

The Dark Side of Logic

By Ray Gebauer Feb. 2008

PART I—Understanding Logic

The Logic Weapon
Inductive Logic
Deductive Logic
Logic Wars
Inducing The Truth
Score: 5000 to Zero
Dismissing The Evidence
Who Is "God"?

Part II—The Mystery That Never Was

Part III—What Is Sound Doctrine?

Criteria #1—The Sound Of Truth
Criteria #2—The Words Of Jesus
Two Birthdays Of Jesus?
Criteria #3—Not Going Beyond...

It was another perfect day in paradise! It seemed life could not get any better--yet each day brought new and exciting discoveries to both of them. Life was fantastic, and just kept getting better. She knew that today would be no different.

Then it happened. A new possibility emerged from an unexpected source! The amazing possibility--no, it was a more than that, it was a promise--that she could instantly gain a higher level of wisdom and become like God!

It was a simple, easy, logical and of course pleasurable process: Just eat this super fruit from this special mystery tree, and her eyes would be "opened." She--no, both of them--would immediately become like God!

You know the rest of the story. Eve discovered that it was indeed true that their eyes were opened as they ate from this tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But the outcome

was not at all what Eve had expected, and as a tragic result, Paradise was lost.

THE LOGIC WEAPON

How could it be that this perfect, sinless being could be so easily deceived? How did this beautiful gift of reasoning, as part of the image of Yehovah God, backfire on these super intelligent beings, including God's own son, Adam? (Luke 3:38).

I'm going to call this logic weapon the "dark side of logic."

Think of the biggest mistake in your life. In fact, consider all the mistakes you have made. What do they all have in common?

I say it was the dark side of, not the force, but of logic that faked you out, that caused you to come to a faulty and perhaps tragic conclusion. It's not because you were stupid or even uninformed, and it happens to me, you and everyone. Look at history starting with the defection of Satan and one third of God's holy angels. Right after Adam and Eve's fall, it was Cain. Abraham, Moses, David, Peter, Paul and, of course, Judas made serious errors because of this "dark side of logic."

INDUCTIVE LOGIC

The most **fundamental** form of logic and reasoning is called inductive logic. This consists of observing all of the available raw data in order to come to a conclusion that is consistent with all the data. This is the necessary beginning point for all reasoning. It goes from many specifics, based on observation, to a general conclusion.

An example would be a survey or poll. Or if an orchard grower examined every apple tree in his orchard to determine how much water it needed he would be using inductive logic.

DEDUCTIVE LOGIC

In sharp contrast, deductive logic is a reasoning process that starts with a single presupposition or assumption that is considered to be true and, based on it, creates (deduces) a new conclusion. Deductive logic is an "If this, then that" line of reasoning. If the farmer made his assessment of the orchard by looking at just one tree, assuming it accurately reflected the conditions of all the others, he would be using deductive logic.

As long as the presupposition is true, the conclusion will also be true. But, if the presupposition is not true, although it may *appear* to be accurate (Proverbs 14:12; John 7:24), the conclusion will be false. That is the dark and *dangerous* side of logic.

Eve reasoned: "If [since] this fruit will make me like God, and, since that is a good thing, the smart thing to do is to eat it."

Likewise, Satan tried to use deductive logic to trip up the second Adam, Jesus (Matt. 4:1-10). The Pharisees used deductive logic to justify killing their Messiah. Hitler, Stalin and abortionists used it to justify killing millions of people. All deception, evil and most serious mistakes are based on the dark and dangerous side of logic: deductive logic.

On the one hand, deductive logic is very useful, but only as long as the presupposition is correct. But when it is not, we refer to this as "jumping to the wrong conclusion." When's the last time you've done that?

LOGIC WARS

Paul repeatedly points out the danger of using the less reliable "short cut" deductive logic. Here are a few examples.

"Do we then nullify the law by faith? Not at all!" (Romans 3:31).

Paul anticipates and attacks the dark side of logic in Romans 6:1: *"What shall we say, then? Shall we continue to sin that grace may abound? By no means!"* He does this again in Romans 7:7, 13 and 3:5-9.

Anticipating that his readers may jump to the wrong conclusion with faulty deductive reasoning, he counters it very directly:

"Now when it says that 'everything has been put under him (Jesus)', it is clear that this does not include God Himself who put everything under Christ. When He has done this, then the Son himself will be made subject to Him (God) who put everything under him so that God may be all in all." I Cor. 15:28.

Based on this critical distinction between inductive and deductive logic, and the particular weakness of deductive logic, examination of *all* the biblical data reveals that the theory of the trinity is based *entirely* on flawed deductive logic and ignores the massive volume of data from using the more fundamental approach of inductive logic.

INDUCING THE TRUTH

Paul complimented the people of Berea in Acts 17:11 for using **inductive reasoning** instead of relying on the less reliable deductive logic:

"The Bereans were of more noble character than the Thessalonians, for they...examined the scriptures daily to see if what Paul said was true."

It is absolutely imperative to take a fresh look at the biblical data regarding the nature of God and his son by using the approach of inductive logic rather than taking the quick but less reliable approach of trying to interpret isolated verses with the short cut deductive logic ("if this, then that").

In order for deductive logic to be reliable, the presuppositions on which it relies must be based on the data gathered using the inductive logic approach. Only the inductive

approach can provide the *whole* truth and safeguard against false conclusions that can easily come from the faster but less dependable deductive logic approach.

According to the trinity theory, Jesus is equal to the one true God—that is, he is 100% God and 100% man at the same time. Let's see what the raw biblical data actually reveals regarding this theory.

SCORE: 5000 to ZERO

Using Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, it is very easy for anyone who is willing to take the time to discover that Jesus is referred to or presented *as a man* over 5000 times, including by name, title and pronouns. I read all 1000 plus verses in the N.T. that contain the word "man" and found that Jesus is referred to as "a man" 151 times, of which 85 times he refers to himself as a man (including "the son of man").

After his resurrection, he continues to be referred to *as a man eleven times* (Acts 13:36; 17:31 ("*He will judge the world by the man He has appointed*"); Romans 5:15; I Cor. 15:21, 47; Phil. 2:8; Heb. 3:3; 5:4; 7:24; 10:12; Rev. 14:14; I Tim. 2:5 ("*There is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*")

The name "Jesus" occurs over 1000 times and is always a reference to his being a man. The most common title used of Jesus is "Christ," which occurs almost 600 times, and means one who is anointed--literally meaning to be smeared with oil but used symbolically to mean a man empowered by God's Spirit for authority and power. Because the word "anointed" is always in reference to a man (or a holy object), it is never and could not possibly ever be used to refer to God.

DISMISSING THE EVIDENCE

So how do the proponents of the trinity theory handle this massive amount of data revealing Jesus as a man **5000 times**?

Since there is no inductive data to support their theory, they use a "nuclear bomb" of

deductive logic to "dismiss" this army of 5000 references using the presupposition (assumption) that Jesus is *both* God and man. Therefore they say that Jesus being a man proves nothing because he's God at the same time, as if both could be true, like having your cake and eating it too.

The deductive conclusion would be correct if there was inductive evidence that this presupposition was correct. What is the source of this common assumption? Is it based on inductive data? Let's see.

In light of the fact that Jesus is indisputably referred to as *a man* over 5000 times in just the N.T., if he were equally God wouldn't you expect to see an equal number of references to Jesus as God? Of course you would!

In reading the entire Bible, searching inductively for this evidence, I found *zero* clear references to Jesus as being equal to God and a small handful of ambiguous passages that have been used to support the claim. But under scrutiny they do not actually support the notion that Jesus is equal to God.

So that puts the final "score" at 5000 to zero, or at most maybe 5000 to 10 if you count the ambiguous verses such as John 1:1, 18; 8:58; 10:30-32; Phil. 2:6; Romans 9:5; Titus 2:13; Heb. 1:8; II Peter 1:1; Isa. 9:6.

The only reason there are any verses at all used to support the notion that Jesus is God is because people either forget or assume that "God" is merely a title and does not always refer to the one true God, Yehovah.

WHO IS "GOD"?

In the O.T. the word translated "God," ("Elohim" in the Hebrew), is used of angels, idols and of men 320 times (e.g., Exodus 7:1; Ps. 45:6 [of King David]; 82:1-7 [of male rulers]; Isaiah 9:6).

In the N.T. "Theos," the Greek word for "God," is used not just for the one true God [e.g., John 17:3; I Cor. 8:4-6], but 15 times of angels, Satan, men and of Jesus [John 10:34, 35; 20:28; Acts 7:40, 43; 12:22;

14:11;17:18; 19: 26; 28:6; I Cor. 8:5 (twice)]; II Cor. 11:4; Gal. 4:8).

So before you jump to conclusions when you read that Thomas says to Jesus, "My Lord and my God!" in John 20:28, or that Satan "is the god of this world" in I Cor. 4:4, or "the word (logos, which is God's plan, blueprint—not Jesus) was God" in John 1:1, you must carefully examine the context to see if the reference is to the one true God rather than just assuming it is.

Because there is no inductive evidence for the trinity theory, its advocates always resort to what they believe is their ace in the hole, which is the assertion that the trinity is a mystery that cannot possibly be understood.

Yes, they admit that it is very confusing, that it violates basic logic and reasoning, but that's "okay" because "it's a mystery that no one can understand." Therefore we just have to accept "it" by faith.

That could be a convincing argument if there were any actual biblical data to support this notion of the trinity being a mystery.

PART II—The MYSTERY THAT NEVER WAS

There are **three serious problems** with the mystery theory. First, there is absolutely no inductive evidence that Jesus is 100% man and 100% God to start with or that God was incarnated as a human. This speculative notion is based entirely on deductive logic consistent with the common pagan myth that gods sometimes became men. Two times, a crowd assumed was the case with Paul:

"When the crowd saw what Paul had done, they shouted in the Lycaonian language, 'The gods (theos) have come down to us in human form!'" Acts 14:11.

When Paul was bitten by a snake, and did not die, the notion of incarnation came out *again*:

"The people expected him to swell up or suddenly fall dead, but after waiting a long

time and seeing nothing unusual happen to him, they changed their minds and said he was a god (theos)." Acts 28:6.

Evidently, the deductive logic of incarnation (a god becoming a man) was a common pagan belief 2000 years ago, just as it is today in most Christian churches.

Secondly, rather than referring to the nature of God as a mystery, Paul says the very opposite in language that could not be more plain. **In the space of just two verses, he emphatically states four times that the nature of God is so plain and simple that even unbelievers know God and understand his nature!**

"Since what may be known about God is (1) plain to them, because God has made it (2) plain to them. For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--His eternal power and divine nature--have been (3) clearly seen, being (4) understood from what had been made, so that men are without excuse" (Romans 1:19-20).

Did you notice the part about "the mystery?" The fact is that **there is no mystery**—the nature of God and his attributes are **clearly understood**.

Let's do a quick focused review of this important verse: **all** that can be "**known of God**," including his "**invisible qualities ...and divine nature**" is "**plain** to them" because God *himself* made it "**plain** to them" having been "**clearly seen**," being "**understood**" from observing nature.

Jesus himself supported the fact that there were no "mysteries" when he told his disciples just before his death,

"Everything I have learned from my Father, I have made known to you" (John 15:15).

If Jesus was co-equal with the one true God, don't you think that by now he would have learned this from the Father and told them?

If the trinity was to be the centerpiece of Christian theology as it has become with most

theologians, won't Jesus have made it clear to his disciples?

But since he evidently did not reveal this "mystery" to them, having told them *everything* he had learned from God, then it could not be possible that he was God in the flesh as "God the Son."

While the Bible does say that God's wisdom, knowledge and ways are beyond our full understanding (e.g., Romans 11:33-34; Job), it never says or implies that he or his nature is beyond our understanding. Of course, we probably cannot fully understand all of who God is, but we have the same challenge with the opposite sex (Pro 30:19).

In fact, the Bible says that the hearts of kings are "unsearchable":

"As the heavens are high and the earth is deep, so the hearts of kings are unsearchable." Proverbs 25:3.

According to Proverbs 30:18-19, there are four things that are too difficult to understand:

"...the way of an eagle in the sky, the way of a snake on a rock, the way of a ship on the high seas, and the way of a man with a maiden."

Notice there is no mention here, or anywhere in scripture, of the notion that God is beyond our ability to understand. Yes, He is amazing, but is he incomprehensible as the Trinitarians assert? Is He a mystery?

The fact is that understanding God is a very simple matter, unless of course you believe in the incomprehensible "mystery" of the trinity. Rather than trying to justify a notion that is illogical and unsupported by any biblical evidence, by claiming it is a "mystery," I prefer to call it a pagan based myth.

The third problem with trying to defend the trinity by claiming it is a mystery is that the *wrong definition of mystery is being used!*

The convenient assumption is that the common English definition of "mystery"

(something unknown) is the same definition in the Greek word for "mystery."

But it is widely known and accepted among biblical scholars that the word for "mystery" in the Bible, which is used 27 times, actually means knowledge that *had been* hidden, but is *now revealed and understood*. Mystery is better translated as "secret" and usually is in many translations, such as in the NIV. So in the Bible, the secrets (mysteries) are truths that we actually *do* understand. Here are some examples:

"The secret (mystery) of the kingdom of God has been given to you" (Mark 4:11).

"I don't want you to be ignorant of this secret (mystery)" (Romans 11:25).

"Listen, I tell you a secret (mystery)--we will not all sleep" (I Cor. 15:51).

"He has made known to us the secret (mystery) of His will" (Eph. 1:9).

"The secret (mystery) that had been hidden is now disclosed" (Col. 1:26-27).

To this add the fact that God's attitude is always for us to understand Him and His truth. He is into revealing truth, not frustrating us with mysteries beyond our ability to understand. Rather than telling us to just accept it by faith because you cannot understand it, he says, "Come, let us reason together" (Isa. 1:18).

Rather than boasting about how it takes great faith to accept a doctrine we cannot understand as some trinitarians do, God tells us exactly the opposite, that what we should boast about is this:

*"Let him who boasts, boast in this, that he knows me and **understands** Me"* (Jer 9:24).

PART III—SOUND DOCTRINE

Criteria #1—The SOUND OF TRUTH

For a teaching (doctrine) to be true, it *must* be rational and understandable. Or, to use Paul's word, it must be "**sound**." Paul uses the word "sound" nine times in reference to doctrine and faith (I Tim. 1:10; 6:3; II Tim. 1:13; 4:3; Titus 1:9, 13; 2:1, 2, 8).

In the Greek, the word for "sound" is "hugiano" (Strong's 5198) and means to be healthy and well in your physical body. To be healthy means that all your organs and systems are functioning optimally and are in harmony. The way the body works is fully coherent and "rational."

But if a doctor discovers a "mystery" in your body, something wrong, something inconsistent, that is not working right in harmony with everything else, such as high blood pressure, high blood sugar or a tumor, we call it a disease, and endeavor to cure it. So Paul applies this word for physical health, "sound," figuratively to doctrine.

So for a doctrine to be "sound" it must, like a healthy body, be coherent, "rational," harmonious and congruent with the rest of the Bible. Otherwise it is false doctrine.

I see at least three criteria for a doctrine to be sound. First, it must be rational and understandable as Paul states in Titus 2:7-8:

"In your teaching (doctrine) show integrity, seriousness and soundness (hugiano) of speech that cannot be condemned."

Interestingly, this word "condemned" is a-kata-gnostos in the Greek, and literally means against ("a-") the standard ("kata") of rational knowledge (gnostos).

In other words, if a doctrine does not make logical rational sense, it is "condemned" as a doctrine that is not sound. This defines false doctrine.

An example of unsound doctrine is the theory that Jesus was both 100% man and 100% God at the same time. But doesn't the very definition of "100%" make that impossible?

Can your drink be 100% coffee and 100% coke? Can a person be 100% black and 100%

white at the same time? Can an animal be 100% bird and 100% elephant?

Can something or someone be 100% infinite and 100% finite at the same time?

Do you see how it is absolutely impossible for anything, to be 100% of one thing and 100% of something else at the same time?

If Jesus was just 50% man and 50% God, would he still be a man? No, he'd be something else, right? If he was *any* part God, he would no longer be qualified to be our savior because he had to be fully man and only a man, as the second Adam, as we see in Heb. 2:11 and 17:

*"Both the one (Jesus) who makes men holy and those who are made holy are the same family. So Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers. For this reason he had to be **made like his brothers in every way**, in order that he might. . .make atonement for sins."*

It is clearly unsound doctrine to claim that Jesus was 100% man and God.

Along the same line, it is unsound doctrine to claim that God is "three co-eternal persons," which, like it or not, is essentially having three Gods (unless you hide behind the notion that the trinity is a mystery, which allows you to claim anything, rational or not). If I had three wives, but claimed they were all one, but it was a mystery, what would you think?

Criteria #2—THE WORDS OF JESUS

Paul provides a second clear criteria for sound doctrine: It **MUST** agree with and be consistent with the words of Jesus.

*Any teaching that "does not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and godly teaching. . . . He has an unhealthy interest in controversies and quarrels about words that result in strife and constant friction between men . . . who have been **robbed of the truth**" (I Tim. 6:3-5).*

What are the words of Jesus regarding who he is? He asked this very question: "*Who do you*

say that I am?" Peter got it 100% right: "You are the anointed one (Christ), the Son of the living God. Jesus replied, 'Blessed are you . . . for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven . . . and on this rock will I build my church.'" Matt. 16:13-18.

The response that Jesus gave shows that this was a *complete* answer because it was revealed by the Father directly to Peter. Jesus did not say to Peter, "Well, you got it half right. I'm not only the son of God, but, more importantly, I am God the Son, co-eternal with God the Father and God the Holy Spirit."

Seven times in his own words, Jesus described who he was to each of the seven churches in Rev. 2-3. Not once does he claim he is God; instead he refers to God as "**my** God" four times (3:12).

Paul also repeatedly refers to the Father as the God of Jesus (II Cor. 1:3; Eph. 1:3; Col. 1:3).

If Jesus was God, how could he *have* a God? The fact that God is God to Jesus precludes the possibility that he was God.

Using the dark side of deductive logic, the Jews misunderstood Jesus' statement, "*The Father and I are one*," and accused him of claiming to be God (we know he meant they were one in agreement, because Jesus told us to be one with the Father in John 17:22-23).

He corrected them by reminding them that, since God had referred to their own leaders as Gods in Psalms 82:6, his claim as the son of God could not possibly be construed as a claim to be the one true God. If he was equal to God, he missed this opportunity to make it clear (John 10:29-39).

Throughout his ministry, Jesus continued to clearly distinguish himself from God his Father by referring to his Father as **the one true God** (John 17:3). He even rebuked a rich young ruler for calling him "good teacher" with "*Why do you call me good? No one is good except God alone*" (Luke 18:18-19).

Consistent with the words of Jesus, Paul repeatedly makes the same clear distinction between God and Jesus in **I Cor. 8:4-6; Romans 16:27; Eph. 4:4-6; I Tim. 1:17;**

2:5 ("*For there is one God and one mediator between God and man, **the man** Christ Jesus.*"). How can you ignore these just because they do not fit with the trinity theory?

TWO BIRTHDAYS OF JESUS?

The words of Jesus that he used most often of himself were "son of man" and "son of God." Using deductive logic, the trinity theory claims that Jesus was born twice--that his birth as the son of man as a baby was preceded by his "first birth" of being "eternally begotten" as the Son of God, thus manufacturing a new definition of the term "begotten."

Using the dark side of logic, the trinitarians claim that, because a human son is equal to his human father, then, as the son of God, Jesus has to be equal to his Father and thus be equal to God.

While this certainly is logical, it is incorrect, because it is not only inconsistent with scripture, this conclusion is based on a deductive logic based on a faulty presupposition (assumption) that sonship with God is the same as sonship among men.

But the fact is that not only are the angels called sons of God (Gen. 6:2; Job 1:6; 2:1), but so is Adam (Luke 3:37), because in both cases God was the direct creator, in contrast to our being sons of God by adoption (Romans 8:15, 23).

What makes Jesus unique and so special is that God was his Father through the biological process (Luke 1:35). That is why it is said of Jesus that he was begotten, which simply means "born."

Those advocating the trinity theory using deductive logic redefined "begotten" to mean "eternally begotten," speculating that he was begotten "before time," to avoid facing the fact that Jesus had the same beginning as every man and woman did--at his physical birth ("*being **made** in the likeness of man*" (Phil. 2:7, I John 4:2, etc.).

Using Strong's Exhaustive Concordance and Dictionary, it is very easy for anyone to discover what "begotten" really means. It is

used over 100 times in the NT, only eleven of which are used of Jesus as the son of God (Matt. 1:16, 20; Mark 2:1, 4; Luke 1:35; Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; 5:5, and three times in I John 5:1).

In the Greek, the word for begotten is "gennao" (1080 in Strong's). It means to "procreate" or "to bring forth offspring", to **bring into existence**, and is usually translated "born," "begat" or "begotten".

"Gennoa" (begotten) comes from the noun "genos" (Strong's 1085), which comes from the root verb "ginomai," which means "to cause to be (generate)", "to become," or "to come into existence," as is true of all babies, including Jesus.

"Only begotten" (3439 in Strong's) is exactly the same word as begotten with an added prefix, "mono-," meaning "only." The Greek word for this is "mono-genes." This compound word is used seven times in the NT, six of which are used of Jesus as God's only directly born (begotten) son: John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; Heb. 11:17; I John 4:9.

Although most people assume that the phrase, "only begotten" can only refer to Jesus, the fact is that in Luke 9:38 "only begotten" is used of a demon-possessed child. So much for the claim that it means "eternally begotten"!

Criteria #3—NOT GOING BEYOND...

Paul's phrase "quarrels about words" is particularly relevant because much vocabulary used in the trinity theory include many words that are completely foreign to both the Bible and to the Hebrew mind. Such invented words and phrases include "trinity," "incarnation," "same substance," "persons" (i.e., "one God in three persons"), "hypostatic union," "the two natures of Christ," "God the Son," "eternally begotten," "God the Holy Spirit," etc.

The use of these **alien words** and concepts is in clear violation of the third criterion for sound doctrine stated by Paul in I Cor. 4:6:

"... So that you may learn from us the

meaning of the saying, 'Do not go beyond what is written.'"

Jesus gives us a similar warning at the end of the Revelation (22:18.)

The fact is that much of the language and many of the definitions used in the trinity theory clearly violate this seven word warning,

"DO NOT GO BEYOND WHAT IS WRITTEN."

It is astounding to me that many trinitarian theologians actually admit that the doctrine of the trinity is not found in the Bible, that it was "developed" over the centuries, which makes it valid because it was developed by the church, even though it is missing in the Bible!

The very first formal creed on the trinity (the Athanasian Creed) was made over 400 years after the death of Jesus! It should be obvious to anyone that going *far* "beyond what is written" is exactly what the trinity theory does in a desperate attempt to sustain an alien unsound doctrine that is based on pagan concepts.

Why can't we just be satisfied with what is written? Why isn't that good enough? Why take a pure and simple truth and turn it into a convoluted doctrine that is unsound, complicated, irrational and that even trinitarian theologians admit is totally incomprehensible and confusing?

Yet on top of this many Bible teachers insist that the doctrine of the trinity is the cornerstone doctrine of the church!

If Jesus was God, don't you think it would say so clearly at least once, if not 5000 times to match the times Jesus is presented as a man?

In combating the Gnostic teachers who in that day were already teaching that Jesus was more than a man, John gives us a bottom-line criterion for a standard in determining whether a teacher is in line with God's Spirit.

"My friends, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from

God, because many false prophets have gone out into the world. **This is how you can recognize the Spirit of God: Every spirit that acknowledges that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (as a man) is of God**" (I Jn 4:1-2).

Notice that John did not say that the standard of true doctrine is recognizing that Jesus is God, but rather that he is **a man**, the anointed man (Christ) from God. He says something similar in 2:22.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we see that the trinity theory, and in particular the notion that Jesus is equal with God, is a false doctrine because it **fails to meet all three criteria of sound doctrine** because...

(1) it is not rational, which is admitted by all; it is confusing and incomprehensible;

(2) it does not agree with the sound words of Jesus; and

(3) it violates the clear standard/warning to **"not go beyond what is written."**

Yet because of the misuse of the dark side of logic, this trinity theory remains entrenched in the minds of millions of people who blindly trust their teachers but who have never actually thoroughly studied this issue in the scriptures themselves, being totally unaware of the huge volume of inductive data that support the simple truth that Jesus was the son of God, appointed to be the Messiah (anointed one; i.e., the Christ), but certainly was no more equal to the one true God than was Moses or King David, both of whom were referred to as "God."

To continue to blindly distort and inadvertently **steal or distort the true identity** of the son of God by making him into a second God, equal to the One true God, Yehovah, dishonors both God the Father and Jesus His son.

It seems to me that elevating Jesus to the level of God, praying to him, and even worshipping him not only **robs** the Father as the one true God of the glory due to Him, but

it is a form of **polytheism** and idolatry in making Jesus out to be God.

The trinity theory stands in direct contradiction to many passages throughout the entire Bible that clearly affirm the fact that there is only *one* true God, such as these:

"Hear O Israel, the LORD (Yehovah) our God, the LORD (Yehovah) is ONE." Deut. 6:4; Mark 12:29.

"I am Yehovah, and there is no other; apart from me there is no God. I am Yehovah, and there is no other." Isaiah 45:5, 14, 18.

"And there is no God apart from me . . . there is none but me...for I am God, and there is no other." Isa. 45:21-22.

"I am God, and there is no other; I am God and there is none like me." Isa. 46:9.

*"There is...one Lord (Jesus), one faith ...**one God and Father of all who is over all and through all and in all.**"* Ephesians 4:4-6

*"...there are many gods and many lords, yet **for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom are all things and we exist for Him, and one Lord, Jesus Christ. However, not all men have this knowledge.**"* I Cor 8:5-6

So I urge you to not allow the peer pressure of others to keep you from embracing this simple and pure truth. I say this because I am very concerned that this unfortunate unsound distortion of the one true God's identity into three Gods, supposedly existing as one God in three persons as a "trinity," will compromise your ability to do, as stated in the words of Jesus himself to *"worship (the Father) in spirit and truth"* (John 4:23-24).

Certainly give the Lord Jesus, who died to reconcile us to the Father, all the honor he deserves, but love and worship the Father alone as the one true God (Mark 12:29).

"Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen." I Tim. 1:17; 6:15:

APPENDIX ("I AM" in John 8:58)

Does the phrase "I AM" indicate that Jesus is in any way God?

Some people try to make a big deal out of John 8:58, claiming that this verse "proves" that Jesus was claiming to be God because he was using the supposed name of God of "I AM THAT I AM."

God has only one name, which is YHVH, probably pronounced as Yehovah or Yaveh (there is no "j" or "w" sound in the Hebrew language).

This phrase, "I AM THAT I AM," occurs only one time in the Bible, in Exodus 3:14, and is not actually God's name at all—it was a descriptive phrase meant to convey that God was able to provide whatever they would need. It could be loosely translated as "I will be whatever tomorrow demands").

As typically done, this line of reasoning is based on deductive reasoning, which immediately makes it suspect. A simple look at the inductive evidence will satisfy anyone that there is no basis to this speculation and assertion.

The phrase "I am" in the New Testament is in the Greek language, and is not at all related to the one time usage in the Hebrew language that God used with Moses on that one occasion.

"I am" is used in John 69 times, 16 of which are in John 8, all of which are easy to find. If you take the time to read each of these occurrences, you will quickly see that there is certainly no special "name of God" that is being implied with the use of "I am."

What is being clearly implied, and the listeners clearly understood, was that Jesus was saying that "I am he", i.e. I am the one I claim to be.

In fact this is exactly how a number of translations translate it: "I am he." The same construction can be seen earlier in chapter 8, where Jesus is making the exact same point that he makes in 8:58:

" . . . If you do not believe that I am [the one I claim to be], you will die in your sins . . ." (8:24).

In this verse 24 and 28, the translators of the NIV appropriately supplied the words in brackets to make it clear to present day readers what Jesus was saying:

"Then you will know that I am [the one I claim to be]."

Or it could be translated, *"then you will know that I am he", or "I am the one."*

In each case, the point Jesus was making is that he was the Messiah. In order to clear up this misunderstanding, a better translation would be *"I am he" or "I am the one"*.

This is in fact how it is translated in the NIV in John 18:5, 8; Mark 13:16; Luke 21:8 where Jesus identifies himself to those seeking his arrest in the garden as *"I am he."* In other words, I am the one you are looking for.

The point in verse 58 is that he ranked higher than Abraham because he was destined to be the Messiah before Abraham was even born.

Be sure to read these verses yourself so that it will be clear to you. Do not believe anything that I write unless you check it out yourself. It will take some time, but it is easy and worth the time in order to know the truth.

When so much is at stake, it is worth your time so that you can have confidence that you have the truth because you have taken the time to investigate it yourself, just as the people of Berea did in Acts 17:11 whom Paul complemented. So in advance, I compliment you too for doing the same thing.

For more information on this topic:

- www.BiblicalUnitarian.com
- www.ChristianMonotheism.com
- www.TheOnlyTrueGod.org
- www.TheTrinityDelusion.com
- www.FocusOnTheKingdom.org/articles.html