

Friends and Pilgrims,

Never before in the history of Christianity has the fatal heresy of Trinitarianism become so embedded in the human mind and accepted as truth. Most sincere pastors and nominal Christians will recoil in dreadful alarm at such a proposition. Some will welcome the study of Dr. Gyles and reason from cause to effect using the tools of evidence. Others will accuse by ridicule and say they blaspheme the Holy Spirit for which there is no forgiveness while they themselves are under the unconscious influence of the counterfeit spirit of anti-Christ. Yes, there is and has been a most intense conflict between moral truth and error over the souls of humanity, a bitter hostility inclusive of the sweet music of entertainment and the rivalries of sports competition fueled by money and ecclesiastical material wealth. The "standard of living" in this world has long been chosen above the standard of GOD'S Morality for our world and the world to come. Oh! what a fatal catastrophic future looms ahead for all who like Esau have sold their birthright for a bowl of earthly poisoned materialism and/or counterfeit Trinitarian spiritualism. Yes, "The omega will be of a most startling nature." {1SM 197.4}

"For you know how that afterward, when he (Esau) would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." HEB 12:17.

Friends and pilgrims, these indeed are the final days spoken of by all the prophets and the Prophet Jesus Himself said: "Take heed, (pay close attention,) that no man deceive you." MT 24:4. That is, with another spirit other than Mine for "you 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. Nowhere does one read in the Scriptures of the spirit of the Holy Spirit as a third person of a tritheistic God. Think deeply about this!

By what evidence do we know that we know if we have the holy Spirit of Christ in residence or the counterfeit light of that one who is "deceiving the whole world." 2nd COR 11:14 with REV 12:9.

"Take heed therefore that the light which is in you be not darkness." LK 11:35. **JRS**

Calvary Answers All Mysteries (for Seventh-day Adventists) By Dr. Colin A. Gyles

The Argument of Calvary

When all is said and done, the answer to all mysteries is revealed in the light that streams from Calvary. If the argument of Calvary is not sufficient to settle all mysteries for us Christians and set us on the straight path, perhaps nothing else can.

If the testimony of the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism is not sufficient to convince us that the Trinity is a false and pernicious doctrine, then perhaps, Rome herself can do the job by telling us that she was the one who formulated the doctrine.

If the testimony of the Jews, to whom were committed the oracles of God, is not sufficient to convince us that God is one and not one in three or three in one, then maybe the pagans of their day, who invariably had a Trinity of gods, may help us to see that the Trinity concept is of pagan origin.

But, if all else fails, I hope the argument of Calvary will be sufficient to settle all questions once and for all. Calvary declares that the Father and the Son were separated for our sakes when the Son cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt.27:46) and the Father endured the pain of seeing His only begotten Son expire and die on the cross. Such was the sacrifice that was made by the Father and the Son because of their great love for humanity. To this we respond with gratitude by worshipping the Father and the Son in accordance with the precedents in scripture.

Trinity Concept Contrary To Calvary Truth

Contrary to the argument of Calvary, the Trinity concept declares that Father, Son and Holy Ghost constitute an inseparable unity. This implies that no separation took place at Calvary. Which will you

believe? It is either the truth as declared at Calvary that there is One Supreme Being and that Jesus Christ is His only begotten Son, or the omega of deadly heresies – the doctrine of antichrist that denies the Father and the Son (1 John 2:22). The choice is yours. Contrary to the argument of Calvary, the Trinity concept declares that the Son is as eternally self-existent as the Father. To be eternally self-existent means that you cannot die. This implies that the Son of God cannot die and, therefore, did not die at Calvary. Which will you believe? It is either the truth as declared at Calvary that the Son of God was made flesh so that He could die and did in fact die (give up His hold on divine life) or the doctrine of antichrist that denies that Christ came in the flesh (1 John 4:3), thus implying that Christ was incapable of dying (going out of existence).

Contrary to the argument of Calvary, the Trinity concept declares that, apart from the Father and the Son, there is another who is deserving of worship and adoration. There is no precedent or authority given in scripture for worship to be offered to anyone except the Father and the Son, for they only are worthy (Rev. 5:12,13). The choice is yours. Will you follow the example and precept of scripture in worshiping “ the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb ” (Rev. 21:22) only, and accept that the Holy Spirit is not another, but rather, the Spirit of God Himself, or will you worship another who “ sitteth (is positioned) in the temple (place of worship) of God, showing himself that he is God (2nd Thess. 2:4)?

In the name of this other object of worship, many are supposedly speaking in tongues, performing many miracles and communicating with all manner of spirits. Will you join the band-wagon of believing in the Trinity, thus fulfilling the one criterion necessary for acceptance with the World Council of Churches and being a part of the Babylonish ecumenical spiritualistic confederation that will be overthrown at the second coming of Christ, or will you accept the argument of Calvary?

Calvary discounts the three pivotal concepts of the Trinity, namely: {1} Inseparability of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, {2} Eternal self-existence of the Son and {3} Worship of the Holy Ghost. Do you dare contend with the argument of Calvary? I hope that, once and for all, those who were ready to declare the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism in error in their rejection of the Trinity will thoughtfully reconsider.

Trinity Concept Justifies Papal Teachings

Those who advance the idea of God being a Trinity seem to believe that Jesus Christ must, of necessity, have existed as a distinct Being for as long as His Father if He is to be regarded as a Divine Being. If such is the case, then, by the same premise, would it not also be true that Jesus must always exist and therefore could not have died at any point if He is to be regarded as a Divine Being? Unless one's idea of death is similar to that of those who believe in the immortality of the soul, who would hold that there is an aspect of a person that is still alive when the person appears to be dead. If that was true of Christ, then what of human beings who were made in the image of God?

I maintain that, in following the Trinitarian line, one is inescapably led to justify not only the doctrine of the immortality of the soul but every single Roman Catholic doctrine. Indeed, the Roman Catholic church has declared that all their other doctrines are based on the doctrine of the Trinity. (1) Consider even the idea of Mary being co-mediatrix. If Jesus Christ is also, Himself, the God from whom humanity has been estranged and to whom humanity needs to be reconciled, then, is it not evident that there would be a need for someone to go between us and Jesus Christ? How has Seventh-day Adventists come to the place where they are now declaring that Jesus raised Himself from the dead? Could the Bible have made itself any clearer when, in Gal. 1:1, it declares that it was “ God the Father, who raised him from the dead ”? Or, could Ellen G. White have been more explicit when, referring to Christ's resting in the tomb, she declared that “ He was bearing the sins of the world and His Father only could release Him ”? (2)

Trinity Concept Discredits Seventh-day Adventism

I put it to you that Seventh-day Adventism has no credibility (so far as the matter of truth is concerned) if Trinitarianism is correct. What rational explanation could be given for such an anomaly as God's specially led people being in error on a fundamental issue as the question of who God is, when most of the other churches which they denounced as Babylon had a clearer understanding, in that they believed in the

Trinity whereas the pioneers did not?

Which set of people would more fit the bill of being classified as Babylon, if Trinitarianism should be regarded as truth? Would not the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism be found as fitting the bill of being labeled false prophets and Babylon? Is it not inexplicable that some of these very persons had previously belonged to Trinitarian churches before accepting Seventh-day Adventism and this great enlightenment that was brought to their spiritual experience should be tainted by the rejection of truth (the so-called truth of Trinitarianism), which they had previously embraced, only to have it replaced with damnable heresy (the supposed error of non-Trinitarianism)? Yet the world was to accept and believe that God specially called these people?

Trinity Concept Denies Bible And Spirit of Prophecy Consistency

If the Trinitarian line that is being advanced is correct, then the inescapable conclusion is that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy contradict themselves. I will now highlight some statements, which, I maintain, can never be reconciled to a Trinitarian position (all emphases mine).

- “The Father and Son alone are to be exalted” .(3)
- “There is but one God, the Father” (1 Cor. 8:6).
- “The head of Christ is God” (1 Cor. 11:3).
- “Christ, the Word, the only begotten of God, was one with the eternal Father – one in nature, in character, in purpose – the only being that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.” (4) The implication of this is that the Holy Spirit is not a being since the Holy Spirit “ searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. ” (1st Cor. 2:10); yet Christ is the only being who could enter into all God’s counsels (and note, this was referring to the creation!).
- “The Sovereign of the universe was not alone in His work of beneficence. He had an associate – a co-worker who could appreciate His purposes and could share His joy in giving happiness to created beings.” (5) An associate – not two. The associate was not Himself the Sovereign. Plainly, the God that the Word was (John 1:1), could not have been the same God that the Word was with. (In reality, the whole first paragraph on p. 34 of PP is a concise expression of Two Beings only; dual not three.)
- Prior to the incarnation, Christ was “ next in authority ” to the Father.(6)
- Prior to the incarnation, before Lucifer’s fall, Lucifer “was a high and exalted angel, next in honour to God’s dear Son.” (7) There was a clear line of authority: The Father first, The Son second and Lucifer third. The first two were worshipped, being uncreated Beings and the “counsel of peace ” was between them both (Zechariah 6:13). The third was not worshipped, being a creature. The third wanted to be worshipped violating the tenth Commandment. After being removed from his position Lucifer (now Satan), has obviously found a way of getting humanity to accept the idea of offering worship to a third being.
- Speaking of the creation, “ His Son would carry out His will and His purposes, but would do nothing of Himself alone. The Father’s will would be fulfilled in Him.” (8)
- “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.”(9)
- “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 is 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. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” (10)

I could go on and on. But it is not necessary. The point is that there are many statements that simply cannot be reconciled to a Trinitarian concept of God.

Seeming Contradictions

I am aware that there are statements that have been attributed to Ellen G. White that, on the face of it, appear to give a Trinitarian viewpoint. However, a number of them can be explained otherwise. In fact, they must be explained otherwise if contradiction is not to be conceded, since the overwhelming weight of evidence does not support a Trinity.

As supporting a Trinity persons cite, for example, Evangelism p. 615 : “He is the eternal self-existent Son”. (11) This is not the same as saying He is eternally self-existent. To say that Christ is self-existent does not preclude His being begotten. Once begotten in the Father's exact image, He would then be self-existent just as the Father is self-existent. In fact, that is what the Bible says in St. John 5:26: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself”. The expression eternal Son does not preclude His being begotten either.

One that is begotten of God's own essence would be eternal since the essence of God from which such One is born had no beginning. Even the Nicene Creed recognizes a difference between being created and being begotten in the following words: “We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made.” Of course, I am not endorsing the concept of eternal generation. I am only making the point here, that being created and being begotten are two different things that even the Nicene Creed recognizes, and further, that being begotten does not imply inferiority. Why should we seek to deny that a literal Father-Son relationship exists? This does not detract from the Divinity of Christ. This does not make Him an inferior kind of Being. What make us think that an offspring could be other than the same kind as the parent?

Another statement of Ellen G. White that is seized upon to advance the concept of a Trinity is the following: “In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived.” (12) The full statement shows that it is not Jesus Himself that is being described, but rather, life – which Jesus has and is able to impart. Here is the full statement as it was originally published in Signs of the Times: “In Him was life, original, unborrowed, underived. This life is not inherent in man. He can possess it only through Christ. He cannot earn it; it is given him as a free gift if he will believe in Christ as a personal Saviour.” (13) Those who are diligent enough to do a little research will realize that the statement was not saying anything about the life that Christ had that is not within the possibility for humans to experience.

Being described is the nature and quality of this life and not the origin of it. Original – not a pattern or copy, but something genuine, authentic. Unborrowed – does not have to be returned. Underived – not drawn from a source; He has it in Himself. How He came in possession of it? His Father gave it to Him. St. John 5:26 says: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself”. In like manner as He has received this life from His Father, Jesus will impart it to His people.

This matter seems to be quite straightforward and should not lend itself to much of the confusion that this statement is used to create, since Ellen G. White was not even discussing the matter of a Trinity.

Give Prophet the Benefit of the Doubt

It is only reasonable that the prophet be given the benefit of the doubt by understanding her statements in a manner that is consistent with other clear statements that she made and with the unanimous position that the church held during her lifetime. Indeed, the non-Trinitarian statements of faith of 1874, (14) 1889, and 1894 represented the generally accepted position of the church of which Ellen G. White was a part, and she did not object to it.

It is not reasonable to construe the words of the prophet in a manner that brings the prophet into disrepute and calls into question the credibility of the entire foundation of the Seventh-day Adventist movement. Nowhere in Ellen G. White's writing is God referred to as a Trinity or Triune. She never corrected any of the pioneers, including her own husband, James White, who were staunchly non-Trinitarian. Quite to the contrary, she strongly endorsed the doctrinal foundation that was laid by the pioneers, describing it as “ a solid, immovable platform ”. (15)

DESIRE OF AGES Did Not Change Doctrine

When persons present a lame and ridiculous argument that the publication of the book, Desire of Ages, marked an epochal change in Seventh-day Adventist thinking concerning the Trinity, they do their cause a great disservice, perhaps, without even realizing it.

Is that the way a church and a prophet go about the business of correcting a foundational heresy? Can one, for even a passing moment, entertain the thought that a prophet and a church, realizing that they were in fundamental error, preaching a false concept of a non-Trinitarian God, misleading people, and they just silently publish a book that does not even mention the term Trinity? No acknowledgement that they were wrong? No statement that they used to believe this, but further enlightenment has now led them to believe that? It had to be left to a later generation to break the news that a change had taken place?

People who present this kind of utterly flawed argument are begging the world to hold the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism in contempt. If one had set out to discredit Ellen G. White as a prophet and to present the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism as deceiving and dishonest, they could hardly have done a better job.

Those who are honestly seeking for truth and a correct understanding will not, however, be deceived into rejecting Ellen G. White and the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers. In light of the historical record concerning Ellen G. White's writings and editorial changes, since 1883, (16) it is not difficult for one to discern the reason for a number of contradictory statements attributed to Ellen G. White since then.

When scholars extend their editorial liberty beyond legitimate bounds and try to clarify, amplify and re-interpret the writings of the prophets, invariably confusion results, just as early Roman Catholic scholars have done in producing their Latin Vulgate which continues to muddy the waters of truth and give the impression that the Bible is sending mixed signals with respect to some important concepts. (17)

For those who are diligent and care about truth, they can verify for themselves that there were no mixed signals, concerning the subject of the nature and personality of God, in Ellen G. White's writings prior to 1883 when the General Conference passed resolutions setting up a review committee to make editorial changes to Ellen G. White writings. (18) Since then, a number of seemingly conflicting statements have appeared and, notwithstanding the claim by some persons (including the acclaimed Professor Walter Martin) that Ellen G. White changed her position on the Trinity, no statement has been produced from the pen of Ellen G. White wherein the term Trinity has been used to describe God or wherein there were any withdrawal or retraction of the numerous non-Trinitarian statements that were made by her before.

If This is Not The Omega, Then What Is?

It is rather remarkable and unprecedented that one should have to be attempting to defend the honor, integrity and calling of Ellen G. White and the pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism against disparaging suggestions and insinuations being made concerning them, not by avowed enemies of Seventh-day Adventism, but by professed Seventh-day Adventists, and not mere pew-members, but leaders, for the most part. On second thought, it is not altogether unprecedented; Ellen G. White herself prophesied it. In light of the acceptance of Trinitarianism by professed Seventh-day Adventists and the effect that such acceptance has had on doctrine, credibility and overall direction, vis-à-vis the papacy, the predictions of Ellen G. White concerning the 'omega' stand among the surest evidences that she was indeed a prophet.

Many people speak loosely of the 'omega of apostasy' without realizing that Ellen G. White used the term 'omega' in relation to a particular change of doctrine that would be embraced within the church on account of which the earlier foundation would be rejected. The following statements speak for themselves (all emphases mine):

"In the book Living Temple there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies. The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given." (19)

"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. I knew that I must warn our brethren and sisters not to enter into controversy over the presence and personality of God." (20)

“The spiritualistic theories regarding the personality of God, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy.” (21)

“In a vision of the night I was shown distinctly that these sentiments have been looked upon by some as the grand truths that are to be brought in and made prominent at the present time. I was shown a platform, braced by solid timbers,— the truths of the Word of God. Some one high in responsibility in the medical work was directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers supporting this platform. Then I heard a voice saying, “Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion ? Are they asleep? This foundation was built by the Master- worker, and will stand storm and tempest. Will they permit this man to present doctrines that deny the past experience of the people of God? The time has come to take decided action.”

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.” (22)

These statements were made in the year 1904. Therefore, the points of truth to which reference has been made (“ the last fifty years ”) would largely have been those that were held within the period 1854 to 1904 and articulated in the statements of faith of 1874, 1889 and 1894. Consider the following:

- When people were being warned not to engage in any controversy concerning the presence and personality of God, in light of the error that was seeking to intrude, what was then the accepted belief in the church concerning the nature and personality of God? Was it a Trinitarian view? The answer is, no. Therefore she was not urging that the then accepted position be changed. Quite the opposite, she was cautioning against an attempt to change it.

- The “alpha of deadly heresies” was being resisted and it had to do with the presence and personality of God. She said, “the omega would follow in a little while” and “will be received”. What doctrine, that had to do with the presence and personality of God, was “ received ” by the church “in a little while” after the statement was made in 1904? There is only one doctrine that fits the description – the Trinity doctrine. In 1931, after the prophet had died, the first Trinitarian statement of faith was published by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, (23) which marked a distinct shift from all others that were previously published.

- She further indicated what would be the result of the acceptance of that particular heresy: “ The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error” ; “A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced” ; people would “deny the past experience of the people of God” and this would result in “ giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith”. Which other doctrine but the Trinity doctrine fits the description? The acceptance of the Trinity is the only major change of doctrine that has occurred within the Seventh-day Adventist church since the pioneers fell asleep. Other changes have taken place, but not on a scale such that a doctrine which the pioneers actively campaigned against, as a pagan and papal heresy, becomes accepted as truth, and on account of which the pioneers are being discredited.

So significant is the change that George Knight, Andrews University Seminary Professor said: “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.” (24)

With all that I have highlighted concerning the Trinity and the prophetic forecast concerning the omega

of deadly heresies, I have only one further question to ask concerning this matter: If the Trinity doctrine is not the omega of deadly heresies of which we have been warned, then what is?

Trinity Concept Disparages God and Does Violence to the Gospel

The doctrine of the Trinity, further, disparages God by making Him out to be no more than a pretender, who appears in the form of humanity, pretending to die (when He really cannot die) and pretending to sacrifice His only begotten Son out of love for us when, in reality, He made no sacrifice, since Jesus Christ was not really His Son and did not even die.

Which other doctrine is as convoluted and hinged on philosophical speculation as the doctrine of the Trinity? What else could Ellen G. White have been referring to when she speaks of a "A system of intellectual philosophy"? Well on target was Ellen G. White when she said: "The spiritualistic theories regarding the personality of God, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy." (21) Which other doctrine undermines the very foundation of the Gospel as the doctrine of the Trinity that seeks to confuse the very core of the gospel truth that God gave His only begotten Son for us? As to the matter of the Trinity doctrine being spiritualistic, I have already shown that the Trinity doctrine followed to its logical conclusion leads to a belief in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which forms the basis of spiritualism. As was indicated, the Trinity concept presents the Son of God as being alive on another plane while appearing to be dead in body.

Could it be reasonable that we hold an idea of which there is no clear statement in Scripture and on the basis of that idea, deny the clear statements of Scripture, which say otherwise, and dare to say that we are a people of The Book? Seventh-day Adventists would do well to seek the Lord earnestly, retrace their path quickly and cover themselves with the truth lest the shame of their nakedness gets exposed abroad and Seventh-day Adventism be made a mockery and the object of ridicule in the religious world. I find that the issues that are raised in objection to the doctrine of the trinity are often misunderstood or misrepresented. People say that rejecting the Trinity is denying the divinity of Christ. I hope that it is clearly seen that such is not the case.

In accordance with what has been shown, the Son is the monogenesis (only begotten) of the Father (John 3:16) – the only One of God's genes, so to speak; not one of inferior 'genetic' make-up. This is simple, plain Scripture. There is no need for any philosophical maneuvering. Everybody knows what a son is – an offspring. If the Bible writers wanted to describe a Three-in-one or a one-in-three they could have done so. But they did not. They consistently said Father and Son. So there is no need to confuse what is already plain.

It is also claimed by some people that rejection of the Trinity is a rejection of the Holy Spirit and they go at length to quote 1st Cor. 13:14 and Matt. 28:19 saying, "See, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Three, not two." But that is missing the point altogether. Whoever was saying that there is no Father or Son or Holy Spirit? Of course there is a Father, a Son and Holy Spirit. The issue is defining the relationship between the three. Are they three individual Beings, One Being with three aspects to his nature, or what?

The simple point is that the speculations of the Trinity are unnecessary since the Bible has clearly defined the relationships: One is Father (we know what father is), He is the One most consistently referred to as God, the Supreme Being. Another is Son (we know what son is), a different individual Being who is the offspring of the former, having the same nature, but being submissive to the authority of the former (see 1 Cor. 15:24-28). The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Father and Son (we don't know exactly what is one's spirit; however we know that one's spirit is an integral aspect of one's being and not something or somebody different or separate from one's own being). The Bible represents The Holy Spirit as being related to God in a similar way as man's spirit is related to man (of course, this is not saying that God's Spirit is like man's spirit. God's Spirit must be as high above man's spirit as God is above man). The Bible says: "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." 1st Corinthians 2:11.

Begotten Son Central to the Gospel

We are told that Enoch had his first son at age sixty-five years, and Enoch walked with God. Sis. White, in commenting on this, said that the birth and development of his first son gave Enoch a deeper appreciation of what God purposed to do in giving His only begotten Son. This led to Enoch's walk with God.

At another place Sis. White said: "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." (25) Does this sound Trinitarian? Sis. White also wrote that an angel said to her that it was not without a struggle that God gave up His only begotten Son. "Said the angel, "Think ye that the Father yielded up His dearly beloved Son without a struggle? No, no." It was even a struggle with the God of heaven". (26) Does this sound like Father and Son are only designated titles? Or is this a genuine Father – Son relationship?

Abraham understood also, when he was told to go and offer up Isaac as a sacrifice. Abraham's hand was stayed however. But for God there was none to stay His hand. He had to bear the suffering of seeing His only begotten son separated from Him and suffer and die.

I pray that the true gospel of salvation will no longer be obfuscated by spurious philosophical speculation that liken God to inanimate things of nature such as air, fire and water that have their foundation in paganism. I pray that the argument of Calvary will be sufficient to settle all questions. Do you dare contend with the argument of Calvary that shows the Son of God being separated from the Father, and the Son of God dying in our place? Or do you prefer the pagan triune who are inseparable and cannot die? The choice is yours. But as for me and my house we will serve Jehovah and rest our cause in the truth of Calvary.

References

1. Handbook for Today's Catholic, p.16.
2. White, E. G., Youth's Instructor , May 2, 1901 pr. 8.
3. White, E. G., Youth's Instructor , 7 th July, 1898 .
4. White, E. G., Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 34.
5. Ibid.
6. White, E. G., Review and Herald , Dec. 17, 1872 ; also Spirit of Prophecy, vol. 2, p. 9.
7. White, E. G., Story of Redemption, p. 13.
8. White, E. G., Signs of the Times , Jan. 9, 1879 , pr. 2.
9. White, E. G., Testimonies vol. 8, p. 268.
10. White, E. G., Signs of the Times , May 23, 1895.
11. White, E. G., Evangelism p. 615.
12. White, E. G., Desire of Ages, p. 530.
13. White, E. G., Signs of the Times , April 8, 1897; also Selected Messages, vol. 1, pp. 296,297.
14. Signs of the Times , June 4, 1874 .
15. White, E. G., Early Writings, p. 259.
16. Graybill, R., Ministry , April 1994, pp. 10-12.
17. Standish, C. and Standish R., Modern Bible Translations Unmasked, 1993, Hartland Publications, Rapidan Virginia 22733 , USA .
18. Review and Herald , Nov. 27, 1883 .
19. White, E. G., Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, pp. 49, 50; 1SM 200.
20. White, E. G., Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, p53; 1SM 203.
21. White, E. G., Special Testimonies, Series B, No. 2, pp 54, 55; 1SM 204.
22. Ibid.
23. 1931 Year Book of the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination, Washington, D.C. : R&H 1931, p. 377.
- 24 Knight, G., Ministry , October 1993, p. 10.
- 25 White, E. G., Review and Herald , July 9, 1895 , pr.14.
- 26 White, E. G., Early Writings p. 127.

Calvary Answers All Mysteries
(for Seventh-day Adventists)
By Dr. Colin A. Gyles