

Concerning Christ: The current beliefs and teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church

In an article called 'Present truth - Walking in God's Light', William Johnsson boldly asserted in the Adventist Review of January 6th 1994 (Johnsson was then the editor of the Review)

"Adventists beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of present truth. Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Saviour and Lord." (*William Johnsson, Adventist Review, January 6th 1994, Article 'Present Truth - Walking in God's Light'*)

I wonder how many of today's Seventh-day Adventists know about this change? I wonder too how many know what these beliefs were before they were changed, also what they are now?

Commenting on what was once believed about Christ by past Seventh-day Adventists, Johnsson wrote

"Only gradually did this false doctrine give way to the Biblical truth, and largely under the impact of Ellen Whites writings in statements such as "In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived. (Desire of ages p 530)" (*Ibid*)

The doctrine that Johnsson is referring to here is the belief that in eternity, Christ was begotten of God therefore He is truly the Son of God. This belief maintains that Christ is God, in the person of the Son.

Johnsson may consider this Sonship (begotten) belief to be "false doctrine" but the truth of the matter is that for the entire time of Ellen White's ministry, this was the denominational faith of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Johnsson is claiming therefore that concerning the most important teaching of Christianity (what the Bible says about Christ), Seventh-day Adventists, between 1844 and 1915 (the time period of Ellen White's ministry), were teaching false doctrine. I would like to think that most of today's Seventh-day Adventists would regard this as rather far-fetched - certainly something very difficult to believe. Yet those such as our present church leadership, also our current church theologians and the ministry in general, say they agree with William Johnsson.

If you are not sure what Seventh-day Adventists did believe about Christ whilst Ellen White was alive, you can read it for yourself at the following link. You will find it in the section called 'The begotten (Sonship) belief as expressed by early Seventh-day Adventists'. I am sure it will tell you everything you wish to know. It is quite detailed.

[The Divine Persons of God and Christ](#)

In that section it can also be seen that Ellen White endorsed this Sonship belief. She made it very clear that concerning Christ's pre-existence, Seventh-day Adventists were teaching the truth.

In 1893, Ellen White wrote of an encounter the church had with a schoolteacher who was telling people that Seventh-day Adventists did not believe in the divinity of Christ. She explained (this is when she was in New Zealand)

"This man [the schoolteacher] may not have known what our faith is on this point, but he was not left in ignorance. He was informed that there is not a people on earth who hold more firmly to the truth of Christ's pre-existence than do Seventh-day Adventists." (*Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, 5th December 1893, 'An appeal for the Australasian field'*)

This statement does not require a great deal of explanation. It does mean though that regardless of the claims of William Johnsson, Ellen White said that during the time of her ministry, Seventh-day Adventists were teaching the truth about Christ. She was therefore endorsing the begotten (Sonship) belief. This is because this is what Seventh-day Adventists were then teaching. This was still their denominational faith. It had been the same since their beginnings. There had been no change in this belief.

Two years later in 1895, Ellen White again endorsed the begotten\Sonship belief. This is when she wrote in the Signs of the Times

"A complete offering has been made; for "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son,"-- not a son by creation, as were the angels, nor a son by adoption, as is the forgiven sinner, **but a Son begotten in the express image of the Father's person**, and in all the brightness of his majesty and glory, one equal with God in authority, dignity, and divine perfection. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." (*Ellen G. White, Signs of the Times, 30th May 1895, 'Christ our complete salvation'*)

Seventh-day Adventists reading these words could only have drawn the conclusion that God's messenger was again endorsing what they were teaching about Christ. They could not have read it any other way. From this we can see that whilst William Johnsson referred to this Sonship belief as "false doctrine", Ellen White is saying it is the truth. Notice here that she clearly differentiated between "begotten" and created. She made it very clear that they were not the same thing.

Throughout the entire time period of Ellen White's ministry (1844-1915), this begotten\Sonship belief was the standard belief of Seventh-day Adventists. It can only be concluded therefore that if this teaching had been wrong then

- (a) Ellen White would not have given her approval of it (which she did)
- (b) Through Ellen White, God would have told His people that it was wrong (which He never did).

For decades following the death of Ellen White, the Seventh-day Adventist Church continued to teach this begotten\Sonship belief. In fact in 1936, which was over 20 years after her death, the General Conference declared it to be the official faith of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This should be telling us something very important. You can read about this here

The Official 1936 official beliefs of SDA's

I am sure that most would agree that it would not be possible for the entire membership of a denomination to change its faith overnight. It would take many years for this to happen. This is why in our official publications throughout the 1940's and 1950's etc, this same belief (the Sonship/begotten belief) was still being taught. It was not until later that this belief was completely phased out from being a standard belief of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The end result of this 'phasing out' is where we are today (2017). Later in this article we shall see what we, as a church, are now teaching about Christ. You can compare it with the Sonship belief held by earlier Seventh-day Adventists. You can then decide for yourself what is the truth and what is false doctrine.

William Johnsson makes the claim that it was Ellen White's writings that led to this change in beliefs. This claim, since 1980, especially amongst the ministry, has become increasingly popular. It was this year (1980) that for the very first time in their history, Seventh-day Adventists voted in a trinity doctrine as part of their denominational fundamental beliefs. The Seventh-day Adventist leadership therefore have found it necessary to give a reason for this change of beliefs. This brings us back to William Johnsson's statement (see above).

Whatever the rights and wrongs of trinitarianism, there is no way that Ellen White would have said that this Sonship (begotten) belief was error. If she was with us today she would say that her writings are being misused. Take for example the quote used by William Johnsson (that he said led to this change in beliefs). It says

"Still seeking to give a true direction to her faith, Jesus declared, "I am the resurrection, and the life." In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived. "He that hath the Son hath life." 1 John 5:12. The divinity of Christ is the believer's assurance of eternal life." (*Ellen G. White, Desire of Ages, page 530, 'Lazarus, Come Forth'*)

The trinitarians (like William Johnsson) use this quote in attempting to have people believe that Ellen White did not believe that Christ is begotten of God but rather possesses this life (divine life) without receiving it from the Father. If you look closely at this quote though it will be seen that this is something she is not saying. What she is doing is describing the *type of life* that is in Christ ("original, unborrowed, underived"). This is divine life (divinity). It is the life of God.

On page 21 of the same book Ellen White wrote

“All things Christ received from God, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: through the beloved Son, **the Father's life** flows out to all; through the Son it returns, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, to the great Source of all.” (*Ellen G. White, Desire of Ages, page 21, 'God with us'*)

We can see it said here that the Father is “**the great Source of all**”. It is also said that it is the “**Father's life**” that flows through the Son. This life therefore (“**life, original, unborrowed, underived.**”) which is in Christ has its origins in the Father. The Son is the mediator of this life (God's life - divinity). This is the begotten concept. It is in keeping with where Jesus Himself said

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; **so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;**” John 5:25-26

The year previous to the publication of ‘The Desire of Ages’, Ellen White had written

“God has sent his Son to communicate his own life to humanity. Christ declares, “I live by the Father,” my life and his being one.” (*Ellen G. White, Home Missionary, 1st June 1897, 'A call to the work'*)

The ‘new theology’

So if Seventh-day Adventists are not teaching today that Christ really is the Son of God (begotten of God in eternity) then what are they teaching?

Seventh-day Adventists are now teaching that Christ is only role-playing (acting out) the part of a son. They also teach that the person we know as the Father is only role-playing (acting out) the part of a father and the person we know as the Holy Spirit is only role-playing (acting out) the part of a holy spirit. This means that the Father is not really a father, the Son of God is not really a son and the Holy Spirit is not really a holy spirit.

In one of our denominational publications in 1981, a reader posed a very interesting question. This was the year after the trinity doctrine was first voted into our fundamental beliefs (1980). The reader said he was mystified by the doctrine of the trinity. He wondered to whom he should address his prayers. In replying to this question, Pastor Holbrook (a contributing editor) wrote

“**It may be inferred from the Scriptures** that when the Godhead laid out the plan of salvation at some point in eternity past, **They also took certain positions or roles to carry out the provisions of the plan.**” (*These Times, June 1st 1981, 'Frank answers'*)

We can see here that in 1981, through one of their official publications, Seventh-day Adventists were being asked to believe that sometime in eternity, the persons of the Godhead decided who should role-play the Father, who should role-play the Son and who should role-play the Holy Spirit. Did you notice that Holbrook said that this is what is “**inferred from the Scriptures**”. Where or how this is inferred I have no idea.

So what were, according to the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the personal identities of these divine persons before they entered into their role-playing? To be honest with you I have never seen this question addressed so I cannot comment. At the best it seems as though they can only be referred to as persons A, B and C. Other than their role-playing designations they do not appear to have any particular identity. They remain therefore, prior to their role-playing, nameless.

In a 1996 week of prayer reading, Gordon Jenson (who was then the President of Spicer Memorial College of Pune, India) attempted to have Seventh-day Adventists worldwide believe that sometime in eternity

“A plan of salvation was encompassed in the covenant made by the Three Persons of the Godhead, who possessed the attributes of Deity equally. In order to eradicate sin and rebellion from the universe and to restore harmony and peace, **one of the divine Beings accepted, and entered into, the role of the Father, another the role of the Son.**” (*Gordon Jenson, Adventist Review, October 31, 1996, p.12 Week of Prayer readings, 'article 'Jesus the Heavenly Intercessor'*)

When this was written (1996) there were approximately 9,000,000 Seventh-day Adventists worldwide. It should not be necessary to explain therefore why these Week of Prayer readings are an ideal avenue to promulgate certain teachings that the church leadership is keen to promote. It is reasonable to assume that many of those who participated in this particular reading would have read Jenson's remarks. He continued

"The remaining divine Being, the Holy Spirit, was also to participate in effecting the plan of salvation. All of this took place before sin and rebellion transpired in heaven." (*Ibid*)

It appears that Jenson could not bring himself to say that the "remaining divine Being" was only role-playing the part of a holy spirit (pretending to be a holy spirit) but it must have been what he meant. What other conclusion can be drawn? Jenson later said

"As sin progressively developed in heaven and later, on earth, so the plan to deal with it was progressively revealed—the divine Beings entered into the roles they had agreed upon before the foundations of the world were laid (see 1 Peter 1:20)." (*Ibid*)

According to this reasoning, the actually entering in of the roles did not take place until after sin had broken out.

Not many weeks had passed before an objection was made to Gordon Jenson's article. Published in the Review and Herald it had been sent by email and was signed by Herman J. Smit. He was then the President of the Greek Mission. Regarding Jenson's remarks about a role-playing Godhead (this was under the heading "More Than Role-playing") he commented

"That's like writing a dramatic theater play, for which some persons take on specific roles and then, after the performance, change clothes and look as they did before entering the dressing rooms." (*Herman J. Smit, President Greek Mission, Review and Herald, Adventist Review, December 26th 1996*)

That's one way of looking at it. He continued

"Of course, the Holy Scriptures are a precipitation of God's involvement with this planet and its inhabitants; many things are said in a human way. But do we honestly believe that it was like this when our salvation was thoroughly planned and set into motion? Distributing roles?" (*Ibid*)

It appears that Smit was not very impressed with Jenson's role-playing reasoning. He then asked

"How does this relate to John 3:16? In loving us, God gave His only-begotten Son. He didn't need to take on a role. Do the unfallen worlds not need a father? Is God only our Father? If God the Son does not need to act as a Saviour on behalf of the unfallen worlds, isn't He still their Creator, God the Son, or is He a nameless one of the Three?" (*Ibid*)

Smit made some very good points. First of all this role-playing idea destroys the belief that the Father did actually give His Son. This cannot be disputed. In fact if all three are only role-playing, then it must be asked who gave whom? In other words, who is the "God" that Christ spoke of to Nicodemus (see John 3:16)?

Secondly, by what designation do the unfallen worlds know Christ? It could even be asked by what designation do they know any of the persons of the Godhead? How about prior to sin coming into Heaven itself? By what designations were the divine persons then known? I ask this because according to Jenson, these divine beings did not take on these roles until after sin had broken out. Were they nameless up to this time? It seems as though we are left to ponder these things.

Smit appears to have regarded Jenson as denigrating the Holy Spirit. He commented

"Speaking about the Holy Spirit as sort of a third-choice "remaining divine Being" sounds like handing out a "price of comfort" for the less fortunate. For the Comforter, a too-human description." (*Ibid*)

Nothing further was said concerning the Holy Spirit but Smit obviously realised that Jenson was saying

that this third person was only said to be role-playing (acting out) this part. He concluded

“Please, **let us be careful in wording** the Trinity's initiative in regard to the redemption of humankind. I would still like to cling to the old Nicene Creed—certainly with my Orthodox fellow Christians in mind.” (*Ibid*)

The Nicene Creed says that Christ is begotten of God. It maintains therefore, Christ's Sonship to God.

Some may say that this role-playing idea is only the personal view of a few individuals but this is not true. It is promoted in our official denominational publications

One such publication is the book 'The Trinity'. Published in 2002, its prime purpose was to explain (a) the Seventh-day Adventist version of the trinity doctrine, (b) what Seventh-day Adventists believe and teach today and (c) the history of why and when our denomination changed its Godhead beliefs.

Through this book, the Seventh-day Adventist Church again promoted this idea of role-playing. One of its co-authors, Woodrow Whidden, made the following statement

“While the three divine persons are one, **They have taken different roles or positions** in the Godhead's work of creation, redemption, and the loving administration of *the universe*. **The Father has assumed overall leadership, the Son has subordinated Himself to the leadership of the Father, and the Spirit is voluntarily subordinate to both the Father and the Son.**” (*Woodrow Whidden, The Trinity, page 243, 'Why the Trinity is important – part 1'*)

Strange as it may seem, on pages 248, 268 and 269 respectively, Whidden makes the following comments (note the highlighted words, also the title of the chapter)

“The heart of His [God's] plan has been sacrificially to give **His own divine Son** to come and be one with us as a man to show us what godly love is really all about” (*Ibid, page 248*)

“The solution to the problem of evil has and will continue to come from none other than **God Himself in the person and work of His Son**. He has thrust Himself into the battle against suffering and evil. And how has He involved Himself? Through sending **His very own divine Son** as a solution to the horrid blot that evil has spread across creation.” (*Ibid page 268*)

“But the sin emergency did not catch the Holy Trinity off guard. They had conceived a plan in which **God would send His very own Son** to our world to meet Satan in hand-to-hand combat.” (*Ibid page 269*)

The reason I am pointing this out (saying it is strange) is because if the Father and Son are only role-playing their different characters, then how can it be said that Christ is God's “**very own Son**” This is because in this role-playing theology, the two persons we now know as the Father and Holy Spirit could have taken the role of the Son. This would mean that one of them (whoever took the role of the Son) would also have been called God's “**very own Son**”. Does this not sound rather strange?

Another strange thing I noticed is that Whidden said (this was under the sub-heading 'Christ Alone is Able to redeem')

“But why is it that **only the unique Son of God** would be capable of such a mission? Why is Jesus **the only being** who could fully reveal what God is like? (*Ibid page 248*)

Why I say this is strange is because according to Whidden), any one of the three divine persons could have taken the role of the Son. Why therefore say that the person we know as the Son is “**the only being who could fully reveal what God is like**”? I am also left wondering why Christ is referred to as the “**unique Son of God**” (seeing that any one of the three could have taken the part of the Son).

In the same book, Whidden made this comment

“**Another important consideration involves how we interpret the Bible. Here the issue pertains to whether we should interpret some passages literally or whether we may treat them more figuratively.** Maybe we could illustrate it this way. While we often refer to Jesus as the Son and

frequently call the first person of the Godhead the Father, do we really want to take such expressions in a totally literal way? Or would it be more appropriate to interpret them in a more metaphorical way that draws on selective aspects of sonship and fatherhood?" (*Woodrow Whidden, The Trinity, Biblical objections to the trinity, page 94*)

Whidden is suggesting here that rather than taking the words 'Father' and 'Son' in a literal sense it would be better to understand them metaphorically. This is contradictory of course to where he said that God had sent His "very own Son" into the world (see above). If this Sonship is only metaphorical, how can Christ be God's "very own Son"? Something does not 'add up' here.

After discussing a number of texts of Scripture including such as John 3:16, John 17:3, 1 Corinthians 8:6, Colossians 1:15, 18, Hebrews 1:5-6 and 5:5-10, Whidden concludes

"Is it not quite apparent that the problem texts become problems only when one assumes an exclusively literalistic interpretation of such expression as "Father," "Son," "Firstborn," "Only Begotten," "Begotten," and so forth? Does not such literalism go against the mainly figurative or metaphorical meaning that the Bible writers use when referring to persons of the Godhead?" (*Ibid, page 106*)

Notice that Whidden calls these Father/Son/begotten texts of Scripture "problem texts". He says they are a problem if they are taken literally. He also says that these expressions are only meant by the Bible writers to be "figurative or metaphorical".

There is one huge insurmountable problem with this reasoning. This is because many of the Father/Son expressions were not those employed by the Bible writers but were words that were actually spoken by various individuals. They were simply recorded by the Bible writers.

This is such as when God the Father said of Christ "This is my beloved Son" (see Matthew 3:16-17, 17:5). It is also when Christ repeatedly said that He was God's Son (see John 3:16, 9:35-38, 11:4, see also Matthew 27:43 and other numerous places). It was when the Jews accused Christ of blasphemy for calling Himself the Son of God (see John 5:18, 10:36), also when they said He deserved to die because He called Himself God's Son (John 19:7). It is also when both Peter and John the Baptist called Christ the Son of God (Matthew 16:16, John 1:32-33), also when the demons did the same (Matthew 8:29, Mark 3:11, 5:7, Luke 4:41). The disciples, as did Martha, also called Christ the Son of God (Matthew 14:33, John 11:27).

None of these occasions were when the Bible writers used these expressions of their own choosing. They were simply recording the actual words spoken by these various individuals. If it were to be denied that these were their actual words, this would deny the inspiration of Scripture. It must be asked therefore (in the light of Whidden's remarks), when these various individuals said these things, were they only being metaphorical? This would be extremely difficult to believe, especially as the demons referred to Christ as the Son of God. Were they being metaphorical? How about the Father when He said that Christ is His beloved Son? Was He only being metaphorical? How could this be justified from Scripture?

Whidden continued

"Can one really say that the Bible writers meant such expressions as "the only true God" and "one God, the Father" to exclude the full deity of the Son, Christ Jesus?" (*Ibid*)

This is another very strange thing to say. This is because it was not a Bible writer who coined the phrase "the only true God". It was Jesus. These were the actual words spoken by Him when He prayed to His Father.

"And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. John 17:3

Whidden is suggesting here that if the words of Jesus are taken literally, it denies "the full deity of the Son". We must ask therefore: was Jesus denying His full deity when He offered up this prayer to His Father? On the other hand it must be asked, is it really necessary to ask such a question as this in the first place let alone answer it?

Within Seventh-day Adventism today, this same 'metaphorical sonship' idea is still being promoted.

In the November 2015 issue of the 'Adventist World' (which is described as 'The International Paper for Seventh-day Adventists') there is an article that carries the title 'A question of Sonship'. Angel Manuel Rodríguez wrote the article. He was once director of the Seventh-day Adventist Biblical Research Institute. He was attempting to answer the question: - "What does the Bible mean when it refers to Jesus as "the Son of God"?"

From the beginning of his article to the end, Rodríguez promotes the idea that Christ is not really a Son. In his article he made the following statements (please note they are not contiguous)

"The metaphor of sonship means that although Christ and the Father have the same nature, they are different persons, implying a plurality of persons within the Godhead." (*Angel Manuel Rodríguez, Adventist World, November 2015, page 42, 'A Question of Sonship'*)

"We are dealing with a metaphorical use of the word "son". (*Ibid*)

"The metaphor [father-son] is therefore a good symbol for the deep unity that exists within the members of the Godhead (John 17:5) (*Ibid*)

"...the father-son image cannot be literally applied to the divine Father-Son relationship within the Godhead. The Son is not the natural, literal Son of the Father." (*Ibid*)

"The term "Son" is used metaphorically when applied to the Godhead. It conveys the ideas of distinction of persons within the Godhead and the equality of nature in the context of an eternal, loving relationship." (*Ibid*)

If the latter is true, then why is the Holy Spirit called the Holy Spirit? The above reasoning again brings us back to the role-playing idea.

Almost 9 years ago in our Sabbath School lesson studies, the end result of this role-playing reasoning was seen. It was said

"But imagine a situation in which the Being we have **come to know** as God the Father came to die for us, and the One we have **come to know** as Jesus stayed back in heaven (we are speaking in human terms to make a point)." (*Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath School Quarterly, page 19, Thursday April 10th 2008, 'The Mystery of His Deity'*)

This again is the role-playing idea that is taught today by the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It teaches that the Father is not really a father, the Son is not really a son and the Holy Spirit is not really a holy spirit. They are just said to be three (otherwise) nameless divine persons (A, B and C) who, in order to accomplish the plan of salvation, chose to role-play (act out) these various parts. This is why the study concluded

"Nothing would have changed, except that we would have been calling Each by the name we now use for the Other. That is what equality in the Deity means." (*Ibid*)

Seventh-day Adventist ministers, also Sabbath School teachers, taught this role-playing theology to those who attended Sabbath School.

The belief that Christ is not begotten of God (therefore He is not really the Son of God) can be found in various current Seventh-day Adventist publications. Take for example the much-publicised book 'Understanding the Trinity' authored by Max Hatton. Hatton is a retired Seventh-day Adventist minister living in Australia, He too maintains that the Father and Son relationship in the Godhead should only be understood in a metaphorical sense (see page 97).

In the official Seventh-day Adventist Handbook of theology (the 12th Volume of the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopaedia) the very same sentiments are expressed. In opposition to what was said by Ellen White (see above), Fernando Canale says there is nothing in Scripture to support the idea that Christ is begotten of God (see pages 124-126).

This teaching therefore (that Christ is not truly the Son of God) has now become the current official theology of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It is this theology that is taught today from our pulpits, also in our publications, including in our Sabbath School lesson studies. It is also taught to the children of Seventh-day Adventist parents.

It can confidently be predicted therefore that unless steps are taken to counteract this current trend, the next generation of Seventh-day Adventists will also be teaching the same to their children (that Christ is not really the Son of God). This means too that these children will be taught to reject what God has so clearly revealed through the spirit of prophecy. This is the current situation within Seventh-day Adventism.

The reason why this role-playing idea has come about is because of the adoption of trinitarian reasoning. It is no wonder that J. N. Andrews, one of the foremost pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism, said of the trinity doctrine

“This doctrine destroys the personality of God and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. The infamous, measures by which it was forced upon the church which appear upon the pages of ecclesiastical history might well cause every believer in that doctrine to blush.” (J. N. Andrews, Review and Herald, March 6th 1855, ‘The Fall of Babylon’)

Who can argue with this reasoning?

In conclusion

After reading the above, we can now see why William Johnsson wrote in the Review in 1994

“Adventists beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of present truth. Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Saviour and Lord.” (William Johnsson, Adventist Review, January 6th 1994, Article ‘Present Truth - Walking in God’s Light’)

As we also noted above, Johnsson went on to say concerning our past belief that Christ really is the divine Son of God (begotten of God in eternity)

“Only gradually did this false doctrine give way to the Biblical truth, and largely under the impact of Ellen Whites writings in statements such as “In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived. (Desire of ages p 530)” (Ibid)

This is the denial that Christ really is the Son of God. Today as a church we teach that Christ is only role-playing the part of a son. This role-playing therefore, according to Johnsson, is “present truth” and “Biblical truth” but where in Scripture or in the spirit of prophecy can we find support or justification for such an idea? I cannot find it.

Johnsson is saying of course that what the Seventh-day Adventist Church taught about Christ during the time of Ellen White's ministry is “false doctrine”. This, as I think you will agree, is quite a claim – especially as she said that what we were teaching then is the truth. We need to ask therefore, who is telling the truth? Is it the present Seventh-day Adventist Church (with their role-playing Godhead) or is it Ellen White and the past Seventh-day Adventists who said that Christ really is the divine Son of God? Needless to say, both cannot be correct.

You have seen the options. The choice is yours. Who do you believe is telling the truth?

Terry Hill

First issued 31st January 2017

Last edited 16th January 2021

Website: <http://theprophetstillspeaks.co.uk>

© Terry Hill 2017