

Dear Michael,

This will be a brief analysis of the information you provided me with in your presentation and defense of your beliefs about The Doctrine of The Trinity. Hopefully, you will remember all the things which we have discussed together prior to this. Now let's get started with this project!

The first section you entitle "The deity of Jesus Christ." Under this section the first passage you introduce to our attention is Isaiah 7:14 with no real explanation of it other than, "Immanuel is Hebrew for 'God with us.'" Now, since no explanation is given, are we to assume you feel that none is needed because your teaching is patently clear here? If this is so, then it is necessary to start by saying that it is not clearly taught here. Your view would have to be read into it, or a more detailed explanation given on how it is found here. May it also be said at this point that the word Trinity does not occur in The Scriptures (Which fact alone should cause you to question it!), nor is there any passage which clearly teaches this doctrine without someone first reading it into it. Any objective and unbiased reading of The Scriptures would never bring anyone to such an illogical, and unscientific view as The Doctrine of The Trinity. Let us look at this first passage you offer us in such an unbiased and objective fashion, and see what the Hebrews who received this prophecy at the hands of Isaiah would see:

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good.

For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land shall be forsaken of both her kings. (Isaiah 7:14-16)

The very first thing we are told is that this is a sign for the Jews from Yahweh. Does the Jewish Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation (2 Tim. 3:16), teach anything but The Oneness of Yahweh? Obviously not! For the Jews never came up with such an idea as The Trinity. You can search their writings and never find it. In fact, The Scriptures teach just the opposite. For example: "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD." Deut. 6:4. To the Jew (and for that matter the Moslems) people who believe in The Trinity are pagans! In the writings of the pagans, you will clearly find the concept of the Trinity taught as demonstrated in the booklet you were given. Therefore, whatever conclusions the Jews in Isaiah's days would come to about this sign, it would not include anything close to The Trinity.

The next thing we are invited to do is "Behold!" This term is a demonstrative interjection which is "usually expressive of readiness to hear and to obey ... 11 Benjamin Davidson, ANALYTICAL HEBREW AND CHALDEE LEXICON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, page 199. What kind of a wonder are we excitedly asked to look at? A virgin shall conceive and bear a son! How can a woman conceive and still be called a virgin? This was humanly speaking not possible. For, in order to become pregnant, a woman would have to lose her status as a virgin. Thus, the Jew is being told that the conception would be outside the normal human channel. There is only one way this could be possible. How? By miraculous intervention so that the normal method would not be necessary. All miraculous occurrences require a manifestation of the power of El (pronounced Ail). The Deity's title as the power of the universe. Thus, the son that would be born would be a result of this power of El, and, as a consequence, would be a son of El even as Adam had been before (Lk. 3:38). He would be a manifestation of the power (El) dwelling in their midst, or Immanuel, El with us.

Note, also, that this son did not exist at the time the prophet was giving the message for the future tense is talked about. Note, also, that this son is talked about as having to be conceived and born in

order to exist. Note that this special son is not talked about as already existing and taking on a new form as The Trinitarian Doctrine would require it. In fact, how can a son be co-equal and co-existent with his father? The Doctrine of The Trinity defies the universally accepted and historically always held meaning of the words for father and son. Not only does it defy the meaning of these words, it destroys their meaning! This fact is important to realize for God gave us language. It was not invented by man as the evolutionist tries to say. Thus, we are not destroying man made terms, but God-given terms! These terms, as given to us by God, require that the father exists before the son, and for the son to be brought into existence by the father. This universally accepted and recognized definition is what these terms have meant from the beginning of this creation. Therefore, who has given anyone the authority to change these God-given terms now? In fact, The Lord Jesus Christ verifies the meaning of these terms when he says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." John 13:16 "Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I." John 14:28. Here, he establishes that God is his lord, that he was sent by his lord, that God is his Father, and that his Father is greater than he himself. How could any of these declarations be true if the Doctrine of The Trinity is true? It is clearly impossible for these declarations of The Lord Jesus Christ to be true and the Doctrine of The Trinity to be True! It is easy to see that these words of the Lord Jesus Christ and the Doctrine of the Trinity are mutually exclusive and opposing views!

Now notice that verses fifteen and sixteen require that this special son has to learn the difference between good and evil. If he was God, then how could such a statement apply? Isn't God omniscient? Isn't this passage teaching us that this special son would have to go through a learning process like every other normal natural human being? Isn't it telling us that he at one time did not know the difference between good and evil? Isn't it teaching us that he would have to learn to refuse the evil and choose the good? The answer to these questions is obviously yes! It doesn't take someone with a doctorate degree to answer them. In fact, the only too obvious answer to all of these questions destroys The Trinitarian concept of this special son. Furthermore, this conclusion from this passage is verified by what is said about The Lord Jesus Christ in The New Testament. Consider the following passages:

And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him. Luke 2:40.

And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man. Luke 2:52.

But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. Matt. 24:36.

But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Mark 13:32.

For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. John 5:20.

And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. Acts 1:7

The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John. Rev. 1:1.

At this point, let us briefly look at the implications of the above listed passages. We will take them in the order in which we quoted them.

In Luke 2:40, we have the natural process of growth in any descendant of Adam clearly set out and applied to the Lord Jesus Christ. If the Lord Jesus Christ is God, then how can he be said to increase in strength? Does this mean that he became a weak human child? How can God lose His strength and still be called God? In this weakened state couldn't the God of the Universe have been wiped out? Next, how could Jesus, if he was God, need to increase in spirit? Does this mean God decreased His normal quantity of spirit? If so, then how did He refill Himself with it once again? Again, wouldn't this have exposed the God of the universe to the potential of being destroyed? Now notice that the grace of God was upon him. If he was God, then why was the grace of God upon him? Doesn't this show that God is God and separate from Jesus? How can any other meaning be obtained from this statement? Furthermore, why was God in need of grace? Doesn't it seem strange that He would be extending grace to Himself? In that case, shouldn't the grace be found in and not upon Himself? Also, remember that grace is unmerited divine favor. Was God placing favor that He did not earn upon Himself? Doesn't this reveal how fundamentally wrong The Doctrine of The Trinity is? Now let us proceed to the next passage which will further reveal how wrong this doctrine is. In Luke 2:52 we are told that "Jesus ... increased in wisdom ... increased in stature ... increased in favour with God and man.

If Jesus is God, how can he increase in wisdom? Did God empty Himself of wisdom and have to be refilled with it all over again? How could He regain this wisdom once He had let go of it? How is it possible for Him to remove His wisdom and still be considered God? Is there such a thing as an unwise God? It would seem to me that to ask such a question is to answer it! Furthermore, it seems to me that He would be exposing Himself to any crafty individual by doing such an obviously absurd thing. It definitely seems that He was opened up to being outsmarted by almost anyone wiser than He at the time. Also, who was maintaining His universe when he was in such a weakened and unwise state? Now notice that he had to increase in favor with God. Does this mean that He had to increase in favor with Himself? How can it be said that he increased in favor with God unless he wasn't God? Obviously, God is viewed as God in this passage and Jesus as separate from and in need of God's favor like every other human being. In fact, these passages are emphasizing how identical to us Jesus was at that time! This fact is important when we come to look at the atonement and what was accomplished in Jesus' death. We will leave that for a future discussion. Notice, also, that it says Jesus increased in favor with man as well as with God. If Jesus is God, and, therefore, the Creator of man, then, why is it important for him to increase in favor with man who is His creation? None of this makes any sense if The Doctrine of The Trinity is true. If Jesus was really a man and had just come into existence at that time, then all of these passages make perfect sense. If you feel all of this creates insurmountable problems for this doctrine, then wait and see what is coming next!

In Matt. 24:36 and Mark 13:32, we are informed that there is knowledge which no one, man, or angel, or he, Jesus, possesses but only The Father! If Jesus is God, coequal with the Father, then, how is it that he acknowledges that the Father possesses knowledge that he himself, just like other men, does not possess?

How can one part of The Trinity be said to know something that the other part does not know? Isn't this nonsensical to say the least? Notice Jesus puts himself in the same category with the rest of Adam's race with respect to this knowledge. How can he still be God if he knows no more than other men on this subject? Doesn't this show that God is separate and distinct from the son and superior to and not co-equal with him? Obviously, it does!

We now arrive at John 5:20 where we are informed that the Father loves the son. Does this really mean that He is in love with Himself? Isn't this conceit? We are also informed that the Father was educating His son: "and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel." If Jesus is God, then why is it necessary to shew himself all things that he himself is doing? If he is omniscient, then, why does he have to be shown all things?

Doesn't the Doctrine of The Trinity make a farce out of this very beautiful passage of The Father loving and educating His son? Again, doesn't this passage demonstrate that The Father is separate from and superior to the son and not co-equal with him? It seems to me that it does if considered objectively and logically. By the way, being logical is being appealed to for this is the way The Creator made us so that He can reason with us in a very objective and sensible manner. Notice what He says in Isaiah 1:18, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith Yahweh" Also, in Rom. 12:1, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable [LOGIKOS, pertaining to the reason, rational, (English, logical) ...]" E.W. Bullinger, A CRITICAL LEXICON AND CONCORDANCE TO THE ENGLISH AND GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, page 625.] service." Thus, The Doctrine of The Trinity defies the very fundamental way The Creator has made us. It is a totally illogical and irrational doctrine. It is a doctrine that must be offered without explanation because it can not be logically explained. In addition, Faith involves our capacity to reason logically on the evidence that God has offered to us so that we can be persuaded that He exists and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. (Hebrews 11:6) Paul also informs us that we are saved by grace through faith in Ephesians 2:8. Grace is the means and faith is the channel. Thus, logically being persuaded of God's provisions is the channel through which God's grace proceeds! We will now proceed to the next passage.

In Acts 1:7, we are again confronted with a declaration that there is knowledge that is solely in the control of The Father. Remember, this declaration is being made after his resurrection and matches exactly what he had said before. He is no longer checked by mortality. He is immortal and incorruptible. He has been glorified. In spite of these facts, he clearly declares that there are things which are only in the power of the Father! How can this possibly be if he is co-equal with the Father and is the second person of The Trinity?

We have now arrived at the final passage in this series which is Rev. 1:1. Here again we are hit with a paradox if the Doctrine of The Trinity is true! Why? Well, consider carefully the full implications of what Jesus is saying in this passage. He says, "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him,..." Here, we have Jesus Christ glorified and in heaven and quite a few years after he left the earth. Yet, in spite of these facts, he is still telling us that God had to give him this book called by us The Revelation. He himself did not know this information about God's future plan, as expressed previously in the passages already looked at, until God gave it to him! How can this be possible if he is the second person of the Trinity? Doesn't this, once again, show us that God is the only God separate and distinct and superior to His son who is not God? Logically, how can we come to any other conclusion? Isn't it obvious by now that the Doctrine of The Trinity destroys the correct understanding of "... the ONLY true God, AND Jesus Christ, WHOM THOU (God) hast sent." John 17:3. Notice, that, in this verse, John tells us that the correct knowledge concerning this only true God and Jesus Christ is life eternal! Therefore, if we want life eternal, then we have to have a correct understanding on this subject. May it be said at this point that The Doctrine of The Trinity can not be that correct understanding? I feel that if you put all emotion aside, then you will have to agree with The Scriptural point of view which has been presented to you so far in these pages of discussion.

The next item on your list is a passage which we have discussed at length. At that time, it was obvious that it was not concluded that "The deity of Jesus is clearly and irrefutably laid down by

John.” Therefore, it is rather surprising to find it being placed on this list of passages. May it also be said that nowhere in John’s Gospel, let alone in the first chapter, does John ever teach The Trinity. Again, this term is not found any place in The Scriptures! May it also be added that the phrases God the Son and God the Holy Ghost are never found anywhere in The Scriptures! May it also be pointed out that the phrase the Son of God is found in The Scriptures and that it can be applied to every true believer who has been adopted into His family by belief of The Gospel and baptism into Christ. (John 1:12; Rom. 8:14-21; Gal. 4:26-29; Mark 16:16.) Thus, the phrase “son of God” does not equate with the Trinitarian concept of “God the Son” which is not a Scriptural term. Consequently, it can not be used in an attempt to prove that Jesus is the second person of an imaginary trinity. Now, let us look at John 1:1-18 in some detail in order to establish what it does and does not teach.