

Judgment Hour

02/18/2024

## In This Was Manifested the Love of God - Part 1

### Transcript

00:00:34 **Speaker 2**

God is love. The scripture does not say that God loves even though he does, nor does it say that God is loving even though he is. But this verse is going deeper than mere external manifestations of love and saying that God is love. In other words, the phrase God is love doesn't define what God does, but rather qualifies what God is.

00:01:00 **Speaker 2**

God is love. And we will see in a moment why these three words are so important. First, I want to quickly look at some very deceptive concepts regarding God's love that are creeping into the hearts and minds of many to lead them astray from God, and how these views, in the name of love and clothed with the profession of love, are, in truth, concealing from view the magnitude of the very thing they are professing to proclaim. This idea has been chiefly advocated by a Seventh-day Adventist speaker and author named Ty Gibson. He wrote a book called The Sonship of Christ, in which he advocates the idea that in order to be love, God has to be a relational composite of three persons in one being. He also explains this in a television interview he did on the TV network 3ABN. Well, if you think about it, I do this exercise every year with our students in the Arise program. One of the first things that I lead them through is kind of a mental theological experiment. And without giving them any clues

00:02:07 **Speaker 2**

or anything, I say, you know, here's a riddle for you. Break up into groups of two or three and we'll walk to the river and back. But while you're walking, I want you to crack this riddle. What is the minimal numeric value of love? And they all kind of cross their eyes and look at each other. Minimum numeric value of love, what does that mean? I said, that's what you need to figure out. What is the minimum number of individuals you would have to have in order for perfect love to exist? And they begin walking. We get to the river and I say, okay, what did you discover? And Shelly, it's amazing. Every year, it doesn't matter who the group of human beings are, everybody comes pretty much to the same conclusion. They banter a little bit. They say, well, it can't be one because love can't exist with one individual. If you lock yourself in the bathroom for life, you'll never experience any love. You got to come out of the bathroom and have some relationships. If God is a relational unit of three,

00:03:05 **Speaker 2**

Father, Son, and Spirit, that epitomizes what perfect love looks like Perfect love being unselfish and others censored. So each can focus on the other and be focused on by the other, and each also has to defer attention to a third party. So it's this beautiful reciprocation. It's this out and then to the other and then in. It's beautiful. The idea is proposed that love cannot exist with just one person. But where do the scriptures say this? because the answer is they don't. Yet by this reasoning we would be led to believe that if God was by himself he would cease to be love. The question is asked what is the minimum number of individuals you would have to have in order for perfect love to exist? Few seem to realize this question proposes that God's character of love depends upon external factors. The reasoning goes that God cannot be loving unless there are other persons to love and be loved by in return. But this makes God's character and who God is dependent upon what he can or cannot

00:04:20 **Speaker 2**

do. For example, if God does not have another being to love, the reasoning suggests that then he himself cannot be a loving God. And this is a huge problem with this book, is that the author arrives at his understanding of who God is by making God subordinate to external factors. But supposing Ty Gibson's reasoning were true, we might well conclude that when Jesus died on the cross and there were only two divine persons in the universe, that God the Father was no longer love but became a selfish tyrant. Such assertions as these and questions like this that come up as a result are all based upon human philosophy. The Apostle John didn't make the character of God subject to his circumstances by saying God is love because he is able to love. John wrote, God is love. Consider this statement. Through false teaching, the minds of men had long been turned away from God. In the prevailing systems of education, human philosophy had taken the place of divine revelation. And that is exactly what we

00:05:34 **Speaker 2**

are seeing here. Instead of the heaven-given standard of truth, men had accepted a standard of their own devising. From the light of life they had turned aside to walk in the sparks of the fire which they had kindled. Human philosophy will always lead away from God because it is by its very nature not based upon a thus saith the Lord. Yet in the book, The Sonship of Christ, the human philosophy proposed in this book does not even pretend to be based upon a thus saith the Lord. The official news and lifestyle magazine for the South Pacific division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, called the Adventist Record, had this to say about the book, The Sonship of Christ is a readable and engaging argument that makes useful progress in shifting it away from mere argument. Its emphasis on reading the Bible as a larger whole, rather than proof-texting, is important and something that needs to be said more often. So they openly admit, then, that this book is not based on proof-texting from Scripture.

00:06:41 **Speaker 2**

But the Adventist record calls this shifting away from argument in Bible proof-texting progress. The principles of God's Word, not the multiplied conjectures of human philosophy, are to be our guide. The next step in the progression of human philosophy is to spiritualize away the personality of God and Christ by concluding God and Jesus have no physical form. Such a view takes those biblical references to the arms, hands, head, feet, hair, and eyes of God and His Son to be entirely spiritual with no literal meaning. This is what is called spiritualism or the spiritual view because it spiritualizes away the literal reality of God and Christ as real tangible persons. In the book *Early Writings*, we read this quote from Ellen White concerning one of her earliest visions. This one was published in 1851. I have often seen the lovely Jesus, that he is a person. I asked him if his father was a person and had a form like himself, said Jesus, I am in the express image of my Father's person. I have

00:07:58 **Speaker 2**

often seen that the spiritual view took away all the glory of heaven and that in many minds the throne of David and the lovely person of Jesus have been burned up in the fire of spiritualism. So what was this spiritualism? It was spiritualizing away the reality of the form and personhood of both God and His Son, making them into a mysterious intangible essence. But here's the greater problem. If God is just some immaterial essence and some nebulous idea, then God becomes impersonal, and if impersonal, then it becomes impossible to relate to Him or therefore understand the significance of the sacrifice He made in giving His Son. On the Catholic website, Catholic .com, Catholic Answers has an article titled *Explaining the Trinity*, in which they state humankind is created in God's image and likeness. From the context of Genesis 1, we know this image and likeness does not pertain to the body of man because, and here it is, God has no body. Indeed, the divine nature cannot be bodily or material,

00:09:14 **Speaker 2**

because there can be no potency in God as there is inherent in bodies. So this image and likeness must be referring to our higher faculties or operations of intellect and will. This view that God has no body, the Catholics call a foundational truth. Yet Yet this concept is the very idea that Ellen White called spiritualism because it spiritualized away the reality of a personal God and a real Son as relatable, tangible beings, saying it took away all the glory of heaven. And what is the glory of God? It is His character, His character of love. How does this spiritual view that God has no body rob God of His character of love? You will see as we continue. The Catholic article continues by quoting St. Augustine in his explanation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as a trinity. They say, These three are distinct realities, relationally speaking, just as my own being, knowing, and willing are three distinct realities in me. Yet, in both God and man, these three relationally distinct realities

00:10:31 **Speaker 2**

subsist in one being. So, these three, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are relational realities distinct from one another, yet subsist in one being. Does this sound familiar? God is a relational unit of three, Father, Son, and Spirit. But when we say an extreme three, we believe that three divine persons equal one divine being. That's right. As you can see, the spiritual view that lies at the root of the Trinity Doctrine, the same view that has burned up the lovely person of Jesus in the fire of spiritualism, has grown like a malignant cancer stretching its poisonous tentacles even into the foundational beliefs of the Seventh -day Adventist Church. I want to share some quotes with you from some key Seventh -day Adventists, but I want you to see that these statements are coming from these in the higher echelons of the Church. I want you to see that the sentiments in these statements are not the opinions of one or two individuals, but that they reflect the official teaching and understanding

00:11:39 **Speaker 2**

of the entire denomination. And to prove this, I want you to understand what the Seventh -day Adventist Biblical Research Institute is. They state on their website, The Biblical Research Institute was established by action of the General Conference Committee in 1975. The historical roots of the Institute go back to the Defense Literature Committee, established in 1943, and the Committee on the Biblical Study and Research, established in 1952. In short, they say about the Biblical Research Institute that it consists of several Adventist theologians and staff working at the world headquarters of the Seventh -day Adventist Church. So, the Biblical Research Institute, or the BRI for short, says they exist to do the following – to advance the study and practice of Adventist theology and lifestyle as understood by the world church. They also exist to provide theological expertise and resources for the administration and departments of the General Conference and the World Church. It is important

00:12:49 **Speaker 2**

I share this because you need to understand the BRI's job is to uphold and explain the official doctrines held by the Seventh -day Adventist denomination, the World Church. I have been told by a well -known Adventist evangelist who has taken it upon himself to defend and proclaim the Trinity that the Biblical Research Institute is just a small group of people that don't represent the world church. He said this in order to discredit the statements I shared with him, because he knows that he doesn't share the same beliefs as the BRI. He didn't want to acknowledge the BRI is actually speaking on behalf of the world church. Similarly, many Seventh -day Adventists are themselves under the same deception, thinking that the denomination believes as they do, that God and Jesus are real persons with a real form, When in reality, the denomination doesn't. This book, the Handbook of Seventh -day Adventist Theology Commentary Reference Series, was published by the Review and Herald Publishing Association,

00:13:55 **Speaker 2**

and who? The General Conference of Seventh -day Adventists. That is the headquarters of the World Church. Under the heading of editors are many well -known church leaders, historians, and scholars, including the names listed who were the directors of the BRI at the time, and then the Biblical Research Institute Committee included the 66 additional scholars, theologians, historians, and church leaders, including former General Conference President Robert S. Fulkenberg and the current General Conference President of the denomination Ted Wilson. So again, these people are not some small group of people who don't speak for the church. They are in fact the mouthpiece of the World Church, and this handbook of Seventh -day Adventist theology is the document that explains the official doctrinal positions of the denomination. In the following list of contributors who wrote portions of this handbook are many Adventist professors and scholars, including one in particular I want to focus on, named

00:14:59 **Speaker 2**

Fernando L. Canale, the professor of theology and interestingly, also philosophy at Andrews University, because he is the one who wrote the chapter in the handbook called The Doctrine of God. With all that said, now carefully consider these next statements made in this document and understand this is the official teaching of the Seventh -day Adventist World Church denomination. It says in reference to God,

00:15:44 **Speaker 2**

So the belief is that God has a form. If they stopped there, it would be correct, but it continues and reverses course, verse, saying that God's form surpasses the capability and comprehension of the highest created intelligences. In other words, God has a form, but you can't understand what it is. No doubt we cannot understand what material makes up God's form or His nature, but what we can know is that God's form is like ours in structure. feature. God has a head, eyes, a mouth, nostrils, arms, a body, legs and feet, etc. For man was made in his image, not only morally, but physically. For in the beginning man was created in the likeness of God, not only in character, but in form and feature. If we can understand our form, then we can understand that God has a form like ours since we were created in the likeness of God, even in form and feature. But in saying God's form surpasses the capability of comprehension, it leads the mind away from this personable and relatable reality of God,

00:16:58 **Speaker 2**

and instead leads the mind to think of God as some kind of abstract entity, the same as if he had no form at all. Mr. Canale elaborates on his explanation of God's form by speaking of biblical anthropomorphisms. Now, anthropomorphism is defined as an interpretation of what is not human or personal in terms of human or personal characteristics. In other words, giving something human -

like characteristics, like speaking of the arms of a chair or the legs of a table. Anthropomorphism ascribes human or personal attributes to something that is not human or not a person. Now note how Fernando Canale uses this in reference to God. He says that in biblical anthropomorphisms, God reveals what he is and what he can do in terms of human realities. For instance, when God says that he has an arm, he does not mean that he has exactly or univocally what we call an arm. The expression signifies that God's reality is capable of performing all that can be performed by a human arm, and infinitely more.

00:18:13 **Speaker 2**

We cannot conceive or imagine the actual structure of God's reality that allows Him to perform these acts. When it is said, the expression signifies, Mr. Canale is telling us that references to God's body parts are symbolic expressions, but not to be understood literally. Many references to God's body are quite literal, such as when God said to Moses, and I will take away mine hand and thou shalt see my back parts, but my face shall not be seen. Moses really did see God's back parts, and God really does have a face, for he says thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live. And Daniel wrote, I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool. His throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. So God the Father has a white garment, he has a head, and has hair on his head, and sits on his throne. These references are not symbolic, but literal. But if

00:19:23 **Speaker 2**

we make them symbolic, then we spiritualize away the reality of God as a real person. Then God becomes some kind of mysterious, unknowable, and incomprehensible entity, and this, in turn, destroys our ability to relate to God or to understand the love He manifested in sending His only begotten Son. The other way to spiritualize away God as a real person is in some way to consent to the idea that God has a form, but then teach that his form is beyond any comprehension or understanding, thereby bringing us right back to the same conclusion that God is some mysterious and unknowable and impersonal entity. And this is exactly what is being taught by the Biblical Research Institute in this document. For in speaking of God's arm, Mr. Canale says, We cannot conceive or imagine the actual structure of God's reality that allows him to perform these acts. So, again, he is affirming that God cannot have a real literal arm because we cannot conceive or imagine the actual structure of God's reality.

00:20:34 **Speaker 2**

This is Spiritualism. form. The Bible clearly teaches that God and Christ are individual beings, and as such, that their structure and form is not at all beyond our imagination or conception, for it is plainly revealed in the Word of God. The Seventh -day Adventist publication, Adventistoday .org, published

an article in 2022 titled, What Kind of Bodies Will We Have in the Sweet By -and -By? And in this article, they conclude,

00:21:20 **Speaker 2**

The word immaterial means without body or parts. James White wrote a book entitled The Personality of God, in which he directly addresses the error of God's immateriality. In the book, he stated, the atheist has no afterlife or conscious existence beyond the grave. The sectarian has one, but it is immaterial, like his God, and without body or parts. In addition to saying God is immaterial, Adventists today added the word incorporeal, which is defined as having no material body form. So the publication Adventist Today, like the Biblical Research Institute, does not believe God has a real comprehensible body or form. Now, are there Adventists that do believe that God has a form? Yes, there are. In fact, I would say most of them believe God has a form, and in this they would be correct. But I am not addressing what most Adventists believe. I am addressing the official doctrine and teaching of the Seventh -day Adventist world church in their own official handbook on SDA theology. The fact the

00:22:33 **Speaker 2**

official doctrine of the Adventist church is different from what most Adventists believe is just further evidence of mass confusion within the Adventist church. It was important to examine what spiritualism is and see how the church is officially teaching this false doctrine, but now I want to shift gears and have you see why spiritualism is such a big problem, and how spiritualism obliterates the manifestation of God's love. The Bible tells 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." And this Son of God was the express image of the Father's person or form. form. The confusion over this matter is why Ellen White, in one of her first visions, asked Jesus if His Father was a person and had a form like Himself. Said Jesus, I am in the express image of my Father's person. And since the magnitude of God's love was manifested in the giving of His only begotten Son, a real Son in the express

00:23:46 **Speaker 2**

image of His own person and form, then to rob God and Jesus of their form is to steal from the mind of man an understandable and relatable act of a loving Father in giving a real Son for the redemption of the world. And this is why Ellen White said, I have often seen that the spiritual view took away all the glory of heaven, because it took away all the glory of God's character of love in the sacrifice of a real Son, begotten in His own image. So, on one hand, God is a real person with a real tangible body like ours. And Jesus was begotten in the express image of His Father's person, meaning that Jesus, even before His incarnation, was brought forth from His Father's substance having a real body and form like His Father. This makes perfect sense and we can understand this and relate to it because

God has designed that mankind should be put into families and experience what it means to bring forth children in their own image and likeness. And He has designed that parents should experience

00:24:58 **Speaker 2**

what it means to love the child so much that they would without question rather give up their own life than to see their children perish. All this God has purposed mankind to experience so that in sending his own Son to our world to perish in our place, we may comprehend and understand and know the love that God has for us. Now on the other hand, if God is not a real tangible person with a body like ours, but is instead an immaterial, and impersonal Trinitarian essence, then it is not possible for God to be a real Father or to have a real Son, nor is it possible for mankind to relate to God's sacrifice or understand the manifestation of His love in giving a Son, for God could not then be a real Father nor Jesus a real Son. So how can humanity relate to the sacrifice of a nebulous, impersonal, and immaterial God God in sending an immaterial, impersonal, and metaphorical Son to our world. The manifestation of God's love that is designed to melt and convert the heart is lost entirely, for

00:26:17 **Speaker 2**

mankind cannot relate to it nor understand it. And that is why this subject of the immateriality of God that is the foundation of the Trinity doctrine absolutely obliterates and destroys the greatest manifestation of the character of God's love known to man. So which view is correct? Sister White may answer, the reasoning that God is not a personal being is greatly dishonoring to Him. We are to have no controversy over this matter. And so it is settled. Let us abandon all such doctrines and ideas that God is immaterial, without body and parts, or that He is incomprehensible, lest we dishonor our Creator." James White shared what Seventh -day Adventists used to believe, saying, "'What is God? He is material, organized, intelligent, possessing both body and parts. Man is in His image. What is Jesus Christ? He is the Son of God, and is like His Father, being the brightness of His Father's glory and the express image of His person. person. He is a material intelligence, with body, parts, and

00:27:33 **Speaker 2**

passions, possessing immortal flesh and immortal bones. Here James White puts forth the simple, biblical, and logical conclusion that just as the Father is a personal, spiritual being with a body and parts, so too, the Son, who is in the express image of the Father's person, or form, would likewise have a body and parts. The understanding, therefore, that we have concerning the Father will form our understanding of the Son. If Christians today hold that God has no literal form, body, or parts, then they will logically make the same conclusion concerning the Son of God, that He is not a literal Son because God cannot be a literal Father, thus robbing mankind of the great manifestation of God's love that was designed to convert the sinner and to redeem him from sin. The seed of spiritualism has been sown in the official theology of the Seventh -day Adventist Church and has



been reaping its deadly fruit in taking away the revelation of God's love for man that God designed we should have. The

00:28:43 **Speaker 2**

associate director of the BRI, Angel Manuel Rodriguez, who also contributed to the Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology, said, quote, invisibility is sometimes assigned to God suggesting that he lacks a visible form. Statements like these are evidence that spiritualism has a strong foothold in the official doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. It becomes apparent why Trinitarians prefer to take the position that God has no form, For, if God does have a form, then the form of this one being comprised of three persons would make for a rather repulsive construction that would be difficult to call our Father in heaven. Nor could we say any longer that man was made in His image. While Ellen White plainly warned God's people against taking the spiritual view, and James White also spoke clearly about the consequences of accepting it, he wrote in the same year of Ellen's vision in 1851. If we take the liberty to say there is not a literal ark containing the Ten Commandments

00:29:53 **Speaker 2**

in heaven, we may go only a step further and deny the literal city and the literal Son of God. Certainly, Adventists should not choose the spiritual view rather than the one we have presented. We see no middle ground to be taken. So what does the spiritual view deny? It denies the literal Son of God. And this is exactly the position that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is teaching today. Once again, the former director of the Biblical Research Institute, Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, who is the same man that suggested God lacks a visible form, wrote in his article a question of sonship, that the Son is not the natural, literal Son of the Father. Another theologian from the BRI, Gerhard Pfandl, said, The Sonship of Jesus, however, is not ontological, meaning in regard to his origin, but functional. He says, in the planned salvation, each member of the Trinity has accepted a particular role. Just recently, the BRI published a chart entitled The Core Tenets of the Trinity, and they admit that

00:31:11 **Speaker 2**

one of the core beliefs of the Trinity is denying Jesus to be the literal Son of God, for they write on their poster under the heading Son of God that the word son is a metaphor. It does not denote biological descent. So there you have it, right from the church's own publications by its own top theologians, that the doctrine of the Trinity which became the church's His number two fundamental belief in 1980 firmly and unequivocally denies the literal Sonship of Jesus Christ, exactly as James and Ellen White both wrote that it would. The prophet Jude warned, For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus

Christ. And how would they deny God and Jesus Christ? James White writes exactly how, and says, For there are certain men, or a certain class, who deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ. This class can be no other than

00:32:30 **Speaker 2**

those who spiritualize away the existence of the Father and Son as two distinct, literal, tangible persons. And then he shows how this is done. He continues, saying, "...the way spiritualizers have disposed of or denied the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ is first using the old unscriptural Trinitarian creed." James White is saying exactly what it sounds like. He is saying the prophetic warning concerning those ungodly men who deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ applies directly to the doctrine of the Trinity because the Trinity spiritualizes away the existence of the Father and Son as two distinct literal tangible persons. At this point, some Adventist Trinitarians today might like to argue that they do not believe in the Catholic Trinity, they believe in what they call the Godhead. But what they call their three -in -one God matters not, because whether they believe God is a single being comprised of three divine persons, as the Catholics, or whether they are polytheists

00:33:51 **Speaker 2**

and choose instead to believe in a Godhead that includes three divine beings, It matters not, because both Trinitarian doctrines equally and explicitly deny that Jesus is God's literal Son, and therefore equally destroy the manifestation of God's love in sending his real, only begotten Son. By denying the Sonship of Christ, all versions of Trinitarian creeds as readily deny the of God, and worship instead a God of their own creating, which the Bible defines as idolatry. Ellen White also understood the warnings of Peter, speaking of those who privilege shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and many shall follow their pernicious ways. For Ellen White writes, here the Apostle has pointed out one of the marked characteristics of spiritualist teachers, they refuse to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God. To those in the Seventh -day Adventist churches, I give this challenge. For the salvation of your own souls, do not rest satisfied in any church organization

00:35:08 **Speaker 2**

or fellowship that refuses to acknowledge Christ as the literal Son of God. Sister White applied 2 Peter 2 .1 concerning denying the Lord that bought them directly to spiritualist teachers who refused to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God. It's important to understand she called this a damnable heresy, and this would make the core tenet of the Trinity doctrine enshrined in the Seventh -day Adventist Creed of the Fundamental Beliefs a damnable heresy. But Sister White didn't stop there. She continues saying concerning such teachers the beloved John declares 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. Spiritualism by denying Christ denies both the Father and the Son and the Bible pronounces it the manifestation of Antichrist. So the inspired messenger of God linked both warnings from 2 Peter 2, 1 concerning denying the Lord and denying the Father and Son from

00:36:23 **Speaker 2**

1 John 2 to spiritualism, which refuses to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God, and says the Bible pronounces it the manifestation of Antichrist. So, on the one hand, you have the love of God manifested in sending his only begotten Son, and on the other hand, you have a manifestation of Antichrist in denying the Father and the Son. What other conclusion can a rational human being come to except to recognize the Trinitarian doctrine of a co -eternal Christ who is not the literal Son of God as a manifestation of Antichrist and an affront to obliterate the manifestation of God's love and character to the world. In adopting this damnable heresy as found in the fundamental beliefs, the Seventh -day Adventist Church has embraced Antichrist. For this is exactly where the Seventh -day Adventist pioneers proclaimed that this doctrine came from. Seventh -day Adventist pioneer Jane President Andrews wrote in 1855, The doctrine of the Trinity which was established in the Church by the Council of Nice,

00:37:36 **Speaker 2**

A .D. 325. This doctrine destroys the personality of God and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. The infamous measures by which it was forced upon the Church, which appear upon the pages of ecclesiastical history, might well cause every believer in that doctrine to blush. If you're not familiar with the bloody massacres of the Catholic Church and how the doctrine of the Trinity was brought into acceptance by murdering all of its opposers, you will want to see our video, Established by Force. But here J .N. Andrews recognized the Trinity Doctrine was formulated in 325 and said this doctrine destroys the personality, meaning the form and individuality of God and His Son. In 1869, the Seventh -day Adventist publication Review and Herald wrote, "...but to hold the doctrine of the Trinity is not so much in evidence of evil intention, as of intoxication from that wine of which all the nations have drunk." So the Seventh -day Adventist pioneers clearly recognized the Trinity doctrine as originating

00:38:50 **Speaker 2**

from the Catholic Church at the Council of Nice in A .D. 325, and understood it to constitute the wine of Babylon. So what does the Seventh -day Adventist Church today think about this? Well, the Biblical Research Institute director George Reed said in the year 2000, quote, with respect to their doctrine of God, Seventh -day Adventists are in harmony with the great creedal statements of Christendom, including the Apostles' Creed, Nicaea 325 and the additional definition of faith concerning the Holy Spirit as reached in Constantinople in 381. Again, in attempting to defend their

acceptance of the Trinity, many Seventh -day Adventists emphatically argue that their version of the Trinity as defined in their fundamental beliefs is different from the Trinity doctrine as held by the Roman Catholic Church. And yet, here is an official publication from the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh -day Adventists saying that the Seventh -day Adventist Church is in harmony

00:40:00 **Speaker 2**

with the theological doctrines of the Trinitarian creeds established in 325 and 381 AD by the Roman Catholic Councils. And according to the Adventist Church's website, this statement was made by the Adventist Church in a brief review of the history and doctrines of the SDA Church prepared for the dialogue with representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. In the year 2000, the Seventh -day Adventist Church entered into dialogue with the Catholic Church and told the representatives of the Catholic Church that Seventh -day Adventists are in harmony with the doctrine of the Trinity as espoused in the Nicene Creed from 325 AD and the additional definition of faith concerning the Holy Spirit as reached in Constantinople 381. As I stated, most Seventh -day Adventists, however, still insist that their Trinity doctrine is different from the Catholic Trinity. And that may be so, for them personally. But as far as the official Church doctrine is concerned, the Church itself clearly admitted that

00:41:07 **Speaker 2**

they are in harmony with the Catholics on the doctrine of God. The true Seventh -day Adventist Church, as was established by God through the instrumentality of Ellen White and the other Adventist pioneers, had a very different view of the matter. In the source book for Bible Students, published in the Adventist Church in 1919, it is said that the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian creeds, and in general all the doctrinal decrees which the first four general councils have laid down in respect to the Trinity and to the person of Christ, those Protestants who are faithful to their church recognize in common with Catholics. These formularies constitute the common property of the separate churches the precious dowry which the overwise daughters carried away with them from the maternal house to their new settlements. They cannot, accordingly, be matter of discussion here, where we have only to speak of the disputes which occasioned the separation, but not of those remaining bonds of union to which

00:42:17 **Speaker 2**

the severed yet cling." I want you to recognize three points from this statement. First, the Adventist Church was saying in 1919 that even after the Protestant denominations had separated from the Roman Catholic Church during the Reformation that the Trinitarian creeds which deny the literal fatherhood of God and the literal Sonship of Christ are a remaining bond of union with the Roman Church that Protestants were still clinging to, because they recognized the Trinity in common with

the Catholics. Second, notice that these formularies—that is, referring to the above -mentioned Trinitarian creeds, constitute the common property of the separate churches. That is, even though the Protestant denominations are separate from one another, they are all still holding to the doctrine of the Trinity in common. And referring to this doctrine as the Precious Dowry, the statement is made that these Protestant churches carried it with them when they left the Catholic Church, for the overwise daughters

00:43:24 **Speaker 2**

carried away with them from the maternal house, that is, from the Roman Catholic Church, to their new settlements or denominations. In this statement published by Seventh -day Adventists in 1919, the Adventists classified the Protestant denominations as the apostate daughters of Babylon because they all held the doctrine of the Trinity in common with the Roman Church. So, how is it that the Adventist Church today openly claims to believe in the Trinitarian creeds established by these Catholic councils, and yet not recognize itself as a daughter of Babylon? Did the Church change? Did the Catholic Church change? Or did the Adventist Church change? Inspiration tells us there has been a change, but the change is in Protestants, not in Romanists. The third point I want you to see in this statement is in this sentence that with respect to the Trinity, those Protestants who are faithful to their church recognize in common with Catholics. And think about what this is saying. In order for the Protestants

00:44:33 **Speaker 2**

to be faithful to their Protestant churches, they have to recognize the Trinity doctrine in common with Catholics. And is this not still the case today? In order to be a member of the World Council of Churches, a denomination has to embrace the doctrine of the Trinity. The acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity has become the idol at which all denominations must bow in order to be considered a valid Christian faith. And as of 1980, when the Adventists voted in the doctrine of the Trinity as a fundamental belief, this also became true of the Seventh -day Adventist Church. And still today, in order to be considered a faithful Seventh -day Adventist, one must accept and profess and recognize the Trinity in common with Catholics. Those who have accepted that Jesus really is God's Son and have rejected the Trinity can tell you it did not take long before they were shunned, reprimanded, and or eventually disfellowshipped from the Church. And now, to help you understand why the literal Sonship

00:45:41 **Speaker 2**

of Jesus Christ is such a big deal, and how this relates to our understanding of the love of God and His character, I want to change course now and focus on the love of God, and how God chose to reveal His love, the objective this revelation of love was intended to accomplish, and how this doctrine of Antichrist has robbed mankind of the full revelation of the Father's love by denigrating

the exalted honor of Christ's literal Sonship to that of a metaphor or a role-play. We read in John 3.16, 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. The Bible declares God gave his only begotten Son. In order to understand what this means, let's look at the word begotten. But instead of looking to scholars and theologians or Greek and Hebrew dictionaries for the definitions of men, we will look to God's Word and the manner in which the Word is used in the Bible to understand what God means when He uses

00:46:50 **Speaker 2**

the Word begotten. In Ecclesiastes chapter 5, God's Word says, But those riches perish by evil travail, and he begetteth a son, and there is nothing in his hand, as he came forth of his mother's womb, we read that he begetteth a son. And then the same idea is repeated but with different words, saying, as he came forth of his mother's womb. So the word begotten simply means came forth. And this is not my opinion, this is the Word of God defining the Word of God. In Numbers 11 -12, God says, Have I conceived all this people? Have I begotten them, that thou shouldest say unto me, Carry them in thy bosom, as a nursing father beareth the sucking child, unto the land which thou swearest unto their fathers?" Once again, the same idea is repeated twice, but with different words. God asks, Have I conceived all this people? And repeating the question, He says, Have I begotten them? So the word begotten is used by God as a synonym with the word conceived, in the context of a newborn child. In Genesis

00:48:00 **Speaker 2**

we read, "...and the flocks conceived before the rods, and brought forth cattle ring-streaked, speckled, and spotted." So, conceived is used by God here to mean the same thing as brought forth. So, let's look at what we have so far. In Ecclesiastes, "...begetteth was used by God to mean came forth, and we saw in numbers that conceived was used again by God to mean begotten, and in Genesis that conceived was used by God to mean brought forth. So if the word begotten means came forth and conceived means begotten or brought forth, then they all have the same meaning. They mean the same thing. For God uses the terms interchangeably and even in the same verses. So what does the word begotten mean? It means exactly what God's Word says it means. It means came forth or brought forth." The reason I belabor this point is not because this is difficult to understand, but because the entire Christian world has redefined the word to mean something altogether different from the way the word is defined

00:49:05 **Speaker 2**

by the Bible. Scholars say that it means unique, or some even go so far as to say it means created. But I am merely pointing out that the way in which they define the word is inconsistent with the manner in which God uses this word. And as a Christian, if I am to follow God's Word, I must use and

define God's Word in the same way that He does. In Isaiah, we read, And of thy sons thou shalt issue from thee, which thou shalt beget shall they take away, and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. So how is the word beget defined in this verse? It is defined as issue from thee. So, the Word of God defines the word begotten and its derivatives as brought forth, bring forth, came forth, issue from, and conceived. God is not confused as to the meaning of the words He has used, and He has plainly defined this word begotten as its various forms appear in the Bible 176 times, and consistently they have the same meaning. So then, when God's Word says, for God so loved the world

00:50:14 **Speaker 2**

that He gave His only begotten Son. He meant exactly what it sounds like, that His Son was brought forth from Him. And what did Jesus say? For the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved Me, and have believed that I came out from God, I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world. Where did Jesus come out from? From God. And this is why He is called the Son of God. This is not complicated. A child can understand this, and children do understand it. But the worldly wise men have gone out of their way to assure everyone that the Word does not mean what God has said it means. Remember the former director of the Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists stated plainly, the Son is not the natural, literal Son of the Father. A natural child has a beginning, while within the Godhead the Son is eternal. The term Son is used metaphorically when applied to the Godhead. But the Son of God coming out from God is not metaphorical. And how do

00:51:25 **Speaker 2**

we know that? Because Jesus and the disciples understood that it wasn't. Let's look again at John 16, 27 through 28 when Jesus said, I came out from God. I came forth from the Father. And now look at the context. After Jesus had symbolically referred to himself as the Vine in chapter 15 and the Comforter in chapter 14, now he comes into chapter 16 and changes his manner of speech from symbolic or allegorical to literal. For he says in verse 25, These things have I spoken unto you in Proverbs, but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in Proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of the Father. And immediately after this is when he says, I came out from God, I came forth from the Father. And we know the disciples understood Jesus was now speaking literally and not symbolically. For we read immediately after Jesus said this, his disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any

00:52:43 **Speaker 2**

man should ask thee. By this we believe that thou camest forth from God. And guess what? God loved that they believed that Jesus came forth from him. For he said, For the Father himself loveth

you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God." So when we read that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, and when we read Jesus' words, I came out from God, we know that God and Jesus both meant exactly what they were saying. Remember, if we are to understand the greatest revelation of God's love and character that He has given to the human race, it is of the utmost importance we understand Christ was begotten of God, because in this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world. But now we may ask, when? When did Jesus come out from God? When was Jesus begotten? And the answer is in Proverbs chapter 8. In this chapter, Sister White reveals that Jesus is speaking concerning Himself. Through Solomon,

00:53:59 **Speaker 2**

Christ declared,

00:54:20 **Speaker 2**

In speaking of his pre-existence, Christ carries the mind back through dateless ages. He assures us that there was never a time when he was not in close fellowship with the Eternal God. So who does Ellen White say is speaking? It is Christ, and in the book Patriarchs and Prophets, she again refers to Proverbs 8 and introduces the scriptures saying, and the Son of God declares concerning himself, and then quotes from Proverbs 8. In Proverbs chapter 8, Jesus is speaking about his pre-existence. And what is meant by his pre-existence? He is referring to a time long ago, back through dateless ages, before the earth was created. Notice the emphasis on time. The Son of God declares concerning himself, 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

00:55:37 **Speaker 2**

fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. In these four verses, Jesus is telling us two things. He is telling us what happened, and he is telling us when it happened. So what happened? Jesus says, I was brought forth. And the other 90 % of these verses tell us when Jesus was brought forth. Jesus says it was from everlasting. And what does from everlasting mean? If you aren't sure, the meaning of from everlasting is repeated here in no less than eight different ways. From everlasting means from the beginning, or before the earth was. It refers to a time when there were no depths, when there were no fountains abounding with water. From everlasting refers to the time before the mountains were settled, or before the hills, while as yet he had not made the earth, including the fields of the highest part of the dust of the world." All these references are to various parts of the earth. The water, the fountains or seas, the mountains, the hills or the fields, all of this is to comprehensively



00:56:49 **Speaker 2**

illustrate that Jesus was brought forth before the earth was made, while as yet he had not made the earth. From everlasting is repeated here in no less than seven different ways, because God did not want us to be confused. He wants us to clearly understand that Jesus was brought forth, or begotten of God, before the earth was created. And that is what from everlasting means. Yet, the Trinitarian evangelists who do not believe Jesus was begotten must twist the context so that it doesn't apply to Jesus at all. Some people go to Proverbs chapter 8 and if you look in Proverbs chapter 8 in Proverbs chapter 9, there's soliloquy that Solomon gives there on wisdom. It's a beautiful poem on wisdom wisdom cries out listen to my voice and it goes on talks about wisdom and about a third of way down that chapter It says I was with him in the beginning. I was brought forth and they said this is when God created Jesus at the very beginning It's not talking about Jesus at all. The whole thing there is

00:58:02 **Speaker 2**

talking about wisdom, and then you go to chapter 9, again it's talking about wisdom, and it's using poetry there. It's not talking about Jesus at all. It is sad to see a leading evangelist so confused and misleading his church members, but it is worse still when he resorts to lies in order to misrepresent those who don't believe in the Trinity, teaching his congregation that we believe Jesus was created. This is untrue. We do not believe Jesus was created. He was begotten, just as the Scriptures declare He was. The truth can bear investigation. Truth has no need of resorting to misrepresentations or lies in order to sustain itself, but falsehoods will always be the means of advocating false doctrine. The King James Bible uses the phrase brought forth to refer to the beginning of Christ, but the The 1599 Geneva Bible, translated by Protestant scholars, actually uses a different word. It reads, When there were no depths, was I begotten? When there were no fountains abounding with water, before

00:59:11 **Speaker 2**

the mountains were settled and before the hills, was I begotten? So there you have it, right from the Word of God. God, the Son of God, declared concerning himself, before the earth was created, was I begotten. And who was Jesus begotten or brought forth from? Jesus tells us from his own lips, I came out from God, I came forth from the Father. And Jesus is not speaking symbolically, for we read, His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. The Eternal Father, the Unchangeable One, gave His only begotten Son, Tor 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. How was Christ begotten? We read that He was Tor from the Father's bosom. Does that word Tor have literal or metaphorical meaning? Consider also this statement. After quoting John 3 16, Ellen White adds, Though sin had produced a gulf between man and his God, divine benevolence provided a plan to bridge that

01:00:24 **Speaker 2**

gulf. And what material did he use? A part of himself. God used a material to bridge the gap between God and man, and that material was a part of himself. The part of himself that was begotten or brought forth from Him was His only begotten Son. Not created, but begotten, and there is absolutely a difference. A complete offering has been made. For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. Not a Son by creation, as were the angels, nor a Son by adoption, as the forgiven sinner, but a son begotten, in the express image of the Father's person, and in all the brightness of His majesty and glory, one equal with God in authority, dignity, and divine perfection." Can we see then that even the prophet plainly stated Jesus was begotten, and that begotten does not mean created? And I've got my anti-trinitarian friends, and there's some good people out there. I don't want to be unkind, but they said, well, no, no, he wasn't created, he was begotten. I said, well, you can play with

01:01:39 **Speaker 2**

the words all you want. If he did not exist and then the Father brings him into existence, he is a creation. Beware of men who under a pretense of godliness proclaim that if Jesus had a beginning that he was created. This falsehood is contrary to the words of Jesus, the confession of the disciples, and contrary to the inspired writings of Ellen G. White. Remember, it is false doctrine that requires falsehood in order to sustain itself. And it was through falsehood, lies, and deceit over the matter of Christ's Sonship that led to the rebellion in heaven, and those today who insist that Jesus is not the only begotten Son of God are but following in the footsteps of the enemy of Christ. Well, Lucifer, he was striving. He had glory in the heavenly courts, but he was striving for Christ's place next to God. Next, he wanted to be God, but he could not obtain that. Christ was the only begotten Son of God, and Lucifer, that glorious angel, got up a warfare over the matter until he had to be thrust

01:02:46 **Speaker 2**

down to the earth. But let's go deeper and ask the question, why? Why? Why is the issue of Christ's Sonship so important that Lucifer would begin his rebellion and warfare in heaven over the matter of Christ being the only begotten Son? Let's think about this for a moment. Let the mind go back before this war broke out in heaven. We are told that Lucifer had glory in the heavenly courts. God said to Lucifer, Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty, and thou wast perfect in all thy ways from the day that thou wast created. But in all this beauty with which Lucifer was endowed, it was not enough for him. It was not enough because there was something more that he wanted but didn't have. God describes Lucifer's beauty saying that every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, and the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold. The workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in

01:03:58 **Speaker 2**

the day that thou was created. Lucifer was the most beautiful being that God had created. So what was it that Lucifer wanted that he didn't have. What he wanted but didn't have was the position and honor of a son. And this is why he was striving for Christ's place next to God. Christ occupied the place of a son, because he was begotten of God. And because Christ was begotten of God, he had the nature of God. He was divine. But Lucifer was not divine. He did not have the nature of deity, for he was a created being. As God had said, thou wast created. And this is why we are told he could not obtain that. He could not obtain the position of a son, because no amount of additional precious stones or gems or gold or beauty could obtain for Lucifer the position of a son of God. Lucifer was envious that Jesus was divine and he was not, and this is why Lucifer got up a warfare over the matter of Christ being the only begotten Son of God. For Christ was divine because he was begotten and came out

01:05:16 **Speaker 2**

from God. Jesus' Sonship, therefore, is the reason for Jesus' divinity, and this is why when Martha said, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, that Ellen White said she confessed her faith in His divinity. And this is why Satan hates that Jesus is the only begotten Son, for it testifies of His divinity, because He is the Son of God. There are probably fewer things in the world that can upset Lucifer more than that phrase only begotten Son, because it stands as a rebuke to the foundation of his warfare against God. Especially must the word only be upsetting, for every time he must hear the word only, he is reminded that only does not include him, and that as a created being, he can never obtain the position of a real son. So if Lucifer as a created being can never obtain to the position of a real son, what What is his only recourse in this warfare against Christ but to attempt to strip Christ of His Sonship? For in stripping Christ of His Sonship, he is thereby attempting

01:06:33 **Speaker 2**

to strip Christ of His Divinity. And if Christ is stripped of His Sonship with the Father and thereby stripped of His Divinity, then Lucifer can represent Christ to the world as one equal with himself. For if Jesus is not a real son begotten of God and in the express image of the Father, then Lucifer's warfare against Christ has merit, because it would prove that God is a respecter of persons and that he has selfishly chosen to exalt Jesus and unjustly hold Lucifer back, when Lucifer would have just as much right and claim to Christ's place next to God as Christ does. Do you see what Lucifer is doing here? He is representing Christ as one equal with himself and then arguing that God is selfish and unjust and exalting Christ and holding him back. But the problem with Lucifer's argument is that it isn't true. His premise that Jesus is not really God's Son is false. Lucifer hates the literal Sonship of Christ because it proves Christ's divinity and at the same time permanently excludes Lucifer

01:07:48 **Speaker 2**

from ever being divine or equal with God or Christ because he was a created being. To dispute the supremacy of the Son of God, thus impeaching the wisdom and love of the Creator, had become the purpose of this Prince of Angels. To this object, that is disputing the supremacy of the Son of God, he was about to bend the energies of that master mind, which, next to Christ, was first among the hosts of God. But he who would have the will of all his creatures free left none unguarded to the bewildering sophistry by which rebellion would seek to justify itself. Before the great contest should open, all were to have a clear presentation of his will, whose wisdom and goodness were the spring of all their joy. Anyway, Lucifer was about to begin his campaign against God by bewildering sophistry and lies in an attempt to justify his warfare. Knowing that Lucifer will do this by attacking the literal Sonship of Christ, God makes a clear declaration to the entire universe expressly and clearly stating

01:09:00 **Speaker 2**

the truth so that none need be deceived, if they will believe what God said. The king of the universe summoned the heavenly hosts before him that in their presence he might set forth the true position of his son and show the relation he sustained to all created beings. The Son of God shared the Father's throne, and the glory of the eternal self-existent One encircled both. About the throne gathered the holy angels, a vast, unnumbered throng, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, the most exalted angels as ministers and subjects, rejoicing in the light that fell upon them from the presence of the deity. Before the assembled inhabitants of heaven, the king declared that none but Christ, the only begotten of God, could fully enter into his purposes, and to him it was committed to execute the mighty counsels of his will. The Son of God had wrought the Father's will in the creation of all the hosts of heaven, and to him, as well as to God, their homage and allegiance were

01:10:12 **Speaker 2**

due." It is very important to understand the purpose of God making such a profound public declaration to all the universe. The purpose is expressly stated in that it is to set forth the true position of His Son, and to show the relation He sustained to all created beings. And what is that relation? In the hearing of all the hosts of heaven, God declared Christ the only begotten of God, and that the relation He sustained to all created beings was that He was their Creator and they were His creation. for the Son of God had wrought the Father's will in the creation of all the hosts of heaven." The reason God made this clear is because he knew that Lucifer would accuse him of being a liar in declaring Jesus to be his only begotten son. God also knew Lucifer would attempt to persuade all the angels that Jesus is not really a son at all, and the angels that fell worked with Satan to accomplish this end. For this fact the angels would obscure that Christ was the only begotten Son of God, and they

01:11:26 **Speaker 2**

came to consider that they were not to consult Christ. Here we clearly see exactly how Satan and his angels would seek to justify their warfare against God. For this fact, or this truth, the angels, that is the fallen angels, would obscure or conceal or hide. That is the fact that Christ was the only begotten Son of God. Satan and his angels will twist, distort, misrepresent the words of God declaring Jesus to be his only begotten Son, or even redefine the word begotten or even remove it from the Bible altogether. Anything, but let the reader understand or see the love of God as exhibited in the giving of his only begotten Son. This is why God set forth the true position of His Son by declaring Christ to be the only begotten of God. Now you know the reason why this issue is so important to Lucifer is because the fact that Christ was the only begotten Son of God removes all the force of Lucifer's argument against God in the great controversy and reveals Lucifer to indeed be the father of

01:12:40 **Speaker 2**

lies. And today Today in the 21st century, Satan and his angels have convinced the whole professed Christian world that Jesus is not literally the only begotten Son of God, thereby deceiving them into joining Satan and his angels in their warfare against God and His Word. While Satan accuses God of being a liar in declaring Jesus to be his only begotten Son, God's Word declares the opposite, saying, "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ, he is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." Lucifer's warfare against the Sonship of Christ is not limited to him coveting the position of the Son of God. There is another reason why Lucifer absolutely hates that God's people should understand Jesus is God's literal only begotten Son, and it has everything to do with the love of God. Because in sending his only begotten Son, God had made the greatest sacrifice that he could make. And because it was the greatest sacrifice God could make, it was also the greatest demonstration

01:13:50 **Speaker 2**

of love that God could give. And this demonstration of God's love, the most important part of this message, is what we will explore in part 2 of In This Was Manifested the Love of God.