your ideas of the two subjects you mention do not harmonize with the light which God has given me. The nature of the Holy Spirit is a mystery not clearly revealed, and you will never be able to explain it to others because the Lord has not revealed it to you. You may gather together Scriptures and put your construction upon them, but the application is not correct. The expositions by which you sustain your position are not sound. You may lead some to accept your explanations, but you do them no good, nor are they, through accepting your views, enabled to do others good.

'It is not essential for you to know and be able to define just what the Holy Spirit is. Christ tells us that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, and the Comforter is the Holy Ghost, 'the Spirit of truth, which the Father shall send in My name.' 'I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you' [John 14:16,17]. this refers to the omnipresence of the spirit of Christ, called the Comforter...

"There are many mysteries which I do not seek to understand or to explain; they are too high for me, and too high for you. On some of these points, silence is golden..."

"I hope that you will seek to be in harmony with the body...you make the mistake that many others have made, of thinking that you have new light, when it is only a new phase of error.

"You need to come into harmony with your brethren...It is your duty to come as near to the people as you can...Now, my brother, it is truth that we want and must have, but do not introduce error as new truth." MR#-1107.

FOOTNOTES
2 "While the author does not wish to distance himself from certain of the conclusions of feminist theologians, it is not historically accurate to consider that movement a major factor in inducing SDAs to study ordination of women." Adventist Review, May 1995 p. 23.
3 Women In Their Place, U.J. Underwood, M.D.pp. 391,392.
4 Women Of The Cloth, by Jackson W. Carroll, p. 8.
5 "Satan's position in heaven had been next to the Son of God. He was first among the angels."SM p. 341. "To dispute the supremacy of the Son of God, thus impeaching the wisdom and love of the Creator, had become the purpose of this master mind, which, next to Christ's, was first among the hosts of God." PP 36.
6 "Sin originated in self-seeking. Lucifer, the covering cherub, desired to be first in heaven. He sought to gain control of heavenly beings, to draw them away from their Creator, and to win their homage to himself." DA p. 21.
7 "It was Satan's purpose in heaven to dethrone God, and himself take the place of the Most High. He failed in this purpose, and was cast out from the heavenly courts; and since that time he has tried to instill in the hearts of men and women the belief that God is arbitrary and harsh in his dealings with his creatures."RH-03/19/08.
8 "Satan fell because of his ambition to be equal with God. He desired to enter into the divine counsels and purposes, from which he was excluded by his own inability, as a created being, to comprehend the wisdom of the Infinite One. It was this ambitious pride that led to his rebellion, and by the same means he seeks to cause the ruin of man."ST p. 702.
9 "The Lord has shown me that Satan was once an honored angel in heaven, next to Jesus Christ....And I saw that when God said to his Son, Let us make man in our image, Satan was jealous of Jesus. He wished to be consulted concerning the formation of man. He was filled with envy, jealousy and hatred. He wished to be the highest in heaven, next to God, and receive the highest honors."SP pp. 18.
10 Before the fall of Satan, the Father consulted his Son in regard to the formation of man. They purposed to make this world, and create beasts and living things upon it, and to make man in the image of God, to reign as ruling monarch over every living thing which God should create. When Satan learned the purpose of God, he was envious at Christ, and jealous because the Father had not consulted him in regard to the creation of man. Satan was of the highest order of angels; but Christ was over all. He was the commander of all Heaven. He imparted to the angelic family the high commands of his Father....Satan urged, for what reason was Christ endowed with unlimited power and such high command above himself! He stood up proudly, and urged that he should be equal with God...Satan unblushingly makes known to all the
heavenly family, his discontent, that Christ should be preferred before him, to be in such close conference with God, and he be uninformed as to the result of their frequent consultations. God informs Satan that this he can never know. That to his Son will he reveal his secret purposes, and that all the family of Heaven, Satan not excepted, were required to yield implicit obedience. Satan boldly speaks out his rebellion, and points to a large company who think God is unjust in not exalting him to be equal with God, and in not giving him command above Christ. He declares he cannot submit to be under Christ's command, that God's commands alone will he obey. "3Spiritual Gifts p. 36-38.

Rev. 1:6, 5:10; 3:21; Rom. 8:17; Jn.3:35, 13:3.

"In the plan to save a lost world, the counsel was between them both; the covenant of peace was between the Father and the Son." Signs of the Times 12/23/97, (6BC p. 1070).

12 "Satan determined to be first in the councils of heaven, and equal with God...When Satan had succeeded in winning many angels to his side, he took his cause to God, representing that it was the desire of the angels that he occupy the position that Christ held...Satan has continued to present to men, as he presented to the angels, his false representations of Christ and of God, and he has won the world to his side. Even the professedly Christian churches have taken sides with the first great apostate"7ABC p. 973.

13 "From the beginning it has been Satan's studied plan to cause men to forget God, that he might secure them to himself. Hence he has sought to misrepresent the character of God, to lead men to cherish a false conception of Him...Satan hoped to so confuse the minds of those whom he had deceived that they would put God out of their knowledge. Then he would obliterate the divine image in man and impress his own likeness upon the soul he would imbue men with his own spirit and make them captives according to his will. "It was by falsifying the character of God and exciting distrust of Him that Satan tempted Eve to transgress...Christ came to reveal God to the world as a God of love full of mercy, tenderness, and compassion. The thick darkness with which Satan had endeavored to enshroud the throne of Deity was swept away by the worlds Redeemer, and the Father was again manifest to men as the light of life." PP p. 338.

14 James 1:14,15; "Faith is the medium through which truth or error finds a lodging place in the mind. It is by the same act of mind that truth or error is received, but it makes a decided difference whether we believe the Word of God or the sayings of men."1SM p. 346.

15 "Though unable to expel God from his throne, Satan has charged God with satanic attributes, and has claimed the attributes of God as his own. He is a deceiver, and through his serpentine sharpness, through his crooked practices, he as drawn to himself the homage which man should have given to God, and has planted his satanic throne between human worshiper and the divine Father." RH April 14, 1896.

16 Rev. 12:7-9.

17 2 Cor. 10:3-5.

18 "The same spirit that prompted rebellion in heaven still inspires rebellion on earth....By the same misrepresentation of the character of God as he had practiced in heaven, causing Him to be regarded as severe and tyrannical, Satan induced man to sin." Great Controversy p. 500. Rom. 10:1-3.

19 Rom. 7:18.

20 From the beginning it has been Satan's studied plan to cause men to forget God, that he might secure them to himself. Hence he has sought to misrepresent the character of God, to lead men to cherish a false conception of Him...Satan hoped to so confuse the minds of those whom he had deceived that they would put God out of their knowledge. Then he would obliterate the divine image in man and impress his own likeness upon the soul he would imbue men with his own spirit and make them captives according to his will. "It was by falsifying the character of God and exciting distrust of Him that Satan tempted Eve to transgress...Christ came to reveal God to the world as a God of love full of mercy, tenderness, and compassion. The thick darkness with which Satan had endeavored to enshroud the throne of Deity was swept away by the worlds Redeemer, and the Father was again manifest to men as the light of life." PP p. 338.

21 (Rev. 12:4).

22 2 Cor. 3:18.

23 2 Cor. 4:6.

24 "We are not to think of God only as a judge and to forget Him as our loving Father. Nothing can do our souls greater harm than this, for our whole spiritual life will be molded by our conceptions of God's character." Know Him p. 262.

25 Pro.27:3; Lk. 6:45; Jn. 16:2,3; 1Jn. 4:7, 8.

26 "Concerning Babylon, the symbol of the apostate church." COL p. 179.

27 "The existing confusion of conflicting creeds and sects is fitly represented by the term 'Babylon', which prophecy applies to the world loving churches of the last days." PP p. 124.

28 "Babylon is said to be the 'MOTHER OF HARLOTS'. By her daughters must be churches that cling to her doctrines and traditions, and follow her example of sacrificing the truth and the approval of God, in order to form an unlawful alliance with the world. The message of Rev. 14, announcing the fall of Babylon, must apply to religious bodies that were once pure and have become corrupt." GC p. 383.

29 "By her daughters must be symbolized churches that cling to the doctrines and traditions, and follow her example of sacrificing the truth and approval of God, in order to form an unlawful alliance with the world."2SM p. 68.

30 "What is that wine? Her false doctrines." 2 SM p. 118.

31 "The wine of Babylon is the exalting of the false and spurious Sabbath above the Sabbath...also [it is] the immortality of the soul. These kindred heresies, and the rejection of the truth, convert the church into Babylon."2SM p. 68.

32 "Even before the establishment of the papacy the teachings of heathen philosophers had received attention and exerted an influence in the church. Many who professed conversion still clung to the tenets of their pagan philosophy, and not only continued its study themselves, but urged it upon others as means of extending their influence among the heathen. Serious errors were thus introduced into the Christian faith." GC p. 58.

33 "Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. Her spirit controlled the church. Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ. "This compromise between paganism and Christianity resulted in the development of the "man of sin" foretold in prophecy as opposing and exalting himself above God." GC p. 50.

34 "To the first inhabitants of the world after the flood, Nimrod (Ninus), the first King of Babel, his queen Semiramis, and their miraculously born God-child Tammuz, (the son of the sun) was the first pagan Trinity. A multitude of various names have covered their true identity, but the discoveries of the ancient ruins of Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, Mexico, etc., have enabled scholars to trace their worship from Babylon and Assyria, to the Hindus; and across the ocean to the early American Indians. Their pattern of worship is usually the same, the only names are different because of the various languages in the world.

35 Comparing the Bible doctrine with pagan mythology, scholars, both Christian and non- Christian, will agree that some of the most cherished traditions and ordinances kept by both Catholic and Protestant churches, have their origin from Sun worship, and not from the Old and New Testaments.

36 "SUNDAY SACREDNESS, CHRISTMAS, THE CHRISTMAS TREE, EASTER, THE EASTER EGG, AND BUNNY, HOT CROSS BUNS AND GOOD FRIDAY, are not Holy days and ordinances to be kept sacred from the Bible: but were sacred to the ancient Babylonian gods: NIMROD (BAAL) 1Kings 16:30-33, SEMIRAMIS (ASHTOROTH) Judges 2:13 and TAMMUZ (ADONIS) Ezekiel 8:14.

37 This mixture of Sun worship and the true worship of God brought judgments from God on the Israelites during their apostasy. We will also study this later. These festivals to the heathen Trinity were
observed centuries before the birth of Jesus in Babylon, Persia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, Scandinavia, and other remote areas of the world." The ANTICHRIST 666, by Institute of Religious Knowledge.

"The Roman Catholic Church, uniting the forms of paganism and Christianity, and, like paganism, misrepresenting the character of God, has resorted to practices no less cruel and revolting." GC p. 568, 569.

The code of Justinian, Bk.3, title 12, law 3.

"The whole Christian system was still [2nd century] comprised in a few precepts and propositions; nor did the teacher publicly advance any doctrines besides those contained in what is called the Apostles’ Creed...A hundred and fifty Bishops who were present at this Council[Constantinople, A.D. 381] gave the finishing touch to what the Council of Nice had left imperfect, and fixed in a full and determinate manner the doctrine of three persons in one God...they branded with infamy all the errors, and set a mark of execration on all the heresies". Mosheim, History of the Christian Church Fourth Century, Part 2.

"In the space of fifteen years Theodosius issued no less than fifteen severe edicts, more especially against those who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity; and to deprive them of every hope of escape, he sternly enacted that if any laws or rescripts should be alleged in their favour, the judges should consider them as the illegal productions of either fraud or forgery." History of Roman Empire, vol.3, chp.27. 34 Handbook For Today’s Catholic, p. 12.

Catholic Encyclopedia, 1912 ed. vol. 15 p.47.


TWISTING THE TRUTH by Bruce Tucker pp.59, 79, 80, 197.

"Like our Savior, we are in this world to do service for God. We are here to become like God in character, and by a life of service to reveal Him to the world. In order to be co-workers with God, in order to become like Him, and to reveal His character, we must know Him aright. We must know Him as He reveals Himself. A knowledge of God is the foundation of all true education and of all true service. It is the only real safeguard against temptation. It is this alone that can make us like God in character. This is the knowledge needed by all who are working for the uplifting of their fellow men. Transformation of character, purity of life, efficiency in service, adherence to correct principles, all depend upon a right knowledge of God. This knowledge is the essential preparation both for this life and for the life to come." Ministry of Healing, p.409.


Review and Herald July 6, 1869. R.F.Cottrell. 35 see footnote # 129.


"I see people who live apart and do not consider themselves one of the nations." Nu. 23:9 NIV.

1Selected Messages pp. 203-205.

"Dear Brother White:

Ever since the council closed I have felt that I should write you confidentially regarding Dr. Kellogg’s plans for revising and republishing “The Living Temple”...He [Kellogg] said that some days before coming to the council, he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views. He said that all the way along he had been troubled to know how to state the character of God and his relation to his created works...

"He then stated that his former views regarding the trinity had stood in his way of making a clear and absolutely correct statement; but that within a short time he had come to believe in the trinity and could now see pretty clearly where all the difficulty was, and believed that he could clear the matter up satisfactorily. He told me that he now believed in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and his view was that it was God the Holy Ghost, and not God the Father, that filled all space, and every living thing. He said that if he had believed this before writing the book, he could have expressed his views without giving the wrong impression the book now gives.

“I placed before him the objections I found in the teaching, and tried to show him that the teaching was so utterly contrary to the gospel that I did not see how it could be revised by changing a few expressions. We argued the matter at some length in a friendly way; but I felt sure that when we parted, the Doctor did not understand himself, nor the character of his teaching. And I could not see how it would be possible for him to flop over, and in the course of a few days fix the book up so that it would be all right.” A.G. Daniells To W.C. White October 29, 1903, pp. 1,2 (emphasis supplied).

"The work would not have been hindered as it has been for the past several years if Dr. Kellogg were a converted man. ‘Come,’ I call, ‘come ye out and be separate from him and his associates whom he has leverened.’ I am now giving the message God has given me, to give to all who claim to believe the truth: ‘Come out from among them, and be ye separate,’ else their sin in justifying wrongs and framing deceits will continue to be the ruin of souls. We cannot afford to be on the wrong side.” Series B #7 p. 64 (emphasis supplied).

1 Selected Messages, p. 197.


"Are we worshipers of Jehovah, or of Baal? of the living God, or of idols? No outward shrines may be visible, there may be no image for the eye to rest upon, yet we may be practicing idolatry. It is as easy to make an idol of cherished ideas or objects as to fashion gods of wood or stone. Thousands have a false conception of God and His attributes. They are as verily serving a false god as are the servants of Baal. Are we worshiping the true God as He is revealed in His word, in Christ, in nature, or are we adoring some philosophical idol enshrined in His place? God is a god of truth. Justice and mercy are the attributes of His throne. He is a God of love, of pity and tender compassion. Thus He is represented in His Son, our Saviour." 5 Testimonies, pp. 173, 174.


Ministry, Oct/1993 p. 11, George Knight.

Questions on Doctrine, p. 42.


ibid.

THESE TIMES / NOV. 1982, p. 4, Roy Allan Anderson.

The Godhead, one or three Gods, pp. 15,16, Bob Sessler.


Deuteronomy 6:4,5.

MH pp. 409, 425.
Mark 12:28-34.


Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 34.

Prophets and Kings, p. 509.

J. S. Washburn paper (1939).

Gen. 1:26; Zech. 6:12, 13; 3 SG pp. 36-38; PP p. 36; SR pp. 13-15; 2SG p. 18.

Ro. 2:4; 1Jn. 4:19; 2Cor. 3:18; DA p. 22; GC p. 541; 1SM p. 346.

2T p. 200.

"In order to fully realize the value of salvation, it is necessary to understand what it cost. In consequence of limited ideas of the sufferings of Christ, many place a low estimate upon the great work of the atonement. The glorious plan of man's salvation was brought about through the infinite love of God the Father. In this divine plan is seen the most marvelous manifestation of the love of God to the fallen race. Such love as is manifested in the gift of God's beloved Son amazed the holy angels." 2T p. 200.

"Could God give us any greater proof of His love than in thus giving His Son to pass though this scene of suffering? And as the gift of God to man was a free gift, His love infinite, so His claims upon our confidence, our obedience, our whole heart, and the wealth of our affections are correspondingly infinite. He requires all that it is possible for man to give. The submission on our part must be proportionate to the gift of God." 3T p. 369. (see also 1SM p. 156; 3T p. 369).

"Jesus was a created spirit being, just as angels were spirit beings created by God... Jesus, no more and no less than a perfect human, became a ransom that compensated exactly for what Adam lost..." Should You Believe in the Trinity? 1989, pp. 14, 15; Watch Tower [Jehovah's Witnesses].

SAB pp. 50, 51.

Gen. 22:8; 2 Cor. 5:19; Jn. 3:16, 17; 7BC p. 974; YI-Dec. 16, 1897. 3RH p. 302, 302; 5BC p. 1108.

"In carrying out his enmity to Christ until He hung upon the cross of Calvary, with wounded, bruised body and broken heart, Satan completely uprooted himself from the affections of the universe. It was then seen that God had in His Son denied Himself, giving Himself for the sins of the world, because He loved mankind. The Creator was revealed in the Son of the infinite God. Here the question, 'Can there be self-denial with God?' was forever answered." 7BC p. 974.

Mat. 16:13-18.

"He (Christ) will save man at any cost to Himself." DA p. 693.

Eph. 1:12; DA pp. 117, 693, 49.

"Yet into the world where Satan claimed dominion God permitted His Son to come, a helpless babe, subject to the weakness of humanity. He permitted Him to meet life's peril in common with every human soul, to fight the battle as every child of humanity must fight it, at the risk of failure and eternal loss." DA p. 49.

Youth Instructor Oct. 17, 1895. (LHU p. 232). "The love of God was Christ's theme when speaking of His mission and His work... well did the disciples understand this love as they saw their Saviour enduring shame, reproach, doubt, and betrayal, as they saw His agony in the garden, and His death on Calvary's cross. This is a love the depth of which no sounding can ever fathom. As the disciples comprehended it, as their perception took hold of God's divine compassion, they realized that there is a sense in which the sufferings of the Son were the sufferings of the Father." Youth Instructor, Dec. 16, 1897.

"At the cross of Calvary, love and selfishness stood face to face. Here was their crowning manifestation. Christ had lived only to comfort and bless, and in putting Him to death, Satan manifested the malignity of his hatred against God. He made it evident that the real purpose of his rebellion was to dethrone God, and to destroy Him through whom the love of God was shown... In the judgment of the universe, God will stand clear of blame for the existence or continuance of evil. It will be demonstrated that the divine decrees are not accessory to sin. There was no defect in God's government, no cause for disaffection. When the thoughts of all hearts shall be revealed, both the loyal and the rebellious will unite in declaring, 'Just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of saints. Who shall not fear Thee, O Lord and glorify Thy name?...for Thy judgments are made manifest.' Rev. 15:3,4." DA p. 57, 58.

Signs of the Times, July, 1985, Frank B. Holbrook.

These Times, "Is God a committee?" Gerald Wheeler, p. 21.


Seventh-day Adventists Believe...A Biblical Exposition of 27 Fundamental Doctrines, (references to "God the Son"), pp. 23, 30, 33, 37, 38, 80, etc. SR p. 13.

Heb. 1:7, 13, 14; 2 Chron. 16:9; 2Sam. 22:11; Psa. 18:10; Ez. 9:3.

Ex. 13:21; 14:19, 24; 16:10; 19:9; 24:16; 33:9; 34:5; 40:34; Lev. 16:2; Deut. 31:15.

Dan. 4:13, 23; Ecc. 5:6.


Ex. 25:18-22; 37:7; 1Ki. 6:23; 2Ch. 3:10.

1Sa. 16:14; 11Sa. 16:23; 18:10; 19:9; Ac. 19:15, 16.

Le. 20:27; 1Sa. 28:7, 8; 1Ch. 10:13; 2Ch. 33:6; Isa. 29:4.

Job 4:15; Ez. 1:21; 2:2; 3:12, 14, 24; 8:3; 11:1, 24; 43:5; Mr. 6:49.

S.A.B. p. 60.


Gen. 1:26; Jn. 1:3, 10; 1Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16; Eph. 3:9; Heb. 1:2.

In Luke 1:35, the "Holy Ghost" and "the power of the Highest" are synonyms referring to the Spirit of God the Father.

2Co 5:19; Gal. 3:13 Re 5:9; Re 14:4.

The same person who gave the "inspiration" for all scripture (2Ti 3:16); the same "Holy Ghost" who "moved" men of old to speak and write prophecy (2Pe 1:21); the same person who "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow," was "the Spirit of Christ." (1Pe 1:11).

Jn. 14:10; Jn. 5:19, 30; 8:28; Acts 2:22; 10:38.


2 Cor. 3:17, 18.
"I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee" (Heb. 13:5). "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Mt 18:20). "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Mt 28:20). Jesus is the one knocking at the door of your mind seeking entrance, "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him." (Re 3:20). Jesus has promised to come to His people as the "latter rain," the final outpouring of the Spirit of God (Joel 2:23; margin emphasis; Psa. 72:6; Hos. 6:3.

106 Jer. 3:15; 1Cor. 12:6,11,28; Eph. 4:6-13.

107 Jn. 7:17; 14:6; 15:26; 18:37; 1Tim. 2:3,4.


109 Signs of the Times—July 1985, FRANK ANSWERS by Frank B. Holbrook.


111 As far as I can fathom, the difficulty which is found in the Living Temple, the whole thing may be simmered down to this question: Is the Holy Ghost a person? You say No. I had supposed the Bible said this for the reason that the personal pronoun 'he' is used in speaking of the Holy Ghost. Sister White uses the pronoun 'he' and has said in so many words that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead. How the Holy Ghost can be the third person and not be a person at all is difficult for me to see." Letter From J.H. Kellogg To G.I. Butler, Oct. 28, 1903.

112 I believe this Spirit of God to be a personality you don't. But this is purely a question of definition. I believe the Spirit of God is a personality: you say, No, it is not a personality. Now the only reason why we differ is because we differ in our ideas as to what a personality is. Your idea of personality is perhaps that of semblance to a person or a human being." Letter From J.H. Kellogg To G.I. Butler, Feb. 21, 1904, p. 6. G.I. Butler didn't buy Kellogg's misinterpretation of Ellen White's quotation: That the Holy Spirit is the "third person" of the Godhead; actually refers to a third separate and distinct God rather than the personal presence and personification of both Father and His Son themselves through the ministry of holy angels. Notice the following reply from Butler to Kellogg:

113 God dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, as a Comforter, as a Reprover, especially the former. When we come to Him, we partake of Him in that sense, because the Spirit comes forth from Him; it comes forth from the Father and the Son. It is not a person walking around on foot, or flying, as a literal being, in any such sense as Christ and the Father are..." Letter From J.H. Kellogg To J.H. Kellogg, April 5, 1904.

114 Adventism in America, edited by Gary Land, p.160; (see also "Light Bearers to the Remnant pp. 395, 396).

115 "May I here make a frank personal confession? When, back between 1926 and 1928, I was asked by our leaders to give a series of studies on the Holy Spirit, covering the North American union ministerial institutes of 1928, I found that, aside from priceless leads found in the Spirit of Prophecy there was practically nothing in our literature setting forth a sound Biblical exposition in this tremendous field of study. There were no previous pathfinding books on the question in our literature. I was compelled to search out a score of valuable books written by men outside of our faith—those previously noted—for initial clues and suggestions, and to open up beckoning vistas to intensive personal study. Having these, I went on from there. But they were decided early helps. And scores, if not hundreds, could confirm the same sobering conviction that some of these other men [from Babylon] frequently had a deeper insight into the spiritual things of God than many of our own men had on the Holy Spirit and the triumphant life. It was still a largely obscure theme." Movement of Destiny, 1971, p. 322, LeRoy Froom (Emphasis supplied). The Trinitarian emphasis about the Holy Spirit is seen in the following quotation from Froom’s book "Coming of the Comforter," p. 40:

116 "If He [the Holy Spirit] is a divine person, and we think of Him as an impersonal influence, we are robbing a divine person of the deference, honor, and love that is His due. Again, if the Holy Spirit is a mere influence or power, we shall try to get hold of and use it. But if we recognize Him as a person, we shall study how to yield to Him, that He may use us." (emphasis supplied). Interestingly enough, L.E. Froom borrowed this precise concept (an almost verbatim quotation) from a book by a Protestant Evangelist, R.A. Torry, titled "The Fundamentals" (see Vol.1. p.55). The main and fundamental question is this: If the Holy Spirit is not a separate and distinct being other than the Father and His Son, and if we give "deference, honor and love" to this divine person, and if we also yield ourselves to this other God who is not the Father and/or His Son, then who are we worshipping and yielding our lives to? That's right. Satan Himself.

117 "I am writing to you brethren as a group, for you are the only living members of the original committee of thirteen, appointed in 1941 to frame a uniform Baptismal Covenant, Vow, and Certificate. Elder Branson was chairman and I was secretary. Elder McElhaney, (J.F.) Wright, Ruhling, and (A.B.) Russell are all deceased.... Elder Branson was given the task of chairing the committee to formulate a uniform Baptismal Covenant, Vow, based on the 1931 'Fundamental Beliefs' statement in the Yearbook and Manual. It was also to point up a bit more sharply the First, Second, and Third Persons of the Godhead." Letter From L.E. Froom to R.A. Anderson, J.L. Shuler, D.E. Rebok, A.W. Peterson, W. G. Turner, J.E. Weaver, Nov. 22, 1966.


119 "I am writing to you brethren as a group, for you are the only living members of the original committee of thirteen, appointed in 1941 to frame a uniform Baptismal Covenant, Vow, and Certificate. Elder Branson was chairman and I was secretary. Elder McElhaney, (J.F.) Wright, Ruhling, and (A.B.) Russell are all deceased.... The task of this committee was to formulate a uniform Baptismal Covenant, Vow, based on the 1931 'Fundamental Beliefs' statement in the Yearbook and Manual. It was also to point up a bit more sharply the First, Second, and Third Persons of the Godhead." Letter From L.E. Froom to R.A. Anderson, J.L. Shuler, D.E. Rebok, A.W. Peterson, W. G. Turner, J.E. Weaver, Nov. 22, 1966.

118 Movement of Destiny, L.E. Froom, pp. 420-422.

119 ibid. p. 422.

120 ibid. p. 426.

121 ibid. p. 427.

122 (see Colporteur Ministry p. 123 (1899; 1903); RH Feb. 16, 1905).

123 W.W. Howell, the chairman, reported progress to the Cincinnati Autumn Council on October 22, 1942: "In dealing with matters of fundamental doctrine in our work, we found only one instance in which it seemed advisable to make a change, namely, in the teaching on the eternity of Christ. It is a matter of record that Uriah Smith once believed that Christ was a created being. But later he revised his belief and teaching to the effect that Christ was begotten sometime back in eternity before the creation of the world. Since his day, later books of the Spirit of prophecy, such as Desire of Ages, came out in the nineties and later on, making clear with the support of the Scriptures that Christ is coeternal with the Father. Since there is some difference of view among us on
And they were in mortal shock. For Dr. Froom produced the quotations, and I opened up a suitcase and produced rings as true as steel. I said, “do you think he wasn’t a Christian?” For the record, he wasn’t a Christian, and emphatic. And he was an excellent church historian and he said, “of course he wasn’t a Christian, he denied the deity of Jesus Christ.” I said, so did Ellen White. Dr. Froom said, What? I said yes and then I produced the quotations, and I opened up a suitcase and produced at least twelve feet of Adventist publications stacked up and marked for Dr. Froom’s perusal. And for the perusal of the committee to check the sources in there. And they found everything I said was there was there. And they were in mortal shock I might add, to think that it was as pervasive as it was. Mrs. White reversed herself later on very quickly, and affirmed the doctrine of the trinity very strongly and taught it. But she was influenced by Uriah Smith. She did deny the eternal deity of Christ at one time and relegated Him to the place of a second deity. That’s why you were classified with the Jehovah Witnesses early on, because of the Arian emphasis in Adventism. And because of the fact that you affirmed Michael the Archangel to be Christ.”

“Dr Froom and the committee decided that they would peruse this material immediately. So we adjourned the meeting and they took all the material with them and I guess others, and went through the materials. They came back and said, well, a great deal of these things you’re calling attention to are there, we agree, and we don’t agree with those statements. They do not reflect orthodox Adventist theology, and we reject it. I said, good, happy to hear that, now you can fault us, because we read this material and it’s not peripheral issues we are talking about.” “We went through all kinds of materials and then the idea came for a book where we would question and the Adventist denomination would respond... Out of that came the book called Questions on Doctrine. Contrary to some of the fantasies and myths which I hear today from Adventists who ought to know better, the book had the approval of the General Conference.”

“1. In common With Conservative Christians and the Historic Protestant Creeds, We Believe... That the Godhead, the Trinity, comprises God the Father, Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit. [COMMENT: The creeds are not Protestant but Catholic. Council of Nicea 325 A.D. and Constantinople 381 A.D.] QUESTION 3 “Have Seventh-day Adventists changed from some of the positions advocated by certain adherents of earlier years, from whom citations are still currently circulated? Do such citations misrepresent the present teachings of Adventist leadership? “The founding fathers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church over a century ago came out of various denominational backgrounds. While all were premillennialists, some were Trinitarian; others were Arian... Nor did they, at first, seek to define the nature of the Godhead, or the problems of Chritology, involving the deity of Christ and His nature during the incarnation; the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit;... But with the passage of years the earlier diversity of view on certain doctrines gradually gave way to unity of view. Clear and sound positions were then taken by the great majority on such doctrines as the Godhead, the deity and eternal pre-existence of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Spirit... “A few, however, held to some of their former views, and at times these ideas got into print. However, for decades now the church has been practically at one on the basic truths of the Christian faith... “But the charges and attacks have persisted. Some continue to gather up quotations from some of our earlier literature long since out of date, and print. Certain statements are cited, often wrested out of context, which give a totally distorted picture of the beliefs and teachings of the Seventh- day Adventist Church of today... “The belief of Seventh-day Adventist on these great truths is clear and emphatic. And we feel that we should not be identified with, or stigmatized for, certain limited and faulty concepts held by some, particularly in our formative years... “This statement should therefore nullify the stock “quotations” that have been circulated against us. We are one with our fellow Christians of denominational groups in the great fundamentals of the faith once delivered to the saints.” Question on Doctrine, pp. 29-32. (emphasis supplied) Note: Froom says that the statement above was added as a public disavowal, denying all “erroneous” statements by the early pioneers that are not in harmony with the current “Fundamental.
Statement of Beliefs” or “New Theology.” This was to be a token of goodwill, and a gesture of friendship toward all the Protestant Evangelical world. (Movement of Destiny, L.E. Froom, pp. 483,484).

131 “As you know, I don’t concur with the position that Michael is the title for Christ in His pre-incarnate existence, but apart from this, I find the Trinitarian theology of Adventism, particularly its repudiation of the doctrine of the Eternal generation of the Son, most compatible with my own.” Walter R. Martin to L.E. Froom, May 20, 1968.

132 “QUESTIONS ON DOCTRINE” p.42-46.


134 ibid. p. 147.

135 “One of these days I want to write a history of the development of doctrine in the Seventh-day Adventist Church from the very beginning of the little Sabbath conferences in 1848, on up through the formative period of some forty years to the place where the matter of the Godhead, the Deity, the nature of the incarnation, and the nature of the atonement came to the point of issue over clarification and correction in 1888. That marked the turning point. There was still reverberations on the part of some of earlier misconceptions; the minority opinion of a little group of individuals who were rather vocal, but did not represent any majority view. When I study the history of the emergence of other religious bodies, and their formative period, their divergences, and their conflicts, and their ultimate clarification—I do not know that our background problem was too much different except that a few Arians did obtain a prominence all out of proportion to their number. The majority were on the quiet order who simply went on believing in the Deity and the Atonement much as most of the larger Protestant bodies have held. “I think that the book Questions on Doctrine, with its definite repudiation of those two points held by some, has done much to clarify this matter and dispel a misconception, and a misrepresentation of a distinctly minority but vocal view.” L.E. Froom to Walter R. Martin, Aug. 18, 1960.

136 RH-Special Issue 1980.

137 The following discussion about the trinity is taken from the minutes of the 1980 meeting: “G.N. BANKS: Is our position as fundamentalist-believers that the Godhead is a unit of three equal members, preexistent to all things, and that there was a period when there was no Sonship involved—just three members of the Godhead? Is that our position? Did the term Father come into play only in relationship to the Sonship experience as a result of sin and the need of the atonement?

NEAL C. WILSON: Well, you are getting into an area that could lead us into certain Arian complications...

W. DUNCAN EVA: Mr. Chairman, we did not want to get into those areas that Elder Banks has talked about, but we felt confident in using the word Father because that is the word Jesus gave us to use—‘Our Father which art in heaven.’” Adventist Review, April 24, 1980, p.18.

The reason why church leaders “did not want to get into those areas that Elder Banks has talked about,” is because people might have begun to “wake up” to the devastating implications of this false doctrine they were pushing for a vote on. Our early Adventist Pioneers understood all too well the horrible implications of the Trinitarian teaching and its cruel effects upon true Christian faith and devotion.

138 “Medina Seventh-day Adventist Church Pastor Greg Schaller March 6, 1991

“This letter concerns our church business meeting held on February 23, 1991. At this meeting we voted in majority to disfellowship Joe Molnar and not allow him to attend until he reconciles his issues and differences.

“I want you to know the issues and process which lead to Joe’s disfellowship. Joe’s major issues concern the following areas:

1. The Holy Spirit and Trinity. He doesn’t believe in the divinity and personhood of the Holy Spirit, therefore, he rejects the Trinity. To Joe, the trinity originated with the Catholic’s. Therefore, those who believe in the trinity, including Adventists, follow the Beast.”

139 Selected Messages p. 205.

140 Letter from H. Cottrell to L.E. Froom, Sept. 16, 1931.

141 Letter from B.G. Wilkinson, (President of Washington Missionary College) to Dr. D.S. Teters, Nov. 3, 1936.


146 In his first printing of “Thoughts Critical And Practical On The Book Of Revelation” (1865 ed. p. 91), Uriah Smith uses the term “created” as applied to Christ’s birth or origin from His Father. This term however, was qualified, and used in a different sense than all other “creation.” The “created” term was deleted and further clarified in the next printing of that book.


148 Transcript from a taped conference at Loma Linda University between Walter Martin and Kenneth Samples and Pastors and Seminarian Students. Campus Hill Church January 1989.

149 Questions on Doctrine, p. 31,32.


151 THESE TIMES/May 1978, I Believe In The Trinity Of The Godhead, by Marvin Moore.

152 RH-October 21, 1971, I Believe In The Triune God, by J.R. Spangler.

153 DA pp. 758, 21; 1SM p. 341; 4BC-1143; PP p. 36.

154 Eph. 3:10; Re 3:21.
Women’s Ordination
God’s Design for Man
Father and Son
Man and Woman
Angel Spirits
Fear of being Different
Pioneers: Right or Wrong?

One of the earliest exhaustive examinations of the Godhead-Trinity issue after 1980