



2 Cor. 3:18

Open Face

No. 25

APRIL 2002

THE ORTHODOX TRINITY AND ADVENTISM

Lloyd Martin



The following article is an edited version of a letter written by brother Lloyd Martin (author of the book, "100 And More Mysteries Of The Trinity"). Brother Martin contends that the word "Trinity" was coined specifically to describe the Roman Catholic concept of God and that therefore the Catholic understanding of the word is the only legitimate definition of the word that there is. He feels that in using the word "Trinity" to describe its concept of God, the SDA Church has embraced the most objectionable feature of the faith of Rome.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE TRINITY

Object to all heresies opposed to the true sonship of Christ and the true relationship of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. More particularly, I renounce the doctrine of the Trinity which above all other heresies is the very antithesis of the deity of Christ and is the premier fabrication of the antichrist Roman Catholic Church. Of all heresies inimical to the true sonship of Christ and the infinite love of God,

the Trinity stands without equal as the most subtle and influential. This doctrine, while teaching the distinctiveness of Christ, at the same time denies His individuality (separateness as a being) by portraying Him as a derived projection of God the Father, thereby making Him a virtual non-entity. By this subtle teaching the true sonship as well as the deity of Christ is destroyed and in its wake, the infinite love of God.

This doctrine which has engulfed Adventism since 1930 is obviously fraught with implications for the credibility and acceptance of our Church as God's final remnant. It brings into question our church's fitness to fulfill its specific mission to prepare a dying world for the long overdue return of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. No justification for our acceptance of the Trinity can possibly repair the damage done to the credibility of the founding fathers of our faith and to Seventh-day Adventism, which during the first 86 years of its existence was decidedly anti-Trinitarian. It must not be forgotten that all of the pioneers (with the great majority coming from a Trinitarian background) renounced this doctrine when they became Adventists.

Sheer loyalty to our heritage as well as common sense demand that we must investigate this doctrine. Almost everyone who professes belief in the Trinity has, at best, only a limited knowledge of the doctrine and this in itself speaks volumes. These facts make the question as to whether or not a discussion on the subject is relevant, quite redundant.

THE BASIS OF MY FAITH

Lest there be questions as to what exactly the basis of this supposedly "new thing" I have espoused is, let me state that it is the oldest position of all, the same as was held by the first post biblical (after AD 100) believers known as the apostolic fathers and the apologists as well as the Waldenses and the Adventist pioneers. This historical basis is the belief that the Scriptures teach that Christ was literally begotten of the Father before all ages (eternal times), yet He is from all eternity. It is the belief that this seeming contradiction is perfectly harmonious and whether or not one can explain it, it must be accepted by faith as true, since the Scriptures declare both to be a fact. In addition to accepting this by faith it accepts the logic that since He is begotten of the Father's eternal substance He must therefore be the eternal son (offspring) of God and hence, in essence be truly from all eternity. It is the belief that if Christ is truly begotten of the Father, it cannot demean His eternity or deity but rather enhances them. Above all it is the belief that if Christ is not truly begotten of the Father He cannot be a true son and if He

Also in this issue:

In Our Neck of The Woods	5
Campmeeting Report	6
A Defender of Laodicea	8
Who Sent Jesus	12
Voices of The People	14

Open Face
Manchester, Jamaica W.I.

April, 2002

Open Face is dedicated to the promotion of the truths committed to the Advent movement, as believed and taught by the early Adventist pioneers. In particular to the restoration of those truths which have been cast down to the ground and trampled underfoot by the papacy, and adopted by her daughters.

Our purpose is to motivate our readers to commit themselves wholly to the task of personal preparation for the coming of the Lord, and to the taking of the final warning message to every nation, kindred, tongue and people.

Open Face is published at least once quarterly, and is sent free of cost to all who desire to receive it.

David Clayton: Editor & Publisher

P.O. Box 23, Knockpatrick

Manchester, Jamaica W.I.

Phone: (876) 904-7392

email: david000@cwjamaica.com

Website: <http://www.restorationministry.com>

is not a true son, God could not have demonstrated the magnitude of His love for sinners in sending Him to die for them. (John 3:16; 1 John 4:9)

It is the only position on the sonship of Christ that conforms to the true meaning of the Greek word *monogenes* meaning "only begotten." It is the only belief that upholds at the same time the views of the true relation and relationship of the Father and the Son; the individuality of Christ; His eternity and His equality in attributes to the Father. It is therefore the only belief that upholds the true sonship of Christ. It denies all the other beliefs regarding the sonship of Christ, foremost of which is the doctrine of the Trinity. It holds that all such teachings are theological technology, human speculations antagonistic to the most foundational truth of Scripture that Christ is truly the only begotten Son of God and that these teachings are founded in pride, inspired by Satan rather than faith in the infinite word of God.

The conclusion is that there are only two choices. Is Christ truly the Son of God or is He not truly the Son of God? My position beyond controversy is the

only one that could answer in the affirmative. It is instructive to note that the subject of the sonship of Christ has been the focal point of attack against God by Satan from the inception of sin both in heaven and on earth, at the crucifixion and in every major apostasy within God's church since, not excepting the omega of deadly heresies within the SDA Church in the 1930s. If indeed the pre-incarnate Christ is not truly the Son of God then there can be no just basis for genuine faith in the love of God for lost sinners.

ADVENTIST MISCONCEPTIONS

Some of the points of confusion and misconception in relation to the subject of the Trinity existing within the Adventist Church today are as follows.

- (1) That the Trinity simply means that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three divine persons and these somehow constitute the one God. The understanding of what this means is so cloudy that when there is an attempt to explain it as many as five explanations for this doctrine are shown to exist within the Adventist Church today. Although the Scripture uses the expression "one God," where it chooses to explain itself it always applies to the Father. Likewise the Spirit of Prophecy has never said that there are three persons in God.
- (2) That the Trinity is the same as the godhead. This is a great misconception.

A DERIVED SONSHIP

- (3) The belief that the doctrine of the Trinity opposes the teaching that Christ was derived from the Father. This is a patently false statement because the derivation of Christ from the Father by a continuous, unceasing process is the very foundation of the doctrine of the Trinity. This assertion is unchallengeable and its accuracy can be readily attested to by any knowledgeable and authoritative writing on the subject of the Trinity. This process of derivation is what is termed "The doctrine of eternal generation." This concept is fur-

ther bolstered, firstly by the Gnostic Sabellian word "homoousious" (same or identical substance or being) which is the controversial key word of the Trinity appearing in the Nicene creed, secondly by the meaning which was first assigned to the term Trinity by Tertullian who in introducing the concept said that Christ was a subordinate projection or portion of God the Father. Lastly Augustine in giving the final expression to the Trinity stated that the will of the Father and the will of the Son was the same, hence they were one and the same Being.

A **derived** existence was the specific version of the sonship of Christ taught by Trinitarians as opposed to a **begotten** sonship of the apostolic fathers and the apologists, a **transitional** sonship of the modalists; an **emanated** sonship of the origenists and a **created** sonship of the arians. An **inoriginate** sonship, the idea that the Son of God did not have an origin was the view held by persons whom everyone else regarded as pagan and polytheists. Such persons were never a part of the Christian community as they were termed blasphemers.

The begotten sonship concept is fundamentally different from all the others in that it is the only one that rejects the premise of all the others that "the substance of God could not be divided." Essentially therefore there were only two kinds of sonship, a real and an unreal sonship. The begotten sonship was the very opposite to the derived sonship in that it set forth Christ as God's very own Son (Rom. 8:32) a separate entity (being) from the Father, as against a distinct portion (person) of the Father. The failure to appreciate this distinction is not unlike the failure to understand the difference between what is created and what is begotten, the origination of specie (creation) as opposed to the continuation of specie (procreation).

- (4) When Ellen White made the statement that, "in Christ is life original, unborrowed and underived," was she trying to correct a false view concerning the divinity of Christ? If this

was so then this statement would be most appropriately directed at the Trinity. The Trinitarian view above all others most specifically taught that Christ was derived. The fact is that while Ellen White was uplifting the deity of Christ by this statement she was also emphasizing that as the only true offspring of God, the only one of the Father's eternal kind, nature, race or genus, He inherently possessed eternal life as a natural inheritance. Hence, He must be truly Son and logically, truly God, fully divine. By contrast eternal life is not inherent in creatures who are products of created (non eternal) matter and hence it can only be bestowed upon them as a gift. Nevertheless, eternal life, whether inherent (naturally innate) or bestowed (conferred upon) as a gift to all creatures possesses the same features. It is original, unborrowed and underived. Original because it is the only genuine life, the very life of God. It is unborrowed because it is permanent or everlasting. It is underived because it is not a projection or portion of the life of the Father as the Trinity teaches, but is possessed by each recipient as a substantive reality.

The substantial or primary meaning of the word "derived" if its Latin root is taken into consideration, is something that is a tributary or branch of a main source from which it is never detached. "De" means "from" and "rivus" means "river." The word derived therefore literally indicates "from a river." Accordingly the Trinity was frequently explained under various analogies such as the fountain, the river and the stream, or the sun, the ray and the heat. Christ was the river or the ray which was continuously being derived from the source of the fountain or the sun. The conclusion was that He was never a separate entity. This is precisely what the doctrine of eternal generation, the very foundation of the Trinity, taught. The Trinity, in contrast to all other views was the only one that held that Christ was a distinct "person," but not a separate being from the Father.

The chief objective of Ellen White's statement was to commend Christ

to sinners as the life giver who could bestow eternal life (life original and unborrowed) upon repentant sinners. In an indirect and secondary sense the phrase was a repudiation of the Trinity which specifically taught that the life of Christ was derived. Ellen White, by stating that in Christ was life original and unborrowed, must be regarded as indirectly condemning the Trinity. It seems that she understood that the Trinity meant numeric unity whereby God is regarded as a single organism or being, possessed of three component parts.

THE ORTHODOX TRINITY

- (5) The Nicene creed of 325 A.D. is the universally accepted original basis of the doctrine of the Trinity, a fact which is acknowledged even in the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary. Any teaching of a Trinity which does not acknowledge or conform to the creed is not regarded as the orthodox accepted Trinity and carries no recognition at all. This certainly bears thinking about in light of the fact that it was the acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity which caused Seventh-day Adventism to lose the label of "cult," and to be accepted by popular Christendom as a "good Christian church." The Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed of 381 A.D. which gave greater recognition to the Holy Spirit reconfirmed the earlier creed as authoritative. The Athanasian creed of uncertain date of origin and source, also confirms the Nicene creed. In view of the fact that the term Trinity or a counterpart is not found in Scripture (unlike "rapture" for "caught up," or "millennium" for "thousand years") and that there is no historical precedence for a different version, there can be no reasonable basis for insistence of a use of the term that does not conform to the creed.

In other words, the Term "Trinity," means only one thing and that is the definition given to it when it originated in the councils of the Catholic Church. Ethics, honesty and common sense ought to suggest that the term should be best avoided. The prophet Ellen White who was an inspired example of honesty, ap-

parently thought that prudence in the choice of her terminologies as well as clarity in doctrine should take precedence over expediency, which is one obvious reason why she never used the word "Trinity." On the other hand it appears that expediency takes precedence over everything else in today's church, even over gross embarrassment and transparency.

- (6) The Nicene creed, the authority for the Trinity taught that the one God of Scripture was the Father from whom the Son was begotten. The creed therefore contradicts the 27 fundamentals of Adventism which teaches that the one God is Father, Son and Spirit.
- (7) To say that the teaching that Christ was begotten of the Father is the same as the Arian concept of a created Son is a blatant falsehood. In reality Arianism was the only teaching that denied that the Son of God in any sense came from the Father. Instead Arianism taught that the Son came into existence from out of nothing (ex nihilo). The Nicene creed which addressed the Arian heresy countered it by stating that the Son was begotten of, or out of the Father's substance (ousia). Any professed Christian who denied that Christ was "begotten," that is, came from the Father's being was regarded as Arian or otherwise as a pagan and polytheist. **Any person who denies that Christ was begotten is truly an Arian.**
- (8) It is obvious that the people of the orient (including even Arians) like persons of the west today, also understood that the term "begotten" clearly had a connotation of being brought into conscious existence even in its application to the pre-incarnate Christ. More specifically, except for the Arians, they all knew that it meant to born from or to proceed from out of something already existing. They were therefore not confused with theological devisings (unlike many Christians today), that the term "begotten Son," was anthropomorphic, merely a convenient but not a literal term, designed to make finite beings believe something that they could never understand or

make sense of.

- (9) The charge that the pioneers were Arians is spurious and should cease at once. The Adventist pioneers believed that Christ was begotten of the Father as a separate entity. Hence it is impossible for them to have been Arians as they are often misrepresented to have been. On the other hand they obviously did not believe that Christ was derived from the Father by an unceasing generation which is the reason they rejected the Trinity.

KNOWN BY ITS FRUITS

- (10) The true fame of the Trinity must surely be its infamy, for it has stood out by far more for the evil it has done than for any good it may be imagined to have done. From its introduction in the early third century the hallmark of the Trinity has been controversy, heresy, apostasy, deceit and crusading warfare. When first proposed it introduced the concept of subordinationism whereby the Son of God was said to be inferior to the Father.
- (11) When ratified by the council of Nicea, it was introduced into the creed by deceit and foisted off on the majority who did not subscribe to it. Similarly it was through artifice sometime afterwards that it was able to draw into its ranks those who had entered into an accord with it against the outrageous Arians and Anomeans.
- (12) It had as its patron two neophyte emperors who enforced it upon dissenters under threat of banishment, death and condemnation. It was a state imposed doctrine in collusion with professed churchmen. The act of its enforcement at Nicea gave birth to the Papacy. The Papacy is therefore derived from the Trinity, one inseparable substance.
- (13) Its rise to prominence in the Pergamos period was synonymous with the apostasy of that period. The Trinity was the central point of controversy and when the dust had settled, the Trinitarians who comprised the Roman Papal church triumphed, while those opposed to the Trinity went into the wilderness. The

Trinity was therefore directly responsible for the greatest apostasy of the Christian era which marked the falling away from the Smyrnan period of spiritual prosperity which preceded it.

- (14) The Trinity which initiated the great apostasy was also the prime factor directly responsible for the eventual Papal domination in 538 A.D. This was accomplished when it successfully overthrew the last bastion of resistance to the doctrine in the form of the three so-called barbarian kingdoms. These "barbarians" were converted, Sabbath-keeping Christians who rejected the Trinity, yet were not Arians. The Papal antichrist church would never have attained the supremacy without the Trinity. 1260 years of Papal supremacy and all that it represents from heresy to inquisition must be laid squarely at the feet of the Trinity. Papal supremacy therefore corresponds to the triumph of the Trinity.

MERE COINCIDENCE?

- (15) The restoration of Papal supremacy through the many concordats of the Lateran treaty in 1929 was in effect a restoration of the Trinity which is synonymous with apostasy. In the following year, 1930, the Adventist Church for the first time officially sanctioned the Trinity. The proximity of the acceptance of the Trinity by Adventists to the healing of the deadly wound of the Papacy is not a mere coincidence, but rather a natural consequence of cause and effect for a church steeped in Laodicean backsliding. The reverse to this is also true. The wounding of the Papal Trinity at the end of the 18th century was followed by the rise of the great Adventist anti-Trinity restoration movement in the first half of the 19th century.

ADVENTIST DILEMMA

The conclusion that the last point leads to is unavoidable. Clearly it is only as the Papal Trinity (the only Trinity) receives a deadly wound in Adventist theology that God's Advent people will be reinstated as purveyors of virgin, unadulterated truth. To put it bluntly,

Seventh-day Adventists must rediscover their heritage as the remnant church, charged among other things with presenting the pure truths of the gospel of salvation. In doing so they must be mindful that the sanctification that is an indispensable prerequisite for the return of Christ must be a blend of doctrinal truth and a corresponding Christian experience. John 17:17. This can never be attained while any heresy is subscribed to. Rev. 14:5. The Trinity represents the mother of all heresies and hence should be the first to be discarded. No doctrine that one is so ignorant of and hence so unable to understand and teach could ever be the central doctrine of Christianity as is claimed of the Trinity. Moreover, no doctrine that is so steeped in controversy and deception could ever be of God. A doctrine so embedded in deception that claims made for it are the very opposite of what it really teaches.

Any attempt to defend this doctrine is a futile one, especially if one is doing so on the basis that it is opposed to a derived existence of Christ. Our church today has entrapped itself in a dilemmic entanglement of the most massive and embarrassing proportions by its acceptance of the Trinity, and the fundamental reason for this is that it has chosen to participate in the contest of the age old contention of the devil that Christ is not truly the Son of God. Nowhere is this more evident than in the distortion and consequent denial of the true meaning of the word "begotten," (monogenes) by paralleling it with the words, "created" and "derived." As a result, the SDA church has placed itself between a rock and a hard place by having to live with Sister White's constant assertion that Christ was truly the begotten Son of God from before the creation while she just as definitely stated that he was neither created nor derived.

The dilemma is manifold for if one claims to be a true Trinitarian then he must of necessity accept the life of Christ as a derived existence. On the

Continued on back page

IN OUR NECK OF THE WOODS

Zemrie McGlashan

We are living on the south side of the beautiful island of Jamaica, overlooking Treasure Beach. Although the Seventh-day Adventist church is some one hundred years old in this neighbourhood yet the Sunday church which is only forty (40) years old has managed to conjure up far more membership and has flooded the entire area with its beguiling doctrines.

Although our group is small and the work seems to be extremely slow, we are determined to spread the truth about God and His Son with the hope of demystifying the mystery that has held, and continues to hold so many innocent people in darkness. Since the Seventh-day Adventist Church has joined hands with the Sunday Church, their friendship has become much closer to the extent that they are supporting each other in their crusades, concerts and Christmas programs. Even the present piano that the Sunday Church is using was loaned to them by the SDA church. You can imagine that this has made our work much harder. Nevertheless we are not discouraged for the God who sent us out to work has promised that He would be with us always.

When God sent us out to sow, He did not intend for us to be concerned about the field or soil on which we sow, but rather that we should always be concerned about the seed which we sow. My belief is always to sow, to flood every area with the word of God, then leave the rest to God, because it is He who gives life to His word and it is His Spirit alone that can cause the word (seed) to germinate in the heart of an individual.

I was brought up with the belief that if I did not win a soul into the church, then when I go to heaven there would not be any stars in my crown, and for years I laboured with the hope of filling my crown with stars. But the Lord saw my ignorance and had mercy on

me, because I could not seem to bring one soul in that I could pinpoint and say, "I brought him in." Today, my only intention is to do the work that God gives me to do and not fight Him for that which belongs to Him, which I am unable to do anyway.

During the past several years I have been inspired to work in the area of health with the hope of using this as the gateway of spreading the Third Angel's message. Although I have no formal training in this area, yet I can see where the Lord has blessed me tremendously with the little mustard seed that He has given me, because He has not limited my work to just helping people to reform their way of eating and drinking or in giving advice to those who are ailing, but also to help the sick and the helpless in any way that I can.

For example, a few months ago I heard about an incident that involved three deacons from the Seventh-day Adventist Church. I did not realize how serious the situation had become until one day whilst at the supermarket I overheard one of the deacons in a heated conversation with a young man who was involved in the incident. The situation was apparently so serious that the deacon went off to get the police.

I rushed home, put away my purchases and immediately went to see the parties in question. I was just in time to calm down a huge confrontation involving four families including the three deacons. Because the word of God is "sharper than any two-edged sword," it was able to pierce the hearts of these individuals and because the spirit of the Lord is calm and gentle it was able to bring peace to them. So when the police arrived they discovered that they were not needed.

This confrontation all started when a man on his way to see one of the deacons crushed the foot of a relative who

fell asleep with his feet stretched across the driveway. The man was sent to the hospital and although the x-ray showed no broken bones, the foot was so badly damaged that the doctor's advice made it necessary for him to visit the hospital daily, to prevent any future amputation.

This man neglected his daily visit however, and as a result, the foot became infested with screwworms, swelling to about three times its normal size. This was a part of the reason for the calling in of the police. The other part was that the patient as well as his relatives wanted to capitalize on this misfortune. The Lord impressed upon my brother and me to take up the matter. We ended up feeding this man three times per day, buying all his antibiotics, all his dressings even though, in spite of this, it was often difficult to get his cooperation. At times he would not allow us to touch him and at other times he attempted to throw away his antibiotics. His foot took approximately two months to heal. Nevertheless we were well rewarded when we saw the peace and harmony shared by everyone afterwards and in addition, this gave us some opportunity to share the word.

To date we have had many listening ears and though we have not yet seen what many of us would have liked to see – people coming out and joining our group – this is not our primary aim as I am no longer working for stars in my crown, but that the precious name and love of God may be seen in our work and in our lives. We want the living Saviour to be seen in our actions, heard in our words and perceived in our attitudes. This is our aim, our motive in our neck of the woods.



REPORT OF JAMAICA CAMPMEETING 2002

Gideon Clayton

Many who attended anticipated CAMPMIEETING 2002 with much enthusiasm. Somewhere between 4:00 and 5:30 p.m. the campers began arriving, on Thursday the 28th of March, with brother Howard William's large dump truck getting there first and taking some of the brethren (mostly the younger folk).

“MAINTAINING THE VISION” was the slogan chosen for the camp meeting and brother H. Williams was the first person to present a message at the start of the meeting. In the evening meeting of this first day, our eyes were turned to the subject of Christ as the central figure to be kept always before us.

On Friday morning at approximately 6:30 brother Charles Peter gave a presentation which many found both stimulating and challenging.

Rain fell relatively heavily on the first day the campmeeting began, but never fell again throughout the duration of the event. It would almost seem as if God was giving his approval by this occurrence.

There was very strong wind during the nights and warm days at times but not a deterrent in comparison to the wonderful spiritual feasts we enjoyed each day.

There was beauty all around both night and day. The campsite is set overlooking the sea a few miles from Alligator Pond (a little township just near the bay). The nights were also pretty as one looked towards the land. The lights which seem to be set in the distant plains of St. Elizabeth looked like jewels glittering against the soft background of the darkness.

Brother Allen Stump became the next speaker, who delivered a meaningful admonition which was felt where it mattered most (in our hearts).

Brother Stump, Hans (his son), Heidi (his daughter), brother and sister Ann and Glen Ford came all the way from West Virginia to be at our camp meeting. They really blessed us with their presence.

The midday hour presenter that had been chosen was well known to all. As brother Cole took his place on the podium everyone knew that we were all going to receive a valuable lecture on healthful living. Brother Marlon Cole is an authority on wholistic medicine. He operates a colon care clinic in Mandeville as well as one in Kingston. Following his talk, most who were present felt blessed and wiser con-



Attentive audience at campmeeting

cerning the use of supplements in the diet.

Colin Gyles our brother from Kingston was expected to take the afternoon slot at 3:00-4:30 p.m. but was unable to keep the appointment, so brother David Clayton led out in a question and answer session in which people were able to express themselves freely and to have their burning questions addressed. The session was a lively one as there was wholehearted participation.

From seven to half past eight o'clock brother Glen Ford gave a very moving experience taken from his life. His powerful testimony was given in a somewhat quiet way, but left indelible

marks in the hearts of those who heard.

It seemed like a North American night as the evening became nippy then breezy and finally cold to some of us Jamaicans, but the temperature seemed to be quite comfortable for our American brothers and sisters on the other hand. However, the spiritual warmth of the atmosphere between our brethren remained intense.

Sabbath morning ushered in an anticipated high point of the entire camp which saw over a hundred saints attending which included women and children. The beautiful day was initiated with a heavenly rendition vocalized by a female quartet which could be called restoration singers. Wonderful strains emanated from the lips of sisters Naomi Morris, Karleen Williams, Jennifer Clayton and Ivorene Hendricks as they sang 'He was there all the time'.

Brother Leford, Russel during the early presentation made an impact on most when he described the result of a Christless life. His homily was based on a personal experience taken from his life.

Brother David Clayton as the succeeding presenter, got everyone involved in the lesson which he conducted. The younger folk in particular were encouraged to participate. Jesus to be reproduced in his people was the focus.

A newly formed singing group from restoration ministries provided another musical repast that thrilled many hearts. This happened just before brother Allen Stump took the rostrum again. As brother Allen proceeded, he used some practical demonstrations to make his point and to cement the lessons which he brought. The focus was Christ crucified.

Lunch time found the family of God

scattered around the compound; some chatting, some in bible studies, others simply enjoying the beauty of the setting and the tasty lunch. The brethren from the U.S.A. thoroughly absorbed the Jamaican atmosphere and made sure that we knew it. They like our food.

Our dear sister Lorraine Sutherland had graciously volunteered to take charge of the canteen which she did. She got help from a few other willing sisters who unselfishly gave up their comfort and time to help make the meeting the success that it was.

The song service which preceded every presentation, never failed to make our brethren demonstrate their enthusiasm. Their lusty singing echoed around the walls of the chapel as happiness seemed to be expressed on every face.

Brother Neville Morris next spoke about Christ's worthiness and his love. He closed with a musical solo which every one appreciated.

Brother C. Howard was given charge of what was called a marriage seminar. This convened during the last session on Sabbath afternoon. It proved to be a very interesting and intense discussion, with brother Wayne Sutherland's and brother Orlando Clayton's family being highlighted as model families. This event was so interesting that it lasted until pretty late into the night.

A highlight of the camp experience was the baptism in which three of our pre-

cious sisters desired baptism and were granted their wish. The baptism was administered at Alligator Pond by our dear brother, Pastor Allen Stump. Those baptized are sisters Sonya Griffiths, Daliah Deer and Thalia Gordon. A few of the young people wanted to get their feet wet and did so after the baptism, at the beach which ran in close proximity and parallel to the river that eventually empties into the sea.

Three other young people expressed their desire to be baptized and will be baptized sometime in the near future.

Because of the baptism, we got behind our schedule a bit and so we had breakfast rather hurriedly and quickly repaired to the chapel where brother Stump related the difficulties experienced in getting brother and sister Ford to Jamaica, and God's hand in the matter which eventually brought success.

Our brother Marlon Cole again treated us to some good advice concerning maintaining good health. 'NUTRITION' was his topic. His admonition to, 'chew your liquids and drink your solids' will not be easy to forget.

Brother Arthan Wright gave the next message, which centered on God's special care for his people. Brother Wright spoke with conviction and left every one to muse on those thoughts which he presented. We especially appreciated the fact that brother Arthan had come all the way from Miami to fellowship and to share with us.

In the evening we were all deeply moved by brother Roger Hendricks' presentation which was basically a testimony combined with a challenge to us to be fully committed to Christ. This



Daliah and the children singing

was followed by testimonies. All listened intently to the various testimonies which blessed our souls on this last evening at camp. Many of our brethren left changed, convicted and determined to maintain the high spiritual tone which was evident at the camp.

On the last day of the wonderful experience just before close of camp, sister Lorraine Sutherland made her contribution by focusing on how Moses learned that all God's biddings are enablings. The lesson she wished to impart was this; 'There is a purpose for every one'. Brother Wayne Sutherland sang 'Lord I'm available to you' as a complement to his wife's presentation.

It should be noted that brother Sutherland volunteered to conduct the Sabbath school for the younger folk during the adult's version on the Sabbath.

The closing admonition before breaking camp was conducted by brother David Clayton, after the hymn 'Tell me the story of Jesus' had been sung. The singing was very hearty as all had come to expect. They sang their hearts out (the brethren).

All too soon the wonderful meeting drew to a close as brother David Clayton gave a short message and exhortation. Camp broke as hugs and goodbyes were seen every where.

Many became emotional as they turned away from the bit of heaven that had been felt during those few days.



Pastor Stump baptizing Shona

A DEFENDER OF LAODICEA

In response to the article in the February Open Face entitled, "Philadelphia or Laodicea," we received a critical response from an apparently well-meaning but seriously misinformed brother who took us to task for taking a position contrary to that which Uriah Smith took in his interpretation of the Seven Churches of Revelation chapters 2 and 3. We have chosen to respond to the main points of his letter in this public way because we believe it may be helpful for others who may also have similar misconceptions and who are similarly misguided, to be exposed to his arguments and to see the loopholes in them.

Since we did not get this brother's permission to publish his letter we will let him remain anonymous and refer to him simply as brother G. Below we have listed what we consider the main points of brother G's objections along with one or two secondary points which we feel also need to be dealt with.

BROTHER G'S CRITICISMS

1. Your work and its outcome can be tested by two things: Does it stand up under intense scrutiny and what are its results and implications?
2. As an ardent student of prophecy I cannot help but note some gaping holes in your arguments and serious internal discrepancies between your views and those of the pioneers your work is seeking to promote.
3. You and I share the view that Uriah Smith's work is a sterling example of prophetic interpretation that is both accurate and spirit-led, even given the highest stamp of approval in the writings of Ellen White
4. Keep in mind that the SDA church had no reason to alter the explanations given by Uriah Smith (the leading pioneer on matters of prophetic or "apocalyptic" interpretation) as it related to the seven churches. And

you have not one shred of evidence that the church did alter his work, except statements dealing only with the nature of Christ. You and I know that full well.

5. I am a little concerned that in your zeal and strong desire to wake up the sleeping virgins or convert the lukewarm Laodiceans you have unwittingly done the following in your article: (a) Undermined Uriah Smith's sequential interpretation of the seven churches and even contradicted him on some points (b) showed your lack of comprehensive reading of the pioneers on this matter.
6. Notice further the faults in your arguments: YOU SAY, (a) "God's church in the last moments of time will not be Laodicea but Philadelphia." (b) "Sardis is the period of the great awakening from the time of the Millerite movement, to the early stages of the SDA Church. (pg. 3 top of first column) In your desire to do a good work of "reforming" and "restoring" you have actually done the following also. (a) Presented inaccurate facts on the time period covered by Sardis (the period of the reformers – Luther Calvin etc.) making it relate to the Millerite movement – THIS CONTRADICTS URIAH SMITH. (b) Made it appear that Philadelphia was the period of the formation of the Adventist Church after 1844 when in actual fact it covered the Millerite movement "up to" 1844 when the investigative judgment began. (c) Made it appear that the Laodicean state and stage of the Church is one of doctrinal error and no good can be found in this stage when actually it is clearly a contradiction of the pioneer teaching by Uriah Smith who clearly believed the end time church was the last stage called "Laodicea" but suffers from a lukewarm state and a feeling of sufficiency because, quote, "no fault is found with Laodiceans on account of doctrines they hold."
7. You and I know full well that what Uriah Smith taught on the seven churches is, has been, and always

will be what the pioneers, as a majority, believed and taught as it related to the sequential order of the seven churches and also the periods they covered.

8. So I ask you, do you still believe that you are really supporting the pioneer stance on this issue? I hope you will be honest to take a second look at your work.
9. It would be helpful to recognize that, as Mrs. White puts it: "No man's judgment is to be surrendered to the judgment of one man. But when the judgment of the General Conference, which is the highest authority that God has on earth is exercised ... private interpretation must not be maintained, but surrendered." (Testimonies Vol. 3, p.492)
10. Uriah Smith's views were GC endorsed. Were yours? Your views on Laodicea & Philadelphia are so singular in their findings it begs the question: Were they subject to the "highest authority that God has on earth," the GC? So how are you a part of the remnant church?

RESPONSE TO BROTHER G

I would like to respond to brother G's criticisms point by point. I will refer to his statements by number as enumerated above.

1. In his first point brother G recommends that my work be tested by two things: (a) How it stands up under intense scrutiny and (b) Its results and implications. I have no problem with these criteria, but just wish to qualify his first point by stating that it depends on who is doing the intense scrutiny. Hopefully it would be someone who is more careful and more informed than brother G. My reasons for saying this will become apparent as I continue.
2. Whether or not brother G is an ardent student of prophecy I do not know. The facts must speak for themselves. One thing seems ap-

parent however and this is the fact that his “ardent” study seems to be limited to the writings of Uriah Smith. The best result that can come from such a narrow field of research, be it ever so “ardently” done, is that one may become very capable of parroting Uriah Smith and become a brilliant reflector of other men’s thoughts.

3. I certainly empathize with brother G in the sentiment that Uriah Smith’s work (Daniel and the Revelation) is a sterling example of prophetic interpretation but I must take issue with his implication that it is absolutely accurate. Even though Ellen White approved of the book only a person who is extremely naïve would take this to mean that there are no errors in the book.
4. Here brother G shows that his methods of research are at worst extremely faulty and at best are extremely limited. He states quite confidently that, “you have not one shred of evidence that the church did alter his work, except statements dealing only with the nature of Christ.” Though he claims that “You and I know that full well,” my knowledge certainly does not coincide with his on this matter. It is regrettable that this well-meaning brother did not take the trouble to do a little careful research before making such a dogmatic statement. One is tempted to wonder if this is the kind of foundation upon which he bases his claims to be an “ardent student of prophecy.”

CHANGES TO DANIEL & REVELATION

Below there are two statements from two different editions of Daniel and The Revelation by Uriah Smith. They are both taken from the identical chapter and from the same place. Please note the prominent omission from the present day edition of the book: The differences in both passages have been highlighted in bold letters.

Daniel and The Revelation 1897 edition (The Original book)

“... the 144,000 here seen on Mount

Zion are the saints who were just before brought to view as objects of the wrath of the beast and his image, **there are the very best of reasons for believing.**

1. They are identical with those sealed in Revelation 7, who have already been shown to be the righteous who are alive at the second coming of Christ.

2. They are the overcomers in the sixth or Philadelphian state of the church. (See Rev.3:11, 12.)

3. They are “redeemed from among men” (verse 4), an expression which can be applicable only to those who are translated from among the living.” – *Daniel & The Revelation, p.629, by Uriah Smith, (1897 edition)*

Daniel and The Revelation 1944 & 1972 edition (Present day version)

“... the 144,000 here seen on Mount Zion are the saints who were **in Revelation 13** brought to view as objects of the wrath of the beast and his image.

They are identical with those sealed as described in Revelation 7, who have already been shown to be the righteous who are alive at the second coming of Christ.

They are “redeemed from among men” (verse 4), an expression which can be applicable only to those who are translated from among the living.” – *Daniel & The Revelation, p.626, by Uriah Smith, (1944 and 1972 edition)*

As we can clearly see, Uriah Smith taught that *The sixth or Philadelphian state of the church* was the segment of the seven churches which would produce the remnant or the 144,000. This truth was included in his original book (the book approved by Ellen White) before it was expunged along with the godhead truth back in the purging of 1944. Clearly, the changes in Uriah Smith’s *Daniel and The Revelation* have been far more comprehensive and wide-ranging than brother G’s “research” has led him

to believe.

5. My only comment on point number 5 is that the facts will show who has been guilty of a lack of “comprehensive reading of the pioneers,” on this matter.

PRINTING ERROR

6. The first two criticisms made by brother G under point number 6 are the result of a printing error. The passage in question actually reads, “After Thyatira there is Sardis, ing the period of the great awakening from the time of the Millerite movement ...” In actual fact it should have read, “After Thyatira there is Sardis, **then Philadelphia. Philadelphia is accepted by all Adventists, as representing** the period of the great awakening from the time of the Millerite movement ...” apparently in the process of printing, the last line on page 2 got cut off so that the last word on that page was Sardis, while the first word on page 3 is “**ing,**” which is the last part of the word “**representing**” This was a genuine misprint and was our fault, but even then I think careful reading might have made brother G realize that some words were missing since the first word on page three “**ing**” actually makes no sense unless it is a continuation of another hyphenated word.

NO DOCTRINAL ERROR?

As for the repetition of Uriah Smith’s contention that “no doctrinal error can be found in Laodicea,” we find ourselves caught on the horns of a dilemma if we perpetuate that argument. It is as clear as day that the SDA church today teaches a different doctrine on the subject of the **godhead** than did the SDA pioneers. Now then, which version of Laodicea was free of doctrinal error? Was it the pioneer version (after the 1850s) a decidedly non-Trinitarian church, or was it today’s version of Laodicea, a decidedly Trinitarian church? Which doctrine was error? Surely even the most die-hard Laodicean cannot suggest that both teachings about God are equally



true.

7. We have already responded to point number 7, however, we will just quote a couple of others of the earliest pioneers to demonstrate that again brother G is quite misguided in his contention that the pioneers were unanimous in their acceptance that the Advent movement represented Laodicea:

SOME EARLY ADVENT VIEWS ON PHILADELPHIA & LAODICEA

Joseph Bates

“The fifth state of the Church is Sardis: 3:1-6; out of which the great body of the second Advent believers came in 1843 and ’44. - 4th and 5th verses.

The sixth state of the Church is Philadelphia. It was made up or organized by second Advent believers principally from the churches in the fifth or Sardis state.

The seventh state is the Laodicean, organized by those who left the Philadelphia after the 2300 days, the appointed time, had ended. Hosea describes all their converts, v. 7. This is the state which the great head of the church is laboring to disband and dissolve: 3:14-21; see particularly 19th verse. Repent (and turn to the Philadelphia) for there is no other state of the Church since 1844, where the new commandment can be kept.” — *Joseph Bates, An Explanation of The Typical and The Antitypical Sanctuary*,

“These three last states of the church will be here when Jesus comes. They all exist now.” — *Joseph Bates, An Explanation of The Typical and The Antitypical Sanctuary, p.138, Joseph Bates*

“Thus they have organized the Laodicean church. And by their false teaching they have drawn thousands of the Philadelphians away with them into the Laodicean state. Jesus has sent a gracious message for all the honest ones in this state, saying, “As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten:

be zealous therefore and repent.” Rev.iii,19. We thank the Lord that a goodly number have taken heed to his message, and are now in the Philadelphia church, believing and proclaiming the third angel’s message. Still Jesus is calling after others, saying, “Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne.” Verses 20,21. Thus Jesus is continually calling, and holding out every inducement, by counseling, chastening and promising the poor Laodicean, even the highest honors he can bestow, if, after all he has done, he will repent and open his heart to him.”

“My dear brethren in the Philadelphia church, let us read this gracious message again, and pray the God of Israel to animate and inspire us with new courage, and unslackened zeal, to carry out the purpose of our divine Lord and Master, to the poor Laodicean, by searching them out wherever they can be found, and teaching them the present truth.” — *Joseph Bates, 2R&H2 p.14*

The Review and Herald

“So with the Philadelphia period. It terminated in the past. But the testimony to that church reaches to Christ’s coming, because many of the Philadelphians were to prove faithful, keep the word of Christ’s patience, pass on down through the Laodicean period, and finally overcome.” — *J. W. (James White?)*

“That there is to be a call to the Laodicean Church, and that the time for that call to be made is at hand, is evident. But who constitute the Laodicean Church? An array of argument on this point seems unnecessary. All Advent believers know perfectly well that the Philadelphia Church, the Church of Brotherly Love, was made up of those who came out of the

Sardis, or nominal Church in 1844, under the cry “Babylon is fallen, is fallen.” They know, also, that the Laodicean Church is the next in order, and is the seventh and last stage of the Church, as brought to view in Rev. chapters ii, and iii. This church is made up of such as have become “luke-warm,” and have left the Philadelphia Church, of brotherly love, and are saying “I am rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing;” and know not that they are “wretched and miserable, and poor and blind, and naked.” — *Present Truth and The Advent Review – Aug 1849 – Nov. 1850*

“In verse 12, is the precious overcoming promise to all in this church. They are to be pillars in the temple of God, and have the name of God, the Holy City, and Jesus’ own new name written upon them. Here we see that all the precious promises are made to this church that believe in the shut door, and keep in the open door. They cannot be claimed by those remaining in the Sardis, or Laodicean state of the church.” — *R&H, Nov. 1, 1850*

8. On the basis of the evidence presented we would suggest that it is brother G who needs to take a more careful look at his work.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE GC

9. Once again our brother speaks dogmatically merely on the basis of an extremely superficial examination. The statement which he has quoted with regards to the authority of the General Conference is the one which is fed to those who depend on the organized SDA church to determine their diet. Unfortunately such a diet is frequently greatly deficient in balanced truth and leads to spiritual malnutrition. In response to this point I will simply quote some additional statements from Ellen G. White with the relevant dates. These will speak for themselves.

1875 - I have been shown that no man’s judgement should be surrendered to the judgement of any one man. But when the judgement of the General Conference, which is the highest authority that God has on earth, is ex-

exercised, private independence and private judgement must not be maintained, but be surrendered. (T3:492)

1889 - (14 years later) We acknowledge the General Conference to be the highest authority recognized by God on earth. Here the whole of our people are represented, and speak through their delegates. Here is not north nor south, nor east nor west. It is one the world over. (Gen. Conf. Bulletin - Oct.23,1889)

1894 -(5 years later) Do not misunderstand me as approving of the recent action of the General Conference Association of which you write, but in regard to that matter, it is right that I should speak to them. They have many difficulties to meet and if they err in their action, the Lord knows it all, and can overrule for the good of those who trust Him (Testimony to Elder Littlejohn, Aug.3, 1894)

1895 - (1 year later) I do not find rest in spirit. Scene after scene is presented in symbols before me, and I find no rest until I begin to write out the matter. At the center of the work, matters are being shaped so that every other institution is following the same course. And the General Conference itself is becoming corrupted with wrong sentiments and principles (TM:359)

1896 - (1 year later, and 21 years after her first statement regarding the authority of the General Conference). Who can now feel sure that they are safe in respecting the voice of the General Conference Association? If the people in our churches understood the management of the men who walk in the light of the sparks of their own kindling, would they respect their decisions? I answer, no, not for a moment. (Special testimony to Review & Herald office in Battle Creek, 1896)

The same work that has been done in the past will be carried forward under the guise of the General Conference Association. The sacred character of this association is fast disappearing. Who then will be respected as pure,

holy and undefiled? Will there be any voice that God's people can respect as a voice to be respected? There certainly is nothing now that bears the divine credentials. Who can now feel sure that they are safe in respecting the voice of the General Conference Association? Much pride and loftiness, and a spirit which desires to rule, has been manifested; but very little of the Spirit which leads men to sit at the feet of Jesus and learn of Him, has been shown. Human inventions and human plans are eclipsing sacred things, and excluding divine instruction. Men are taking the place of God by seeking to assume authority over their fellow men. (Taken from letter to Elder O.A. Olsen, "Sunnyside," Cooranbong, NSW, May 31,1896)

1899 (3 years later). Let those in America who suppose the voice of the General Conference to be the voice of God, become one with God, before they utter their opinions. (Testimony to Elder S.N. Haskell, Nov. 15, 1899)

1901 - (2 years later). That these men should stand in the sacred place to be the voice of God to the people, as we once believed the General Conference to be, that is past. (General Conference Bulletin, 1901, page 25, column 2, par.1)

The voice of the General Conference has been represented as an authority to be heeded as the voice of the Holy Spirit. But when members of the General Conference become entangled in business affairs and financial perplexities, the sacred elevated character of their work is to a great degree lost. The temple of God becomes a place of merchandise and the ministers of God's house as commercial businessmen. (ibid. 1901, page 76)

NO SALVATION IN LAODICEA

Finally, we would like to close by once again quoting the two sentences from the writings of Ellen White which were included in our previous article on "Philadelphia or Laodicea?"

"The church is in the Laodicean state, the presence of God is not in her

midst." Manuscript 156 (1898)

"The state of the church represented by the foolish virgins, is also spoken of as the Laodicean state." Review & Herald, Aug. 19, 1890

Here Ellen White clearly identifies two characteristics of the Laodicean state:

- a) God is not among those who are in the Laodicean state.
- b) The Laodicean state is represented by the foolish virgins.

Both of those characteristics describe a lost condition. No person or institution who is found in such a state can be saved. The question seems unnecessary, but in the light of the prevailing confusion it needs to be asked: Is it possible for Laodicea to be not in the Laodicean condition? Since Laodicea is a spiritual appellation (it is not the actual designated name of any denomination or religious group today as far as I know), then any designation of any group as being Laodicean must focus on the characteristics of that group rather than any other attribute. The title Laodicean, applied to Adventism is a term of condemnation, not a generic description or a chronological designation.

In the light of these facts, we close with the affirmation in agreement with the original book, *Daniel and the Revelation* of Uriah Smith, that God's last day people will be from the Philadelphian Church and not from the Laodicean.

"Who are these preachers of new doctrines?" exclaim those who desire a popular religion. "They are unlearned, few in numbers, and of the poorer class. Yet they claim to have the truth, and to be the chosen people of God . . . How greatly superior in numbers and influence is our church! How many great and learned men are among us! . . . " These are the arguments that have a telling influence upon the world; but they are no more conclusive now than in the days of the Reformer. (GC - 148)

WHO SENT JESUS, AND FROM WHERE?

We must believe the word of God. We must believe **all** the word of God and care not for the traditions and the suppositions of men.

If God says He sent His Son, I believe He had a son to send.

If God says He sent His Son, I do not believe that the Son sent Himself.

If God says He sent His Son **into the world** I believe that Son could not have been in the world at the time when He was sent.

If God says He had a begotten Son, it matters not what the feeble minds of men may imagine. "One word of truth outweighs the whole world." God was the first Father in the universe, according to the Scriptures (Prov. 8:22-25). How dare we suggest that God could not bring forth a son from His being, simply because He is not flesh? What do **we** know of the nature of Spirit? How disrespectful to suggest that God would have to be pregnant in order to beget a Son!!

Thus saith the Lord!! (not the traditions of men).

Where Was Christ When He was sent? in Heaven or Bethlehem?

1. (John 3:17) For God sent not his Son **into the world** to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.
2. (1 John 4:9) 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.
3. (John 6:38) For I **came down from heaven**, not to do mine own will, but the will of **him that sent me**.
4. (John 10:36) Say ye of him,

whom the Father hath sanctified, and **sent into the world**, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?

5. (John 17:18) As thou hast **sent me into the world**, even so have I also sent them into the world.
6. (1 John 4:9) 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.

Where Did Christ Come From?

7. (John 7:29) But I know him: for **I am from him**, and he hath sent me.
8. John 8:42) Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for **I proceeded forth and came from God**; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.
9. (John 17:8) For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that **I came out from thee**, and they have believed that thou didst send me.

Who Sent Christ?

10. (John 4:34) Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of **him that sent me**, and to finish his work.
11. (John 5:23) That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not **the Father which hath sent him**
12. (John 5:30) I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I

judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of **the Father which hath sent me**.

13. (John 5:36) But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that **the Father hath sent me**.
14. (John 5:37) And **the Father himself, which hath sent me**, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.
15. (John 5:38) And ye have not his word abiding in you: for **whom he hath sent**, him ye believe not.
16. (John 6:39) And this is **the Father's will which hath sent me**, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.
17. (John 6:40) And this is the will of **him that sent me**, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.
18. (John 6:44) No man can come to me, except **the Father which hath sent me** draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.
19. (John 6:57) As **the living Father hath sent me**, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.
20. (John 7:16) Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but **his that sent me**.
21. (John 7:18) He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh **his glory that sent him**, the same

is true, and no unrighteousness is in him.

22. (John 7:28) Then cried Jesus in the temple as he taught, saying, Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am: and I am not come of myself, **but he that sent me** is true, whom ye know not.
23. (John 7:33) Then said Jesus unto them, Yet a little while am I with you, and then **I go unto him that sent me**.
24. (John 8:16) And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and **the Father that sent me**.
25. (John 8:18) I am one that bear witness of myself, and **the Father that sent me** beareth witness of me.
26. (John 8:26) I have many things to say and to judge of you: but **he that sent me** is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.
27. (John 8:29) And **he that sent me** is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him.
28. (John 9:4) I must work the works of **him that sent me**, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.
29. (John 11:42) And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that **thou hast sent me**.
30. (John 12:44) Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on **him that sent me**.
31. (John 12:45) And he that seeth me seeth **him that sent me**.
32. (John 12:49) For I have not spoken of myself; but **the Father which sent me**, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should

speak.

33. (John 13:20) Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth **him that sent me**.
34. (John 14:24) He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but **the Father's which sent me**.
35. (John 15:21) But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not **him that sent me**.
36. (John 17:21) That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that **thou hast sent me**.
37. (John 17:23) I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that **thou hast sent me**, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.
38. (1 John 4:10) Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and **sent his Son** to be the propitiation for our sins.
39. (1 John 4:14) And we have seen and do testify that **the Father sent the Son** to be the Saviour of the world.
40. (Luke 9:48) And said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth **him that sent me**: for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great.
41. (Mark 12:6) Having yet therefore one son, his wellbeloved, **he sent him** also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my son.
42. (Luke 20:13) Then said the lord of the vineyard, What shall I do? **I will send my beloved**

son: it may be they will reverence him when they see him.

With such a weight of Scriptural evidence will we continue to deny this truth so persistently emphasized by our Lord? (at least 37 times in the gospel of John alone!!)

LIQUID BLESSING

75% of Americans are chronically dehydrated. (Likely applies to half the world)

In 37% of Americans, the thirst mechanism is so weak that it is often mistaken for hunger.

Even MILD dehydration will slow down one's metabolism as much as 3%.

One glass of water shut down midnight hunger pangs for almost 100% of the dieters studied in a U-Washington study.

Lack of water, the #1 trigger of daytime fatigue.

Preliminary research indicates that 8-10 glasses of water a day could significantly ease back and joint pain for up to 80% of sufferers.

A mere 2% drop in body water can trigger fuzzy short-term memory, trouble with basic math, and difficulty focusing on the computer screen or on a printed page.

Drinking 5 glasses of water daily decreases the risk of colon cancer by 45%, plus it can slash the risk of breast cancer by 79%, and one is 50% less likely to develop bladder cancer.

Are you drinking the amount of water you should every day?

VOICES OF THE PEOPLE

Thank you so much for your ministry. We receive a true blessing in every Open Face publication. May the Lord continue to bless you in His work.

Tennessee, USA

I am very thankful for my supply of Open Face and I must say it has enlightened me in every way. Thank you. What about the Old Paths publication? Is it only limited to the United States? Do I have to order from them directly? Thanks be to God for your ministry and I pray that you will grow from strength to strength. Keep up the good work.

St. James, Jamaica

The time has just flown since you were here in Australia. It seems like just yesterday that we met you, but time has passed. I hope you remember us. We think of you lots and have visited your web site sometimes as well as Smyrna's. It's actually different reading the articles you write now, since we have listened to you give talks. When we read we can imagine hearing you as well. We just wanted to tell you how much we have enjoyed reading your latest newsletter on *Philadelphia or Laodicea*. When we went to our Bible study this morning we were discussing it with others in the group who had been reading it also and we have gotten a lot out of it.

Vic, Australia

I would like to tell you that I have come to the exact same conclusions as you have regarding the seven churches and the fact that Philadelphia and the 144,000 are identical. I have been preaching this for about eight years now, and I have been working on a book for about three years. Recently I have been presenting these truths to a group of church members who meet independently from the main church here ...

As I have been going through the book of Revelation the numbers of people leaving the main church to come and listen has been growing steadily, which is encouraging. I used to think that I was the only one who believed that the Philadelphia Church was God's last day Church. It is very gratifying to know that others are re-discovering these vital truths too. God bless.

New Zealand

Just read your article, "Philadelphia or Laodicea." Great article. Makes a lot of sense. I don't know if the Lord is trying to tell me something but you are actually the third person this week that has talked to me about the state of the church and whether I should be attending or not. Is this God's remnant church or not? I am battling with this at the moment. It is causing some stress. Is the Lord telling me to get out of this church and start a home group or what? Is it right for me to still attend a church that is preaching error? Your article has made me think a little. I have to do some study. Or is it Satan?

Australia

I'm from Germany. I have contact with Brother Allen Stump since a couple of weeks. I've translated some of your Tracts into German and offered them to him for putting them on his site. He told me to contact you. If you would like some translated versions too, I would be glad if I could send you some.

You know, it all started when I found the site sundaylaw.com... then I was on smyrna.org and was reading the tract, "Satan's deadliest lie". I read the first 3 sentences and thought, "who can write the gospel so plain and clear and delicious". So I started to translate it after these three sentences. Later on I just thought, "wait a minute, what is this all about"? I stopped writing. I was reading. And then: Boom! I was shocked! I took my bible and looked for all those verses..."It's real!", I thought. I was on fire.

I called up my mom, she could not speak when I told her all. (since then she is my companion and Greek-expert in this issue...) We have studied this matter for hours daily. We are so happy to know all this. But we have a lot of brethren, which are warning us to reject this idea, but we love God and His Son (this is what they don't know). There is a lot more to tell, but not much time.

I've also listened to your sermons about the trinity issue, and I was like paralyzed when I saw things clearer. I thank God for such people like you! You're doing a great job!

Please tell me if I can help with any-

thing.

I've heard that you have some beautiful music. I'd be very thankful for some tapes. Now, at the end of your sermon "Who is this God" there is a marvelous group singing a beautiful song, I think it's called "I worship You, almighty God". If you have this song or some more of them... and please let me know how to pay.

And don't forget: Ask me for some Tracts in German.

I would like to write you a lot more but I'm going to save it for the next mail.

God bless you!

Bavaria, Germany

I have read some of your "Open Face" papers and I would like to be on your mailing list. I am thankful for your timely, spirit-filled messages and presentations. Am enclosing a check to help you fund your ministry.

Arizona, USA

I recently listened to your audio tape on "Relative Perfection." I've also read the article in Old Paths and watched the video on "The Return of The Fourth Angel." I praise the Lord for the wonderful light He is shining on His people ... What an awesome responsibility we have to live up to! The report on your visit to Australia is educational and heartening. The three missionary journeys this past year (Africa, Peru, Australia) may well mark the beginning of God's final message being taken to the world.

Kansas, USA

I wanted to send you a letter of encouragement. I have been truly blessed by your ministry. Especially "Who is Telling The Truth About God" and most recently, your February newsletter. WOW! You blew me away! I am now finally able to understand how someone can love God. He demonstrated His love for us by giving up His only begotten Son. It's so simple my 5 year old and 4 year old children can understand it.

Florida, USA

One of the ladies that came to your meeting has really grasped the message down here about the Trinity falsehood and has been sharing her new found truth and doing wonders. A few

people have accepted it because of her work. ...God bless and keep strong in the faith.

Tasmania, Australia

My husband and I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and all the others at Restoration Ministries for being such dedicated servants of our Lord and for your diligence in spreading His message. Our family has been blessed by the videos and newsletters produced with the help of you and the brethren at Smyrna Gospel Ministries. It is comforting to know that God has raised up so many caring people to share the burden of fulfilling the desire for truth in those who hunger for it.

USA

A friend of mine sent me your excellent newsletter and I would appreciate being included in your database for future mailings.

New Zealand

I have read two of your articles entitled, "Which God," and "The God of The Bible," which I've found to be masterpieces. I would like you to send me some more information on the godhead, including the "Godhead Package." Please send me whatever information you can. Maybe you can help me to really change from the life I am living, to the life that pleases God.

St. Thomas, Jamaica

I wanted to let you know how much I appreciated your last newsletter about the Laodicean 'condition'. It is exactly what I feel has happened to people in these churches, that they even rejoice in being asleep, that grace will save them, and that He knows their hearts, blah, blah...He knows our hearts, whether we were willing to obey Him and go on in truth or just sit there and deny ourselves a chance to become more like Him in obedience. Anyway, it was an excellent letter and I am praying for you and your ministry. Let us know if you are ever in the area. We'd love to have you stay sometime. Blessings on you!

Washington, USA

Thank you so much for sending the books by Colin Gyles. I really liked the article from the internet, but books will be nice to share. I gave one to my son the other day and he seemed interested because he has felt something has been wrong in the church for some time.

Their daughter is getting baptized on the 20th of April and I have such mixed feelings about this. I just don't know what to suggest as we don't have a church! She is the one who told me she was 'non-Trinitarian' after I had the long talk with her about Jesus and God and what their spirit was. It made sense to her and she got all excited. But there is nothing to keep them focused. She is just a child going to 'our' church schools and being taught error.

God must have a plan to shake up this church some way. Our leaders are very much Trinitarian and the people really believe them. I have decided to give a copy of the April 'Old Paths' to every minister in our church. I'm going to ask that they preach on the Nature of God 'from the bible'. That we need to hear this subject talked about. You know even after all these years, I have never heard a sermon on the Trinity. If it is so important to them, why don't they teach it! You get statements in the Review and other church papers, and it is sometimes discussed in the Sabbath schools, but they avoid it in the pulpit. No wonder people don't know what they believe. It is just always insinuated that you believe it their way.

I'm just rambling. You are busy and I don't want to take up your time, but wanted to thank you for sending the books and I always appreciate your sermons. God is blessing your work I know! We are looking forward to seeing you again this next summer in West Virginia. We have our plane tickets already, and God willing, we will be there. Keep us in your prayers.

California, USA

Just was reading 'OPEN FACE' #24 and came across a discussion about the Trinitarian Doctrine and maybe more than a discussion. What is all this about? What is the Trinitarian Doctrine anyway? Would be pleased if you could send info about this idea and the discussions that took place. Any material available? Appreciated the lead article on Laodicea. Sounds reasonable. Thanks

USA

We have appreciated and been greatly blessed by your presentations on the Trinity issue since we first heard those first three cassette tapes of yours.

The subject was first brought to our

attention in about 1993 or '94 by Caleb Alonzo our friend; and what an eye opener! We having been raised SDA had never heard of these things! Thanks be our faith is secure in God, so that hurt and disappointment in our church did not shake our hold on Him, but for the first time it really hit us that the church leadership was not to be put up on a pedestal in our minds.

We already knew about many things concerning that, but this new one sickened us BIG TIME!

We just praise God that there are a few brave men out there exposing the lie in clear simple terminology. We are asking that you put us on your Open Face mailing list.

Colorado, USA

I write to thank you for your article "Return of the 4th Angel".

Praise God that he has given you such clear discernment of Church history, SOP and the Bible.

The article gave me much encouragement (in the face of so much opposition). Just the other day I received correspondence from a dear man (SDA), a man perhaps best described as a Bible scholar, who basically said "I have enclosed for your urgent reading a study by one of our Church's best know authorities on the subject of the Godhead - Leroy Froom"!!

Even our so called scholars are blinded by good old fashioned tradition!

Keep up the good work! We regularly uplift you in prayer.

God bless,

South Australia

Thank you very much for your newsletter. Again I must say that I was paralysed as I was reading your article about Philadelphia and Laodicea, just like the feeling I had when I read about the Trinity issue. Its like being born again.

I thank our precious Father for giving us so much light about Him, His glory and about our Laodicean state, so that we can break through from Laodicea to Philadelphia with the power of Jesus Christ.

I found it fascinating, thus I translated it into german, for our german brethren. Please put it on your Website for everyone.

Bavaria, Germany



THE ORTHODOX TRINITY AND ADVENTISM

Continued from p. 5

other hand if one rejects the concept of a derived life, one must also of necessity reject the Trinity. The one cannot be accepted and the other rejected, for they are one identical substance. If one insists on being called a Trinitarian while rejecting the idea of Christ having a derived existence, then such a person must be honest and acknowledge that he does not support the orthodox Trinity of Nicea and be prepared to be relegated to the ranks of cultism.

What bewitching fascination does the term Trinity hold over the minds of modern-day Adventists, in spite of its many embarrassing disadvantages? Why did men like J.N. Andrews who could recite the entire New Testament from memory, and the other outstanding founding fathers of our faith reject the concept and avoid the term Trinity

like the plague? Is it because they did not have as much light as we do today? The fact is that an unbiased study will reveal that they were far more advanced in a knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity than present day Adventists.

Perhaps the Trinity may be accepted as legitimate truth, but only if truth is dependent upon ignorance; only if Rome the antichrist Church brought a blessing to the world by its formulation of the Trinity; only if Constantine can be embraced as the patron of the "blessed" Trinity while instituting a Sunday law; only if Christ is not really the Son of God but a derived projection of the Father and only if all these things require less faith and more sense to believe than that Christ can be truly begotten of the Father while at the same time being from all eternity.

There is only one way for our church to avert the impending challenge from Rome over the common ground which we share with her and which is all of her creation and which will bring untold embarrassment and disruption in the ranks of Adventism and this is to quickly move first and remove the scourge of this doctrine from among us.



Open Face

*Restoration Ministries
P.O. Box 23, Knockpatrick
Manchester, Jamaica W.I.
ph. (876) 904-7392*