“I Hurt So Bad Because I Miss My Boyfriend”

I have been going out with my boyfriend for a year now, I love him so much and there is no doubt he loves me. I always want to be with him but it’s not possible at the moment because we are far from each other. I am at university in another country so we only communicate through the phone and emails. We are both devorted Christians, we love God and we comfort each other knowing that God has a purpose and plan for our relationship even as we long to be together.

My problem is I think about him a lot, I think about him sexually also. I long to be with him everyday and I tell him this. I dream of us being intimate, I pray about this and ask God for guidance. I love him so much and there is nothing in the world that I would want right now except to be with him. We are hoping to get married next year when I finish my studies but the thing is it’s hard for me now, I just want to be with him. It hurts me worse when I see other people spending time with their loved ones, it makes me feel so lonely and I start thinking of the warm feeling that he makes me feel when I am with him.

I completely understand! My husband just returned from a missions trip out of the country for two weeks and I missed him so much I could practically TASTE it!

What you have isn’t so much a problem as it is a painful condition of being separated. Your longing to be with him in every possible way is part of love. I would like to suggest that you turn your emotional energies (and you have a LOT of those for him, right?) from painful feelings into constructive prayer. Every time you find yourself missing him and longing for him, pray for him. There are many scripture prayers you can pray, and I think you would find it very helpful to make a

special prayer journal into which you copy scripture that you turn into prayer for him. For example, consider Eph.1:15-19–

> *15 For this reason I too, having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which exists among you and your love for all the saints,*
> *16 do not cease giving thanks for you, while making mention of you in my prayers;*
> *17 that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give to you a spirit of wisdom and of revelation in the knowledge of Him.*
> *18 I pray that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened, so that you will know what is the hope of His calling, what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints,*
> *19 and what is the surpassing greatness of His power toward us who believe.*

You can turn it into a prayer:

"I do not cease giving thanks for _____, while making mention of him in my prayers; that You, Father, the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give to him a spirit of wisdom and of revelation in the knowledge of You. I pray that the eyes of his heart may be enlightened, so that he will know what is the hope of Your calling, what are the riches of the glory of Your inheritance in the saints, and what is the surpassing greatness of Your power toward us who believe."

You can use this time of separation to "log in" hundreds and hundreds of scripture prayers for your beloved, which you can read from your journal (even if it's a collection of index cards) as prayers as you add to them.

Here is a web page to give you a head start on coming up with some great scripture prayers:
http://www.believers.org/believe/bel117.htm

I hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin

“So Are All Women Pastors Deceived and Going to Hell?”

Dear Sue,

I really have to write you this. I met you at the Mind Games conference in Fall 2004 at my university and asked about the role of women in the pastorate. You gave a convincing view from the Scriptures that women are not allowed in the office of pastor. Even when I asked when a husband and wife team found a church and the Husband serves as Senior Pastor and the Wife as Co-Pastor, you said without apprehension “They are well meaning people, but they are deceived.” Honestly I could just cry in my soul. “Deceived” meaning that Satan the deceiver purposely deceived these people to start a church to carry on the mission of Jesus Christ and go out into the world and save those who are lost and edify the Church? I cannot fathom this is going on between Bible-believing Christians (or so they say) about saving souls and ministering to the Body of Christ. I do believe in the complementary natures of male and female, males serving as the primary heads of their families.

Maybe I come from another perspective, being raised where women did serve in ordained ministry. As I read on more of this, I read that various evangelical denominations (who do believe male and females are complementarily created, who oppose the ordination of homosexuals, same-sex marriages and abortions) for over a century have had women serve in ordained ministry.

What is the divine judgment of this: Will these “deceived”

people inherit the kingdom of God or go to hell? Only "complementarians" will be saved? What? I don't get it! Clear this up for me because souls depend on it!!

I am so sorry that my comments have caused you such grief. Had I known your question came from your heart and not just your head I'm sure I wouldn't have responded so cavalierly.

I would gently suggest that you are making an unwarranted jump of logic here:

> *"Deceived" meaning that Satan the deceiver purposely deceived these people to start a church to carry on the mission of Jesus Christ and go out into the world and save those who are lost and edify the Church?*

No, starting a church and saving the lost is not the same thing as installing a woman as pastor and leader in a church. "Deceived" meaning, convincing oneself that the end justifies the means. That even though God says in His word, "I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man" (1 Tim 2:12), somehow it's OK for a woman to be in pastoral authority over men in the congregation. I believe that God calls people to start churches all the time, to carry on the mission of Jesus Christ and bring the gospel message to the lost and edify the church—but only within the limitations He has set up according to His design for men and women. I can see that God would call a couple to start a church, but there's a big difference between working as a team to plant a church with the wife supporting her husband and contributing her gifts to the church, and the wife being a co-pastor. (Unless her pastoring [shepherding] is limited to women and children.)

As I have thought about your e-mail, I was reminded of Sarah, who believed that God was going to fulfill His promise of a son, but decided to help God out by doing things HER way. . . and the world's been dealing with the complication of Ishmael

ever since. She was right to believe God for a miracle son, but she was wrong to go about it in the flesh. Women pastors are right to believe that God wants to do wonderful, marvelous things to build His kingdom, but wrong to go against and beyond His restrictions in the Word.

I don't believe women being pastors is a salvation matter. It's an obedience issue. I know these women say, "But God called me to this position," and my response can only be, "God would not call you to something He has restricted to men in the Word." They are mistaken in how they walk out their calling. I know God calls women to shepherding ministry all the time; in fact, one of my spiritual gifts is pastor-teacher. But that means I am called to minister to women (and children would be OK too but that's not where God called me), not be in any kind of teaching position or authority position over men.

Does this help explain my position more?

Blessings,

Sue

P.S. Something God showed me last year about a big reason women are not to be pastors is Eph. 3:14-15

> *For this reason I bow my knees before the Father,*
> *from whom every family in heaven and on earth derives its name*

A much better translation of "family" is "the lineage descending from a common father" or "fatherhood." (The Greek word is *patria*, which is closely related to the word *pater* [father].) Male leadership and headship is an earthly manifestation of our heavenly Father's role of leader, protector, and provider toward all of us, and women pastors cannot reflect the fatherhood aspect of God. This is a minor,

but nevertheless important, supporting reason for God's restriction on women from having positions of leadership over men. It's backwards.

Dear Sue,

I thank you for responding to the letter. It seems that "women CANNOT hold authority over men" sounds like a Universal Truth about women, therefore a bit contradictory. Why can women hold postions of civil authority and professional authority over men but not in the church. Doesn't the "order of creation" come to play in every facet of life on this side of glory? Women SHOULD not hold positions of authority over men in any shape form, or fashion if this is a UNIVERSAL TRUTH. For instance, a woman is president of a Fortune 500 company and "exercises authority" over five thousand men in her company. Why is that God, who in your position retricts pastoral authority to men, give Deborah, Huldah, Miriam, spiritual authority as prophetess. Yes, they were not in the priesthood which was restricted to men. But they were not called to be priests, but prophets. The old priesthood was done away with when Christ went to a cross. And how is that the gift of PASTOR is separated from the office of PASTOR? God's Word is spirit and life (Jn 6:63). What difference is the sermon if it comes out of the mouth of a man or a woman if it is thus saith the Lord, not Rev. Billy or Rev. Joan? God's Words have no gender distinction. Please explain.

> *Why can women hold positions of civil authority and professional authority over men but not in the church.*

Civil authority and professional authority are of the world; ecclesiastical authority is of the church. Two different realms.

> *Doesn't the "order of creation" come to play in every facet of life on this side of glory? Women SHOULD not hold positions of authority over men in any shape form, or fashion*

> *if this is a UNIVERSAL TRUTH. For instance, a women is president of a fortune five hundred company and "exercises authority" over five thousand men in her company.*

I would respectfully suggest that things work better if women do not hold positions of authority over men, even in the world.

> *Why is that God, who in your position retricts pastoral authority to men, give Deborah, Huldah, Miriam, spiritual authority as prophetess.*

To be a prophetess is to offer the words of God to His people, but there is no authority inherent in the position. There are many places for women to serve in the body of Christ, and prophetess was/is one of them. As webservant for Probe Ministries, I send out e-mails informing people of new files on our website, offering the words of Probe to people in effect, but I have no authority over anyone either.

> *Yes, they were not in the priesthood which was restricted to men. But they were not called to be priests, but prophets. The old priesthood was done away with when Christ went to a cross. And how is that the gift of PASTOR is separated from the office of PASTOR?*

Because all of God's people need to be shepherded. Women are excellent at shepherding other women and children (a VERY powerful position of service!!) and we are called to do exactly that in Titus 2. There is a distinction between the gift of shepherding and the office of shepherding because God's way is to put men in positions of spiritual authority, so only men should have the office of shepherding.

> *God's Word is spirit and life (Jn 6:63). What difference is the sermon if it comes out of the mouth of a man or a woman if it is thus saith the Lord, not Rev. Billy or Rev. Joan?*

God's Words has no gender distinction. Please explain.

God's Word DOES have a gender distinction when it comes to how things work in the church. We can't get around "I do not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man." We can't get around the requirements for elder as being HUSBAND of one wife, which is a very definite gender distinction. We can't get around the fact that Jesus chose 12 men as His apostles and leaders of His church, even though there were women who traveled with them and ministered to them in a service capacity.

There is also a difference between a person standing up reading scripture, which I would argue is open to both genders in a worship service, and a person standing up preaching a sermon, which is far more than simply reading scripture ("Thus saith the Lord.") A preacher is making statements about God and about the meaning of His word from a position of authority. God says only men belong in that position.

I understand the sweetness and compassion of your heart that wants women to have as much spiritual power and access to people as possible, and bless you for it, but what do you do with the Biblical restrictions of women in positions of spiritual authority? How do you deal with 1 Tim. 2:12-3:7?

Dear Sue,

God bless you for your wisdom and conviction!! I totally admire that!! I guess there will be these FIERY (hopefully loving and prayerful) discussions within the Body of Christ til our Master comes back for His children. And in that day He will not come back for complementarians or egalitarians, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, or Pentecostal-Charismatics. He's coming back for us! And joyfully all of his children will be on one accord. Because in its totality, ministry of any form is not about our self-promotion, or egos. It's about Him. And the fact that we can agree to disagree on

the hermeneutics of the Scriptures without bashing each other because we want to serve our God in our total capacities (however we may view them!) is really evident that we do care for our brothers and sisters in Christ, and how we don't want to marginalize them because some in Church History have abused their authority and opressed, repressed, and suppressed the voices of God's daughters for their own gain. And let just say that, you may not hold an OFFICE Mrs. Bohlin, you surely have a PASTOR's heart (for women anyway)!!!

May God Richly Bless You and Yours,

_____

© 2005 Probe Ministries

See Also:

- **Feminism**

Probe Answers Our E-Mail:

- "Should Women Be Pastors?"
- "I Have Some Questions About Women in the Church"
- "Your Position Against Women Pastors Is Outdated"

"Did Christ HAVE to be Deity?"

Greetings Don,

I came across your website article concerning the deity of Christ and thought I would respond. if you have the time and

interest, please entertain some of my thoughts and get back with me if time allows. My questions surround the topic of the necessity of Christ being deity. I accept that He is, but wonder if He MUST be for both the atonement and eternal salvation. What I would like to do is copy the text from my interaction with a good friend yesterday. That way I won't have to rewrite our dialogue. When you have time, please interject if you would. WB is my good friend, a pastor. I am DB.

WB: Your questions about Christ's deity in regards to salvation do sound like the JWs. "God can do it anyway he so pleases" (even Calvin suggests this as well). If God wanted, he could have made a world without the possibility for sin as well. He can do it any way he pleases, but he has reasons for doing it the way he does.

DB: Yes, he does. But as God, he could do it any number of ways. If you hold to the middle/knowledge position, you would have to agree to this idea, and the idea that he chose the best possible way to redeem mankind. That, in-and-of-itself, doesn't demand that Christ be deity.

WB: The early church fathers reasoned (there, I used the dirty word "reason") that Christ had to be God for our salvation to be effectual. You have heard it before, even from me. Be patient as I explain it again. If I sin against you, how long does the sin remain? Answer: until you forgive me or until you die. Even if I die first, the sin remains as an offense against you.

DB: No problems here at all. I agree wholeheartedly.

WB: If I sin against God, how long does the sin remain? Until he forgives me or until he dies. Since he does not die, and is an infinite being, then the sin is eternal: actually, my sin against him becomes an infinite offense. Now: how can an infinite transgression be forgiven? (I hope we don't have to

revisit justification in all of this). Only an infinite being can pay for an infinite sin – only an infinite being can absorb an infinite curse and satisfy the infinite penalty of an infinite crime. Only an infinite being can bear an infinite wrath. If Jesus was a man, his death would have no efficacy.

DB: Here's where questions arise on my part. I agree that my sin is an infinite offense against God. Actually, God is eternal and infinite and we are neither (in the absolute definitions of those terms—i.e. "immeasurable or without beginning or end"). Hence, maybe there is some reservation on my part to claim I, a finite being, can commit an infinite act. I suppose since we live forever (in glory or judgment), our sins remain always or are cleansed and forgiven always; hence, they are infinite or erased. All that being said (I'm typing out my thoughts), I don't feel it requires that Christ must be deity to be a sufficient sacrifice for my sins. What is required is a perfect sacrifice. If Christ was a created being, one who was higher than angels and who took on the form of man, lived a perfect, sinless life with free will (like Satan but succeeding), his sacrifice would be sufficient. I don't understand how, using reason, it would not. Like us, he would have had a beginning. Like us, free will. Unlike Adam, he did not sin (even if he could have—if he was not deity, this would give even more credence to the example that even though he was a man, he did not sin vs. our position as Trinitarians). As he was sinless, created or not, his perfect example and sacrifice would be sufficient. It seems that if there coexisted TWO forms of deity at the same time, and it was possible for them to sin against each other as does man, then a mediator, who would then have to be deity, would be required. To require deity to be sacrificed for the sins of finite man seems overkill and doesn't pan out in my mind as reasonable. It's certainly plausible, but I don't see how it has to be. Please correct me here. If God requires a perfect sacrifice, Jesus would have been a sufficient sacrifice if God said he was having lived a perfect life (as a perfect man or

perfect Adam).

WB: The applicability of Christ's atoning work to us as human beings depends upon the reality of his humanity.

DB: Absolutely.

WB: The efficacy depends upon the genuineness and completeness of his deity. DB: Not if God only requires a perfect, sinless sacrifice vs. the sacrifice of a deity. I still fail to understand why reason disallows this. It seems to me we are predisposed to this position to embrace our view of the trinity vs. the other way around. Reason, in my mind, doesn't exclude this argument.

WB: The JWs reject this saying that God can do anything he pleases. Okay, why didn't he just let a muskrat die for our sins then? The beauty of the cross is not that we have been redeemed, but that the eternal Holy God was willing to undergo the kenosis (humiliation from glory to earth to servant to criminal to death to tomb).

DB: I agree—that is the beauty of the cross. But if God created for himself a son with free will (much like Satan—and NO, I don't think they were brothers!!!) to be a sacrifice for a lower mankind who despises them both and who hates them, then his suffering and sacrifice on our part for the love of his father, who he could disobey at will, is a lovely story as well. That's just as moving in my mind. If he was deity and couldn't sin (if he was impeccable), we can only glory in his suffering, not his resistance to sin. Again, reason warrants that conclusion.

WB: This reveals God. And it is this that is the centerpiece of the Christian faith (our salvation was the result, and the reason, but the emphasis is on the grand mystery of God himself. (How boring it would be to send someone else to do his dirty work).

DB: I addressed this above.

Hello _____,

Thanks for your e-mail. Don is overwhelmed with other duties and asked me to respond in his place. I hope you understand.

Since you claim to accept the doctrine of Christ's deity, I will simply assume this is a belief we share. Thus, rather than offering any arguments for this important doctrine, I will simply assume it is true for the purpose of this response.

Let me make just a few points by way of introduction. First, I think you raise an important issue that needs to be carefully considered and discussed. Second, I will have to reply in a somewhat abbreviated fashion, merely outlining what I consider to be some important points. Third, at the time of this writing, I freely admit that I CANNOT offer a conclusive argument that it was necessary for Christ to be God in order to provide an acceptable atonement for the sins of man. However, I want to offer a cumulative case for this position which I think is nonetheless compelling. This will involve both a response to some of your statements, as well as a brief, positive presentation of some evidence which I think makes it at least highly probable that Christ would indeed have to be God to provide an acceptable atonement for our sins. Finally, I offer these thoughts for your consideration since you wrote to Probe requesting a response. Although I have to reply rather quickly because of many other pressing duties, I am also offering a tolerably thoughtful response that I ask you to read carefully.

Please allow me to focus on your statements beginning with the remark, "Here's where questions arise on my part." You state:

> *"I don't feel it requires that Christ must be deity to be a sufficient sacrifice for my sins. What is required is a perfect sacrifice. If Christ was a created being, one who was*

> *higher than angels and who took on the form of man, lived a perfect, sinless life with free will (like Satan but succeeding), his sacrifice would be sufficient. I don't understand how, using reason, it would not."*

I wonder HOW you actually KNOW this to be true? Granted, you MAY be right. But HOW do you really KNOW? I note that you appeal to "reason" – a faculty for which I too have great respect – but it's important to remember that reason, like ALL of man's faculties, is fallen. This remark is not intended to denigrate reason. But it's common knowledge that man often makes errors in reasoning about all sorts of things. Not only that, we often begin our reasoning from false presuppositions, which often results in correctly reasoning to false conclusions. Finally, we almost never have all the essential information which we would need to reason to the right answer – even if we didn't continually commit errors in our reasoning.

I would argue that the question of whether or not it was necessary for Christ to be God in order to provide an acceptable atonement for the sins of man is the sort of question about which it would be quite easy to reason incorrectly. I would also argue that YOU BEAR THE BURDEN OF PROOF here. This is so for the simple reason that Christ was in fact God (as you admit), and the Father did in fact send His Son to be "the propitiation for our sins" (1 JN. 2:2). Since God is a rational moral agent, it seems fair to assume that He had some good reason for actually doing things as He did. Not only this, I think it's fair to ask whether God would have sent His only Son as the sacrifice for our sins if He could have achieved this end in some other way. It is at least odd that God would have sent His only Son to do what a morally perfect creature could just as easily have accomplished. Since God did in fact send His Son, however, you clearly bear the burden of proof in demonstrating that this was, in fact, not necessary. I don't think you can do so. Hence, I think your

argument is ultimately unsuccessful.

Let me briefly illustrate this last point from a section of the dialogue between you and your friend:

> *WB: The applicability of Christ's atoning work to us as human beings depends upon the reality of his humanity. DB: Absolutely. WB: The efficacy depends upon the genuineness and completeness of his deity. DB: Not if God only requires a perfect, sinless sacrifice vs. the sacrifice of a deity. I still fail to understand why reason disallows this. It seems to me we are predisposed to this position to embrace our view of the trinity vs. the other way around. Reason, in my mind, doesn't exclude this argument."*

Concerning your final comments, I would agree that reason, in itself, doesn't necessarily exclude the possibility that God only requires a perfect, sinless sacrifice rather than a Divine one. But remember my comments on "reason" again. Just because human reason cannot exclude the possibility that you mention does not in any way prove that a Divine sacrifice was not necessary! And since you bear the burden of proof here, I must ask you HOW, specifically, you KNOW that God does NOT REQUIRE A DIVINE SACRIFICE? Since this is what God actually did, I would argue that it is more reasonable to believe it was necessary than that it was not. Admittedly, this does not PROVE my argument is true, but I do think it's more reasonable. And I am not obligated to assume the burden of proof here anyway.

I think you make an interesting, and potentially revealing, comment when you write:

> *"It seems that if there coexisted TWO forms of diety at the same time, and it was possible for them to sin against each other as does man, then a mediator, who would then have to be diety, would be required."*

Again, I wonder HOW you KNOW this? Why, specifically, would a Divine mediator be required? Certainly reason does not demand this! Why would any mediator "be required" at all? It's quite possible that the gods could mediate their own dispute, just as two men might do. It's also possible that a man, or a talking raccoon, could serve as a mediator. But here's what's interesting. If your logic is valid, and a god must mediate between gods, why would it not also follow that a God-Man must mediate between God and man?

But here's another point. The example of reconciling two gods likely involves the reconciliation of equals. But this is not the case when we consider the reconciliation of man to God. Here, the parties are NOT equal. God is the Creator, man is His creation. It seems at least reasonable to believe (and is in fact true, I think) that the Creator may have a particular character which requires that reconciliation be achieved ONLY through a means which is perfectly consistent with all His attributes. And this, of course, may radically limit the means by which such reconciliation can actually be achieved. Again, I personally think it would be odd for the Father to send His only Son to accomplish on behalf of man what a morally perfect creature was capable of. Indeed, you yourself confess:

> *"To require diety to be sacrificed for the sins of finite man seems overkill and doesn't pan out in my mind as reasonable. It's certainly plausible, but I don't see how it has to be."*

But since this is what God actually did, you bear the burden of proof in demonstrating that such a sacrifice was, in fact, overkill! Since God is a rational moral agent, it is at least reasonable to think that a Divine sacrifice may indeed have been NECESSARY. And if it was necessary it cannot, by definition, be overkill.

Let me conclude with two more observations. First, we both agree that Jesus was, in fact, the God-Man. I could easily

demonstrate from the Scriptures both that Jesus believed this of Himself and that His disciples believed it as well. But here's the point. Every time that Jesus, or one of His disciples, makes the claim that He is the ONLY way to God there is, at least potentially, an implicit argument that only a God-Man can reconcile man to God! I could quote many verses, but let me offer just a few. When Jesus says to Nicodemus, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so MUST THE SON OF MAN BE LIFTED UP; that whoever believes may in Him have eternal life" (JN. 3:14-15, emphasis mine), He is speaking as the God-Man. I admit that it is not necessary to interpret such a statement as requiring a Divine sacrifice, but it certainly has this potential – and that's something to think about. In other words, since Jesus is the God-Man, He could be implicitly understood as saying that ONLY such a One as He is capable of reconciling man to God. It's the same with many such statements of Jesus (e.g. JN. 14:6, etc.). And Jesus' disciples, who also believed in His deity, repeatedly claim that there is no other way for man to be reconciled to God. For example, in Acts 4:12 Peter declares, "And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men, by which we must be saved." Again, this does not PROVE that a Divine sacrifice was necessary (the burden is yours to show it was not), but it may certainly be read as implying its necessity.

Second, consider this. In Paul's famous verse on substitution, 2 Cor. 5:21, we read: "He (the Father) made Him (the Son) who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." Luther referred to this as the "Great Exchange." Christ takes our sin on Himself and gives us His righteousness in its place! Now an argument could be made that, in order to be acceptable to God, man must be clothed in His righteousness. If this is so, then it would seem to follow that a Divine substitute was not superfluous, but ESSENTIAL. For how could we become "the righteousness of God" in Christ, unless Christ was actually God? It's reasonable to believe He

could only give us God's righteousness if He was, in fact, God. And if such righteousness is essential for our reconciliation to God, then it follows that a Divine substitute would be necessary to achieve this goal. Again, I fully admit that this argument is NOT CONCLUSIVE—it is merely suggestive. But as I've said repeatedly (I'm sure you're sick of it!), you bear the burden of proof – not me. Thus, I think I've offered some good reasons to believe that a Divine sacrifice was indeed necessary and not overkill. I also think I've demonstrated that you're far from proving your own position (if in fact it's actually your position; I'm not saying it necessarily is).

Wishing you God's richest blessings,

Michael Gleghorn
Probe Ministries

"What About the Person Who Never Heard of Jesus?"

I have a question. I have a Jewish person asking me "What about the guy who lives in a far off place and has never heard the name of Jesus proclaimed—is he going to hell?" My immediate answer is that God finds a way to speak to your heart. Now, the Jews of the times of Abraham and Moses who believed in one God—after the cross I would say that John 3:16 holds true—but to a Jewish person who never looked at The New Testament—is there a sensitive yet clear and concise way to answer this?

I agree with you about God finding a way to speak to your heart.

We are now hearing many stories of people coming to faith in Christ as the result of a dream or vision where He appears to them, inviting them to trust in Him. This is particularly happening in the Muslim world. Many people instantly know it's the Lord Jesus when He appears to them, but some do not. In some dreams and visions, He tells them who He is, and in others He does not—He just loves them and calls them to come to Him. After the dream/vision, the Lord provides someone to identify Him as they continue to seek Him. (We see something similar in the story of Cornelius in Acts 10.)

So, from what I understand, people are putting their trust in Christ, but some don't know anything more about Him than that He is God, He loves them and He invites them to trust in Him. Two recurrent invitations continue to appear in the dreams and visions we are hearing about: 1) "I am the way, the truth and the life," and 2) "You belong to Me." As people are then able to get a copy of the Bible or talk to a Christian, their knowledge of Christ, the Cross, and the Christian life grows, as well as their faith and their understanding of who Jesus is and what He did.

For years, I have heard that God's only plan for evangelism is for us to share the gospel. But these stories show that sometimes, Jesus goes directly to a person. And, in Revelation 14:6, there is an angel who takes the gospel to men.

So what that means is that if a person has never heard of Jesus through the preaching of the gospel, that is no obstacle for God. He can, and testimony shows that He does, appear directly to—and call a person to—have faith in Him. We still need to diligently pursue the Great Commission and take the gospel to all nations, since evangelism through the changed lives of Christ-followers is still God's main plan. But God's hands are not tied by our inability (or laziness, or selfishness, or disobedience) to get the gospel to everyone He has chosen for eternal life.

Concerning your specific question about a Jewish person who never looked at the New Testament, it's possible he might be in the same category as people who never heard of Jesus. . . however, in today's Jewish culture, part of what defines a Jew is "not believing in Jesus." It's not a valid definition, and it's not true, but it's hard to imagine anyone growing up in a Jewish culture—particularly in North or South America—who wasn't aware of the Jesus of Christianity in the surrounding culture.

So, I think the bottom line is that God would judge a Jewish person by the same standard as anyone else: "What did you do with the light you received?"

Your Jewish friend asks an important question, and it gives you the opportunity to talk about the character of God. I am grateful that our God is not only just, but loving, and I believe that He will allow the blood of Jesus to cover those who had no chance to reject Him, such as babies who die before or after birth, or the mentally impaired.

God promises that if we seek Him, we will find Him (Deut. 4:29). And since dead people cannot seek God and cannot choose life, that means that it's all God's grace allowing us to recognize our need for Him and seek Him in the first place! I would think that this same heart that longs for us to turn to Him, and gives us grace to turn to Him and seek Him, would also respond in love to the cry of a heart that says, "God, if you are there, here I am! I don't know you, but I want to! Reveal Yourself to me!"

I hope this makes sense.

Sue Bohlin

See answers by
Kerby Anderson
and **GotQuestions.org**

“What Are Your Views on Hair Dyeing and Colored Contacts?”

I would like to know if there is anything in the Bible which would support my beliefs on hair dyeing, colored contacts, and anything else that goes along with unnatural changes. I believe that God made our hair color and eye color and everything else about us for a purpose and it’s not respectful to change it. Anyways, this really bothers me because it seems that everybody does it and I would really like some feedback. Also, is it even worth it to say anything about it or does it even matter?

If there is anything in the Bible about these things I am not aware of it. God gave us dominion over the earth and commanded Adam and Eve to subdue it and rule it, which is the foundational philosophy behind science and technology.

The more important issue, though, is the reasons people would do these things. As usual, it’s what’s in the heart, our motivations, that matter. Colored contacts are a function of technology, for instance, but there’s a big difference between donning a different eye color as a touch of whimsy and fun, or doing it as part of a scheme to change one’s appearance to avoid detection during a scam such as a bank robbery.

In terms of hair color, I think it’s worth noting that usually it’s women who color their hair, and why? Because we are both taught by the culture and we recognize instinctively that beauty and femininity go together, and making oneself as

beautiful as possible is part of the feminine heart. But again, the motivation makes a big difference: a woman can color her hair to "go out and get a man" instead of trusting God to make her attractive to HIS choice of a spouse. That is very different from the woman who colors her hair to keep her gray from being an obstacle in ministering to the audiences she has been called to speak to (because our culture unfortunately values younger-looking women, even women that everyone knows are over 50.) In that case, coloring her hair is her way of living out the apostle Paul's comment in 1 Cor. 9:22 that "I have become all things to all men so that by all possible means I might save some." These are very real scenarios: I'm thinking of two specific women who personally told me their vastly different reasons for coloring their hair.

So the motivation makes all the difference, and as is usually the case, we can't know what's going on in other people's hearts. So the better route, I think, is to just trust those decisions to the Lord and leave them there.

Sue Bohlin

P.S. For the record, my contacts are dyed light blue to make them easier to find when I drop them on the floor, and my "silvering" hair is coming in so beautifully I could never find a color that's better than this.

"Your Answer on Generational Curses Really Helped with our

Bipolar Daughter”

Actually, this is a thank-you email.

Our (adopted) daughter is only five years old, and has very obvious childhood-onset bipolar. Unfortunately, this is a new diagnosis among children, and many people refuse to believe that such young, innocent children’s lives could be affected by mental illness. Believe me, there is nobody who would want to believe that more than the children or the parents of the children who are suffering with these illnesses. But, unfortunately, they do exist. In fact, there is now PROOF that a dog that can sense-out a seizure just before it happens can also sense-out a bipolar episode. This is probably do to the nature of bipolar, as they now believe bipolar is a form of epilepsy.

Recently a Christian teacher asked me, “Could this be a generational curse? After all, God doesn’t want any of His children to suffer. We will definitely be praying for your daughter.” This got me thinking, and I ended up at your website reading the article “Could My Children’s Autism be the Result of a Generational Curse?” Boy, was I thankful to learn about what a generational curse really amounts to. Our daughter is on medication, and even that BARELY works.

Going to your website not only taught me about generational curses (enough to where now I can go back and speak with the woman more informatively!), but it also reminded me that this is NOT my fault. I tend to try to lay blame somewhere, and the best person to blame is myself. I can second-guess everything I’ve done “wrong,” imagined and perceived, and say that is why she is suffering. And believe me, she IS suffering, and doesn’t mind saying so! For several months, we lied to her and told her bipolar simply means you are very smart. I got tired of lying to her. Today I finally agreed with her, and said, You’re right. It IS a bad thing, but you can learn to live

with it. Either you can defeat it, or it can defeat you. If you want to NOT let it get the best of you, you have to work very hard at it, especially when you're older.

But we'll get through it together.

It's so hard, I just can't begin to tell you what it is like to deal with a mental illness, especially in such a young child. We love her with all our heart and might. She has shown us how to love unconditionally. Sometimes, though, it takes everything inside us to stay strong.

Thank you for explaining about generational curses, and the fact that sometimes an illness is an illness, not necessarily a sin.

Dear _____,

BLESS YOUR HEART!!!! I am so sorry to hear about this trial your family is going through, and will be for a very, very long time. Our pastor's young son was also diagnosed with BPD when he was even younger than your daughter. It makes for a living hell some days, doesn't it?

I am delighted that you were able to find this article and that it encouraged you. How unfortunate that the teacher has such a profound misunderstanding of God and the role of suffering in our lives. What do people do with verses such as 1 Peter 4:19, which talks about those who "suffer according to God's will"? I guess they skip over them.

Recently, I had the privilege of chatting with the pastor of Wedgwood Baptist Church in Fort Worth; you may remember that this was the church where a gunman murdered a number of students and staff at a "See You At The Pole" rally a few years ago. Dr. Al Meredith, who obviously knows something about suffering, suggested to me a wonderful book called *Don't Waste Your Sorrows* by Paul Billheimer, which I am in the process of reading right now. It's excellent, and I recommend

it to you in view of the suffering you are experiencing.

I would also like to suggest that you pass on the blessing to your daughter that you received in owning the truth that her CPD is not your fault; she is not too young for you to bless her with the truth that it is not HER fault, either. Often when children experience suffering of various types, they personalize it and believe that they did something to cause it. The fact that it's illogical doesn't stop them! The message of "It's not your fault" is a type of revelation; children usually cannot know or figure out this truth without someone else telling them. You just might relieve her of a terrible burden she could be carrying needlessly by sharing this wonderful freeing news with her.

I pray you and your family will know God's comfort and peace as you live out this challenge to His glory and your benefit.

Blessings,

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

Posted 2004

"Can a Book Like Conversations With God be Wholly True?"

Recently, I was at a bookstore and came upon *Conversations with God: An Uncommon Dialogue* by Neale Walsch. In perusing certain parts of the book, the question of the book's reliability came into mind. To put it concisely: Is there a

possibility that such a book, such a dialogue with God, could be wholly true? In the same way that God spoke to the authors of the various books of the Bible, could it not also be possible that God continues to speak to men so that His Word may be known and understood in these times? I find it hard to believe that God stopped talking to men two thousand years ago, thereby limiting the expression of His Word to a single book we call the Bible. Any clarification on this matter would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

To answer you concisely, as long as any book on the market contradicts the Bible at any point, it cannot be wholly true. The Bible is without error and can be trusted; it is our benchmark of what is true. If anything varies from what God has told us is true, it cannot be trusted. There have been a number of books purporting to be from God, among them the Qur'an, A Course in Miracles and Betty Eadie's *Embraced by the Light*, but since all of them contradict the Bible they cannot be from God. *Conversations with God* belongs in that category. It is a dangerous book.

I do believe (and experience) that God still speaks to us today, but when He does He will NEVER contradict what He's already said in His book. What we need to know is in there. If He didn't include it in the Bible, we don't need to know it.

A letter from a discerning believer is making the rounds on the internet, exposing further some of the dangers of this book:

> Two particular books, *Conversations with God* and *Conversations with God for Teens*, sound harmless enough by their titles alone. These books have been on the *New York Times* best sellers list for a number of weeks. These publications makes truth of the statement "Don't judge a book by its cover/title". The author purports to answer various questions from kids using the "voice of God." However, the "answers" that he gives are not biblically-

based and go against the very infallible word of God. For instance (and I paraphrase), when a girl asks the question "Why am I a lesbian?" His answer is that she was born that way because of genetics (just as you were born right-handed, with blue eyes, etc.). Then he tells her to go out and "celebrate" her differences. Another girl poses the question, "I am living with my boyfriend. My parents say that I should marry him because I am living in sin. Should I marry him?" "God's" supposedly reply is "Who are you sinning against? Not me, because you have done nothing wrong." Another question asks about God's forgiveness of sin. His reply: "I do not forgive anyone because there is nothing to forgive. There is no such thing as right or wrong and that is what I have been trying to tell everyone do not judge people. People have chosen to judge one another and this is wrong because the rule is 'judge not lest ye be judged.'" And the list goes on. Not only are these books the false doctrine of devils but in some instances even quote (in error) the Word of God. These books are being sold to school children (through The Scholastic Book Club) and we need to be aware of what is being fed to our children.

Conversations with God is a very unsafe book in anyone's hands.

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

© 2005 Probe Ministries

"Print the Truth About

Islam!”

I read your article A Short Look at Six World Religions. Why are you lying to people about Islam? The prophet Muhammad himself is quoted to have said to his followers that even he would not enter paradise without the mercy of Allah, and the prophets were all free of any kind of sin. The word is composed of the Arabic words “Al” meaning “the” and “ilah” meaning “God.” The word “Allah” means “the God,” “the Creator,” the only one worthy of worship. Who can help you except for the one who created the heavens and the earth? Who can hurt you except for the one who created the heavens and the earth? When Jesus, whom we love as one of our prophets known to us and Isa bin Maryam, Jesus the son of Mary was on the earth, drinking God’s water and breathing God’s air, who could have stopped God had He decided to destroy the earth including Jesus? Don’t mix the creation and the Creator. Even the Christians cannot deny the singular power of Allah when they claim that He came in the form of Jesus (May Allah protect us from worshipping any figure of creation) Allah is one in control of everything. That belief may seem logical, but it is not a product of anybody’s mind because the mind cannot create a reality that already exists. The identity of God for the creation is that of the creator. How can Allah be seen as distant when according to Islam, He is closer to you than your own jugular vein? Allah is said to have 70 times the love for His creation that a mother has for her child.

I am a white American and I am pleading to you out of brotherly love for you and the people you reach to get your facts straight and print the truth about Islam. Allah loves the believers who when they do wrong, they turn to Him in repentance, yet we all know that Allah does not like lying. The Word Islam means “submission.” The way of all the prophets was submission to God. Noah (Nuh) preached submission to Allah, Moses (Musa) preached submission to Allah, and Jesus

(Isa) preached submission to Allah and all other of the 124,000 or more prophets between Adam and Muhammad came with submission to Allah. To become Muslim, we say "La ilaha il lala Muhammad ur-rasululah mean that "There is none worthy of worship except Allah and Muhammad is his final messenger." Please come to Islam.

I think perhaps as a white American, you are infusing your understanding of Islam with concepts about the biblical God. In effect, you are borrowing aspects of the God of the Bible and applying them to Allah. Noah, Moses and Jesus did not preach submission to Allah; they preached about a RELATIONSHIP with Yahweh, who is not the same as Allah.

I am not lying to anyone about Islam. I think perhaps you are mistaken about both what I said and the nature of the one true God, whose name is "I AM," and Who has also revealed Himself to be the loving Daddy (Abba) who is full of grace and truth. There is no grace in Allah. There is only the legalism of submission without personal intimacy.

You pleaded with me to come to Islam. I plead with you, please come to a PERSON—Jesus. He IS true Christianity.

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

"My Boyfriend is Muslim"

My best friend/boyfriend is Muslim. I have been brought up in a very Christian oriented family and have faith through Jesus Christ. My friend, has been attending church with me and at first was receptive to Christianity as he was overwhelmed with the amount of love in the church. He is very educated and does

a lot of reading. He has read several books about Christianity many of them pointing out flaws in the religion. And at the same time is searching to find out if Islam is right. As of now he is content that Islam is right due to its proofs through sciences. Are there any books that go through Koran or talk about who Muhammed really was that will help him to find the Lord? Also, what are good Christian books that I can point him to that would give him EVIDENCE – in Christianity.

First of all, let me encourage you that NOTHING you do or say will be as effective as your prayers on your boyfriend's behalf. That's where the real power is, OK?

Secondly, check out the website "Answering Islam," www.answering-islam.org . . . They really understand the different worldviews.

Third, I can't recommend strongly enough Lee Strobel's excellent books *The Case for Faith* and *The Case for Christ*. Mr. Strobel was a hardened atheist journalist who talked to a number of intelligent, articulate Christians who were able to "give an answer for the hope that is within," and he came to faith. Wonderful, wonderful books, but be sure to read them first so you can talk intelligently with your boyfriend.

Fourth, I say this as a Titus 2 woman (where God instructs the older women to teach the younger)—DON'T MARRY HIM! Scripture is very strong about believers not marrying unbelievers. I send this with a prayer that you will guard your heart and your sexual purity so that you do not find yourself so soul-connected to him that you feel you have to marry him to make things right. It's entirely possible that God wants to use you to draw your boyfriend to Himself, but don't cross over any lines that would compromise your obedience to God's best as revealed in His word, OK? (I say this as a mom who just saw my son marry a wonderful Christian girl who was worth waiting for and fighting the temptation to settle for less than God's best.)

So glad you wrote!!

Blessings,

Sue Bohlin
Probe Ministries

“Scriptures That Prove Trinitarians Wrong”

I dare you to put this on your website!

As I see it, I could write thousands of words to try and prove a Trinitarian wrong. The reason I say this is because the Trinity belief changes depending on which Trinitarian you talk to. There exist hundreds of Trinity-teaching churches, all of which have different interpretations of what the Trinity is or is not. I have heard that Jesus was a Man-God, despite the scriptural reference that no man has ever seen God. I have heard that they (God the Father and Jesus) are the same, but NOT the same..????

In actuality, there is no clear-cut description of the Trinity Doctrine. It itself is written in such a way that you could come up with literally hundreds of combinations to make it work. And believe me, that has been done. Catholics, Mormons, Prodestants, Lutherans and countless other religions have their own interpretations of the Trinity teaching. How can that teaching be right if all these differing opinions exist on its meaning? Is not at least ONE of them absolutely right?

Here are a few points of view that should inspire any honest-hearted, truth-seeking person to carefully examine in an

effort to shed light upon this teaching. Please keep in mind that the earliest DOCUMENTED proof of the Trinity teaching dates back to the Nicene Creed, a government-sanctioned document the purpose of which was to unify a splitting house of worship…notedly, the Roman Catholic Church. All other reports are speculation as to the meaning of certain author's beliefs. All pre-Nicene opinions that I am aware of (not saying that I am familiar with them all) are from "fathers" of the Roman Catholic Church. It was the Nicene Creed that for the first time put it into an official, chuch stand.

All scripture quoted is from the New Internation Version of the Holy Scriptures. I invite you to read your own version of the Bible to compare to these quotes.

JESUS IS AN EQUAL PART OF THE GODHEAD

2 Peter 1:17 : "For he received honor and glory from the Father when the voice came to him from the Majestic Glory saying, "This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased." This scripture not only tells where Jesus' glory came from, but also when…and it is critical. Jesus did not possess any glory on his own, it was given by the Father to him when he was 30 years old in front of witnesses at Jesus' baptism. If he was deity in his own right, he would not have needed the Father to give glory to him, nor would he have had to wait until his baptism to receive it. Here, it is stressed in the scriptures that Jesus is God's SON, not God himself. This points to Jesus' subordinate place along the side of his Father. It is therefore reasonable to deduce that they are NOT equal.

John 14:28: "You heard me say 'I am going away and I am coming back to you.' If you loved me, you would be glad that I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I." Jesus here points out in no uncertain terms that he and the Father are not equal. In contrast to other scriptures that only insinuate a point, this scripture is direct in nature and

states very clearly that the Father is greater than Jesus. They are NOT equal!

Philippians 2:9-11 "Therefore God exalted him to the highest place and gave him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of the Father."

God did the exalting and did so to his OWN glory. This entire passage speaks to God's sole authority to do what He wants, in this case exalting His own Son. Jesus is NOT the exalt-ER, but the exalt-EE. One cannot exalt another unless there is superior position, rank or authority. Jesus is clearly the lesser of the two.

1 Corinthians 15:25-28: (speaking of Jesus) "For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For he 'has put everything under his feet'. Now when it says that 'everything' has been put under him, it is clear that this does not include God Himself, who put everything under Christ. When he has done this, then the Son himself will be made subject to him that put everything under him, so that God may be all in all." Can a logical person even conceive that these two, God the Father and his Son, Jesus are equal from this scripture? This is one of the most direct passages describing their relationship in terms of rank, or position. Any part of the Godhead described by most Trinitarians is equal to the power of the other. This directly rejects that teaching. Here, in these verses, it is crystal clear who has the authority and who has been given authority. They CANNOT be equal.

JESUS IS ALL-KNOWING, AND THEREFORE IS GOD

Matthew 24:36, Jesus speaking: "No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father." While Jesus was certainly blessed by God with

extraordinary powers, the claim that Jesus is all knowing is completely and utterly denied by Jesus' own words here. Jesus does not know the hour in which the actual end will take place. If he were God, he most certainly would know for it is his (God's) master plan. There exists no scripture, let alone Jesus' own words, that says he is all-knowing. Some apostles asked Jesus that, since he knew all things, would he please explain this or that…but to claim that these scriptures say Jesus knows all would be in direct conflict with Jesus' words here. We know it has to be one way or the other, so which is it? For me personally, I will trust in Jesus' words that he does NOT know the hour of the coming of the end and therefore does not know all things.

[Note:. . .And six pages of verses and commentary from Revelation edited]

Thank you for your response and I will enjoy putting this on our web site. I can tell you are zealous in what you believe and I sense a strong disdain towards those who differ from you. I am sorry that with my heavy schedule I cannot address all your points but let me address just a few. Your response is typical of JW's who have misunderstood the doctrine of the Trinity and have used Bible verses out of context.

Let's take a look at a few.

The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that there is one God who has revealed Himself in three distinct persons all are equal in nature. They are distinct in person. The Father is not the Son. The Son is not the Holy Spirit. One God revealed in three distinct persons. JW's mislead people when they say the trinity teaches Jesus and the Father are one in the same person. They are distinct in person, but equal in nature.

In regard to the passage from John 6:46 states, "No man has seen God…" you interpret this to mean no man has ever seen God at all. Let's take a look at some passages and see if this is

the case. Isaiah 6 states, “In the year King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord seated on the throne, high and exalted….” Isaiah appears to have seen the Lord. In Exodus 3, Moses speaks with God at the burning bush. Deuteronomy 34:10 states, “Since then, no prophet has risen in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face.” There are other passages where men have seen and spoken with God. So what John 6:46 is saying is, no one has seen God in His full glory. That no one could withstand. However, God has revealed Himself in veiled form, which we could see and withstand. Jesus is God the Son veiled in flesh. Philippians 2 if you read the entire passage states, that Jesus emptied himself or made himself nothing. He temporarily clothed himself in flesh and revealed himself to us. Later in Revelation 1, we see Jesus in glory.

The allegation that the Trinity was not taught until the Nicene council is incorrect. The Watchtower printed this in their magazine ‘Should You Believe in the Trinity.” There they quote pre-Nicene fathers as rejecting the Trinity. One interesting note, the Watchtower does not footnote any of it’s references. They use endless dots …. why are there no footnotes or references pointing to the exact location of these quotes. Typical Watchtower deception. In my article on the Probe web site called “Why You should Believe in the Trinity,” I quote several pre Nicene church fathers and give the exact reference. Here are a few the Watchtower misquoted.

Justin Martyr (165 A.D.): “…the Father of the universe has a Son; who being the logos and First-begotten is also God” (First Apology 63:15).

Irenaeus (200 A.D.) : (referencing Jesus) “…in order that to Christ Jesus, our Lord, and God, and Savior, and King, according to the will of the invisible Father, . . .” (Against Heresies I, x, 1).

Clement of Alexandria (215 A.D.): “Both as God and as man, the Lord renders us every kind of help and service. As God He

forgives sin, as man He educates us to avoid sin completely" (Christ the Educator, chapter 3.1). In addition, "Our educator, O children, resembles His Father, God, whose son He is. He is without sin, without blame, without passion of soul, God immaculate in form of man accomplishing His Father's will" (Christ the Educator Chapter 2:4).

Tertullian (230 A.D.): "…the only God has also a Son, his Word who has proceeded from himself, by whom all things were made and without whom nothing has been made: that this was sent by the Father into the virgin and was born of her both man and God. Son of Man, Son of God, …" (Against Praxeas, 2).

Hippolytus (235 A.D.): "And the blessed John in the testimony of his gospel, gives us an account of this economy and acknowledges this word as God, when he says, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.' If then the Word was with God and was also God, what follows? Would one say that he speaks of two Gods? I shall not indeed speak of two Gods, but of one; of two persons however, and of a third economy, the grace of the Holy Ghost" (Against the Heresy of One Noetus. 14).

Origen (250 A.D.): (with regard to John 1:1) "…the arrangement of the sentences might be thought to indicate an order; we have first, 'in the beginning was the Word,' then 'And the Word was with God,' and thirdly, 'and the Word was God,' so that it might be seen that the Word being with God makes Him God" (Commentary on John, Book 2, Chapter 1).

Not only in these instances, but also throughout their writings the ante-Nicene fathers strongly defend the deity of Christ.

I would challenge you to ask the leaders at your kingdom hall, Why doesn't the watchtower magazine, on Page 7 footnote their references? Also, where exactly are these quotes located in the writings of the church fathers? If you know a little about

church history, you will know that the early church suffered persecution under the Roman Empire. It was not until Emperor Constantine converted that they could have a church council. At Nicea then, they simply articulated what they already believed and taught.

2 Peter 1:17, states, “For he received honor and glory from God the Father….” Take a look 17:5 where Jesus prays, “And now Father, glorify me in your presence with the glory I had with you before the world began.” Now take a look at Isaiah 42:8. God says, “I am the Lord, that is my name. I will not give my glory to another…” God will not give his glory to another. Yet Jesus shared in God’s glory before the world began. He shares God’s glory because He is in nature God.

Let’s look at John 14:28 where Jesus says the Father is greater than I. Greater refers to position not to nature. For example, you would agree with the statement, “George Bush is greater than you or I.” As the chief executive officer of our country, that is indeed true. But is George Bush a superior being to you or I? No. Greater refers to position, not nature. In the Trinity, there is an economy, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. They are equal in nature, greater refers to position. In Hebrews 1:4 it states, “So he (Jesus) became as much superior to the angels as the name he has inherited is superior to theirs.” Here Jesus is not an angel because He is superior in nature to them. Or as the New World Translation states, “So he has become better than the angels,” Jesus is better, meaning superior in nature to the angels. If Jesus was an inferior being to the Father, He would have said, “the Father is better or superior than I.”

Let’s take a look at the verse you quoted in Philippians 2. You begin at verse nine, but you need to look at the verse in its context. Begin at verse 1. Paul is exhorting the Philippians to exemplify humility as Christ did. How did Christ demonstrate humility? Verse 6 states, “Who (Christ) being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God a

thing to be grasped." The Greek word there is "morphe" which means essential attributes. In other words, Jesus essential attributes was the nature of God. He humbled himself unto death and was exalted by God at the resurrection and sits at the Father's right hand. Another interesting note, verse 11 states, "and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord…" In Isaiah 45:18 God states, "I am the Lord and there is no other." Yet here when every tongue confesses Jesus is Lord, it brings glory to the Father. We can't have two Lords and if God states, He is the only Lord and Jesus has that title as well, what must we conclude?

In regard to the Revelation passages, it would be helpful to outline the book of Revelation. State the theme and how it plays out through the book. The Watchtower has interpreted it incorrectly in many areas. In Chapter 1:7 Jesus is coming to the earth. In verse 8 it states, "I am the alpha and the Omega, says Jehovah God, the One who is and who was and who is coming, the Almighty." God the Father is never referred to as coming soon. the one who is coming is Jesus. Verse 8 refers to the one coming soon in verse 7 who is Jesus. Jesus is called God in verse 8. The whole theme of chapter one is the Son of God. Even if you want to say verse 8 refers to Jehovah and not Jesus, look at 22:12-16. Who is the alpha and Omega there? Jesus. Jehovah is the Alpha and Omega in chapter one. You cannot have two Alphas and Two Omegas. You can only have one. It is Jehovah in chapter 1, Jesus in chapter 22. So we conclude Jesus is God the Son. In 1:17-18 it states, "I am the First and the Last. I am the living one; I was dead and behold I am alive forever and ever." The First and the Last here is Jesus who died and rose again.

In Isaiah 44:6, Jehovah says, "I am the First and the Last; apart from me there is no God." You cannot have two firsts and two lasts. You can only have one. Once again, Jesus is God the Son for He shares the same title. Just a study of Chapter one of Revelation reveals the deity of Christ. I would study

Revelation without the Watchtower articles to see what it says for itself. It is the Watchtower interpretations that led to the numerous false prophecies of Jesus second coming in 1914, 1918, 1925, and 1975. Their record of false prophecies alone should have one question the credibility of this organization.

Sorry I do not have time for a detailed study of the rest of your passages. Perhaps at a later time. Thanks for your reply.

Patrick Zukeran
Probe Ministries