

7. God Who? Part 2 (Characteristics of “God?”)

Having two heads and one body, conjoined twins Abigail & Brittany Hensel are special and unique.(1) Yet others imply that these beautiful girls’ phoenixity is “freakish,” since anti-Trinitarian literature pictures bodies with three heads and calls them “three-headed freaks.” Do not label something you cannot understand as bad, freakish, or nonexistent. Though Atheists complain that any eternally existing god is as problematic as their concept of an eternally existing physical universe, an eternally existing universe is ultimately inexplicable, while God’s existence is inexplicable to us, but perhaps not to God. Rather, if you fully understand “God,” you made a god in your own image.

Everyone Has Their Own God?

Per the assertion that atheists are intellectually superior to believers in one God, I noted that those who believed in God facilitated modern society, not atheists. An atheist responded: “Asserting that they all believed in the same god is ridiculous. You don’t believe in the same god as your brother, father, uncle, neighbor, or anyone else. Everyone has a different god because they each have qualitative differences which make it impossible for them to be the same. Besides, those who facilitated modern society did so despite their belief in gods. They simply compartmentalized their erroneous beliefs from their rational mind.”

Actually we do have the same God, despite this clever assertion that they’re all different. My God is 1:an eternal uncreated being, 2:a spirit, 3:the most powerful and knowledgeable being; in a class by Himself, 4: sinless and all-holy, 5:“a consuming fire”(He will execute perfect justice). Mohammedans agree with Christian believers on these five points. In addition, Christians of all stripes believe that God is 6:Love, 7:a Trinity; and 8:was revealed in the person of Jesus Christ. Since believers agree on these points, this means that billions worldwide believe in the same God.

Seeing God differently doesn’t necessarily create a different god. For example, Abraham Lincoln was variously viewed as a husband, father, son, president, lawyer, brother, rail-splitter, and special friend. None of these views are contradictory; they all believed in the same person. Many have inaccurate views of God instead of believing in different gods. Others add speculation but not dogma. From among these billions who believe in the same God have come the greatest of human beings. Asserting that they compartmentalized their beliefs from their rational mind is pure speculation. If that was true, atheists could have done more to advance modern society, considering their advantage of being unburdened from compartmentalizing part of their brain. Instead, belief in God helps breed compassion and caring.

Christians are Atheists?

Atheists have stated “There have been over 3,000 gods throughout recorded history. So if someone says they believe in just the one God, I’ll proclaim that they are nearly as atheistic as me. I don’t believe in 3,000 gods, and they don’t believe in 2,999.” Yet I affirm over 3,000 gods. I recognize them as angels and demons, who may have acted as Zeus, Hades, Vishnu, Ra, et cetera. Scripture notes a plurality of gods numerous times. Even Jesus said “Ye are gods” (John 10:34-35). We are all gods over the microbes that reside in and on our bodies. Christians are simply prohibited from worshipping anyone but the Creator of the entire universe. Atheists also note that ancient Romans considered early Christians atheists. Yet the ancient Romans were simply dead wrong. And people had different gods for different aspects of human nature and the natural world, simply unaware that one supreme God authored all these things. If I lived in ancient times I would probably worship many gods. That would be okay, since I would be striving to honor the true Creator, since the oneness of the Creator was only revealed to the Jews, who segregated themselves from other peoples.

So in a way the ancients were on the right path in their limited fuzzy understanding. Every ancient culture logically concluded that our world was created by superior intelligence, like Christians do. It would simply be terrible to worship multiple gods after adequate truth about God was revealed. Referring to worship of multiple gods: “The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent” (Acts 17:30). And widespread polytheism disappeared long ago. So this contention by atheists is nonsense.

Russell’s Teapot

Author Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) said that if he claims that a china teapot orbits a space between Earth and Mars, it is ludicrous for him to expect others to believe him simply because they cannot prove him wrong. Even if his teapot were affirmed in history and taught as sacred truth, we shouldn’t believe it because it’s ridiculous, said Russell. He also asserted that the burden of proof lies upon those making scientifically unfalsifiable claims rather than unbelievers being burdened with disproving it.

However, Russell’s teapot is problematic. First, what is ludicrous or ridiculous is subjective opinion, not objective fact. More importantly, though realizing the fallacy of unfalsifiable claims, he abused the concept. A classic case of a fallacious unfalsifiable claim is the aforementioned claim by the atheist who concluded that intellectuals who believed in God compartmentalized their erroneous beliefs from their rational minds.

Besides, insisting that deistic claims are *scientifically* unfalsifiable is using a wrong standard: the fallacy of irrelevant authority. If the spirit world exists, you cannot measure it with scientific instruments any more than you can weigh someone with a thermometer. It must be measured with logic. And if every scientifically unfalsifiable claim requires proof, we should stop teaching students history, since it’s filled with scientifically unverifiable information. Instead of making science attack history, I could make history attack science, since we lack documentation that every current scientific law operated throughout history. What if a completely different set of scientific laws was operating and was replaced? Can you prove that didn’t happen? Summarily, Russell’s argument was motivated by his agenda, not logic.

Contemporary versions of Russell’s teapot are the Flying Spaghetti Monster and Invisible Pink Unicorn; characters invented to satirize properties attributable to God. Atheists use these rhetorical illustrations to argue that spiritual beliefs are arbitrary; for example, replacing the word God in the Bible with Invisible Pink Unicorn.²⁻⁴

Atheists bait believers by asking “Can you disprove my belief in the Flying Spaghetti Monster or Invisible Pink Unicorn? Do you respect my belief?” Reactively, one may simply say that such things are self-refuting, dismissing such beliefs because they are apparently ludicrous or nonsensical. However, that’s a direct reflection on classical theology, much of which appears extremely self-refuting and nonsensical to those without such a background. Some snooty religionists insist that their name for God is the only correct one, and everybody else is heretical. So I’m thankful for these arguments, for they attack dour, gloomy, and self-righteous religion.

Why can’t God have a sense of humor? I’d be happy with God being referred to as the Invisible Pink Unicorn or some other designation. “A rose by another other name would smell just as sweet”: *Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet Act 2, Scene 2.*(5) Since with God, all things are possible, perhaps He may take the form of a flying spaghetti monster, pink unicorn, ultraviolet dragon, or white-bearded man enthroned on a cloud, and have all the qualities and characteristics of these caricatures. Why not, as long as He’s incredibly powerful, intelligent, not limited to any form, and doesn’t cause confusion? For example, God might present an especially appealing image to a small child.

As long as the nine characteristics of God as previously mentioned, no more or less, characterize your god, no matter how fanciful your interpretation of God, I conclude that we have the same God. The

difference is that religionists believe in a supremely intelligent Creator, while the nonreligious believe in an ignorant Creator (Mister Exploding Cosmic Egg of the Big Bang Theory).

Absolute Dependence on God

The daily microbiological miracle of cellular regeneration is astounding. Without this awesome process we'd all be mere skeletons very quickly; contemplating this shocking fact is very humbling. Our absolute dependence on God's creative processes is as if He is constantly and lovingly cradling us in His hand, preserving us from a monstrous devouring abyss. Besides creating the entire universe and everything in it, He's also the author of gravity, electromagnetism, and nuclear properties, the binding forces holding everything together. Summarily, God is everything; so make sure your concept of God is correct, so you honor the true God. Since most people are divided on whether God is one person or three, and ideas of two persons or more than three are obscure, I shall concentrate on whether God is one or three.

Trinitarian/"Unitarian" Controversy

Anti-Trinitarians cry that the words trinity or Trinitarian do not appear in the Bible. However, the words unity, oneness, or Unitarian (the doctrine of most anti-Trinitarians) are equally absent. It's also claimed that the early Church fathers never mentioned the trinity or Trinitarian doctrine before the Nicene council in AD 325.

FALSE. Early Church fathers either mentioned the Trinity, attempted to explain Trinitarian doctrine, or declared that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were equal but distinct numerous times (David W. Bercot's alphabetized *Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs*; under TRINITY).

And Oneness definitions such as "God was alone in the empty space" or "God is a singular person" have never appeared in Scripture, while the Trinitarian definition appears in I John 5:7 (KJV). Therefore these claims completely backfire.

Besides, religious traditions only change at a turtle's pace, and no seriously organized opposition to Trinitarian-ism is recorded before the 4th century. These facts are extremely significant. Rather, the Council of Nicea formed to declare anti-Trinitarian views heretical and Trinitarian-ism the original doctrine. So proclaiming that the Church is Trinitarian because this Nicene council led by Emperor Constantine merely outvoted and physically bullied "Unitarian" believers is libelous. The Church, pillar and ground of the truth (Tim.3:15) was Trinitarian in every century; that fact is well-documented. So forget mudslinging, fanciful, and dishonest books on the Trinitarian controversy, First Ecumenical Council, and the life of St. Athanasius (who led the Trinitarian-ism causes amidst this conflict) that were written a millennium and a half after the fact. I recommend *Athanasius Select Works and Letters*; Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series volume 4 (Hendrickson Publishers).

In AD 381, belief concerning the Holy Spirit was officially defined at Constantinople's Second Ecumenical Council, forming the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. This creed is presently recited worldwide in every Catholic, Orthodox, and Lutheran Church every Sunday. Minor differences are that in the phrase: "We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son" Orthodox and Eastern Rite churches leave off "and the Son" (the filioque). In the phrase: "We believe in One Holy *Catholic* and Apostolic Church," Lutherans simply say "One Holy *Christian* and Apostolic Church." Otherwise, this creed is the most fantastic rallying point of unity in all Christendom.

Comma Johanneum

I John 5:7 simply states: "There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one" (the Comma Johanneum). This passage is disputed because, if accepted, would

be the silver bullet slaying all non-triune views since there's only one possible way to interpret it. Trinitarians did not use the Comma Johanneum at the Nicean council, which sought to settle this matter. However, surrectionists could have removed it beforehand. The passage fits the context of the text body, complimenting it perfectly. Without it, we have a lopsided focus upon earth, inconsistent with other New Testament passages. The Comma Johanneum was referenced by *Cyprian's Treatise I* AD 250, which he quotes as Scripture. As far as the original manuscripts (or autographs), none exist, hence the century's old debate. Even if the Comma Johanneum wasn't in the original text, we know it was in most texts for 1,400 years, and appears in Christian texts today.

Christians cannot have strange gods on a par with the true God, understood as a jealous God. Even making a graven or false image of God is considered reprehensible. If the trinity were a pagan concept, Jesus as God would be a rival god. Would God allow His message to incorporate a blatant pagan formula all these centuries? Would a loving father allow his child to eat a big juicy apple, imbedded with a tiny piece of glass? Apparently so according to some, since Christians have unanimously agreed that the "New Testament" is Christianity's lifeblood.

Scripture incorporated the Comma Johanneum for over a millennium, and modern translations which don't have it didn't exist. Though it's one disputed verse, imagine if Christian Scripture had one passage which informed readers that Aphrodite was a coequal goddess all this time? What would be the difference, if Trinitarian belief is pagan? The Comma Johanneum is found right in the Lord's beloved disciple John's epistle of love.

For argument's sake, if paganism was added once, hundreds of other passages, or the entire "New Testament" could be invalid, since it was translated by "Trinitarian pagans." Athanasius himself was the first to propose the Christian canon as it stands today. Since the Church has been Trinitarian all this time, with full control of the scriptures, anti-Trinitarians attempting to prove their case from Christian scripture is like Christians trying to prove Christianity from the Koran. It's not their book. Since many anti-Trinitarians understand this, there's an urgent need for alternative authority (various "Unitarian" or non-Trinitarian churches or organizations), alternative scholars (many of whom are atheists or members of non-Christian religions) and all new texts, in hope of sorting out the resulting chaos.

Summarily, anti-Trinitarian-ism is not Christianity. Though many things are unsubstantiated opinions, Trinitarian-ism and God becoming Jesus (dyophysitic incarnation) are definitively Christianity. Quoting my former pastor Richard Rosinski on this subject; "Anything less is non-Christian. Many things are debatable, which is okay and is what makes us human, but the core essentials [of Christianity] cannot be debated [by faithful Christians]."6

Alone in the Empty Space?

If only one person in the godhead existed backwards through eternity, then God would be a god of solitude, instead of eternally social. Then for people to be made in God's image and likeness, they would need to be islands unto themselves. Instead, God is Love, which only exists in the context of relationships. If at any point God was alone, there would be no love.

Furthermore, all creativity comes from someone or something interacting with someone or something else (for example, great writers are great readers). Otherwise it would be like the sound of one hand clapping, or a stick rubbing against itself to create a spark. Although creativity seems to emanate from solitude, solitude simply gives one the time to reflect on past experiences of interacting or experiencing someone or something. Solitude alone does not produce creativity.

Natural Triunes

Since the invisible things of God since our world's creation are clearly seen, being understood through what has been created, even His eternal power and Godhead (Romans 1:20), here is a list of natural trinominals:

Matter comprises energy/motion/phenomenon

Matter comprises length/width/depth (The universe is a trinity of trinities)

All physical substances have three forms: solid/liquid/gas

Atoms themselves: protons/neutrons/electrons

Water: two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom intertwined

Amorphous ice (ice lacking crystal structure: LDA/HAD/VDA (7))

Ozone molecules: three interdependent and inseparable oxygen atoms

Nitrogen cycles: 1) Lightning converts nitrogen in the environment into compounds which are absorbed by plants. 2) Plants incorporate nitrogen compounds into organic molecules which animals eat, thus acquiring nitrogen. 3) When plants and animals die, bacteria break down the nitrogen compounds, releasing nitrogen back into the environment.

Hydrologic cycles: evaporation/precipitation/water's incorporation into the environment

The environment: air/water/land The environment: animal/vegetable/mineral

Spectrum of paint: Red, yellow, and blue create every possible color

Spectrum of light: Red, blue, and green wavelengths create everything visual

Light comprises the actinic, luminiferous, and calorific

Electricity: amps(current), ohms(load), and volts(potential)

Fire= fuel/oxygen/heat Sun and stars= light/heat/energy

Chick/hen/egg; Eggs= shell/white/yolk

Fruits= skin/shells/pit Clovers and other leaves of three

Human and animal bodies: flesh/blood/bones Human and animal bodies: head/torso/limbs

Inclined planes: effort, load, the plane itself, with three types: screw, ramp, wedge

Human reproduction: man/woman/child Plant reproduction: two plants and an insect

DNA molecules: phosphates/deoxyribose sugars/nitrogenous bases

Summarily, nature reveals God's nature. Nature being Trinitarian explains why some pre-Christian peoples had a quasi-Trinitarian concept of three gods or three-headed god.

Comparing the Trinity with Mythological Gods

Mythological gods had divergent personalities and prerogatives, were often sinful and unholy, had a beginning, were fickle and changeable, and had various weaknesses. In diametric opposition, the Trinity is understood as being identical in character, holy and perfect, having no beginning or end, being unchangeable, all-powerful, and perfectly united. The various symbiotic relationships of creation such as the oxygen cycle, where plants imbibe carbon dioxide and exude oxygen while animals do the reverse, all point to one grand Creator, not many gods such as the ancient Greeks and Romans, who allegedly worked against each other.

Furthermore, early churchmen contrasted the Trinity against spurious pagan gods in *Apology of Aristides* (AD 125), Athenagoras's *Plea for the Christians* (AD 175), *Theophilus to Autolytus* (AD 180), Clement of Alexandria's *Exhortation to the Heathen* (AD 195), Tertullian's *Apology* and *Ad Nationes* (AD 197), and a dozen other works. Not only were the early Church fathers not influenced by pagan concepts of God, they aggressively rebuked them.

Disharmony Amongst Non-Trinitarians

Non-Trinitarians are in extreme disagreement. Atheists: no god; naturalism: impersonal force; deism: one disinterested god; Islam: one divine person who is wrathful but not loving; Jehovah Witness: major God Jehovah and minor god Jesus whom people will never meet; Oneness Pentecostals: Jesus wears three faces; Binitarians: two personae in God; Adoptionism: Jesus wasn't deity but became such; Tetradites: four personae in God; neo-paganism: often two disinterested gods; Hinduism: many gods by Christian definition; Buddhists: we can all become gods. Chaos indeed.

You Cannot Split a Person?

Beware of naïve anti-triune sentiments that debase our God. God isn't necessarily in multiple places at once like a brontosaurus would be, and I'm not talking about dividing Him up like a pack of playing cards. God's presence in a myriad of places may be like an all-seeing, all-encompassing Mind instead of a physical structure. Scripture states that with God, all things are possible (Mark 10:27), only stating that God cannot sin. A physical phenomenon that simultaneously illustrates God's oneness and presence most everywhere is two or three converging mirrors angled to reflect off each other, resulting in the fabulous effect of a seemingly endless series of duplicate images, each subsequent one slightly smaller and more mysterious than the last. Technically, this doesn't accurately portray God's infinite nature, since the images actually end at the vanishing point on the molecular level, but it's illustrative.

Without a neck, a person could not function; necks never function alone, and necks alone are not people. Without its number one spark plug, a car could never start let alone be driven; spark plugs cannot function by themselves, and spark plugs by themselves are not cars. These are major weaknesses. However, taking any one burning log from a flaming bonfire still leaves a live bonfire; flaming logs function independently, and a flaming log by itself is still a live fire which can ignite its own bonfire. If we could drain away any part of an ocean, we'd still have a whole ocean. If we drained away 99.9% of an ocean, we'd still have a whole ocean. By taking any part that was drained away and placing it elsewhere; that by itself would be a whole ocean. Yet this is only God's creation, imagine what the Master of creation can do?

Besides, God's ability to be divided (so that He is neither bound nor finite) is necessary to simultaneously give everybody and everything His full and complete attention, such as when listening to prayer. Referring to God as an eternal Being instead of a person would help eliminate confusion. However, declaring God omniscient, omnipotent, and/or omnipresent is unwarranted. Christian scripture never makes these claims. Besides, neither the teleological argument (intelligent design) nor the cosmological argument (deducing God's existence from causation, finitude, and so forth), necessitate an omni-quality God. Besides, supposed qualities such as omnipresence would be terribly problematic, having God inhabiting dirty toilets and other unpleasant-ries.(8,9) Also, God must be ultra-complex, not simple, since He's the cause of the effect of complex creation, and causes must always be sufficient for their effects.

Further Examination of Son and Spirit

While the first two Ecumenical councils reaffirmed the Son and Spirit's full divinity, the Third Council (Ephesus; AD 431) condemned Nestorianism: the doctrine that two personalities, one divine, one human, were joined in Jesus Christ, and reaffirmed Christ's singular indissoluble personage. The Fourth Ecumenical Council (AD 451) condemned monophysitism (having the human and divine within Jesus Christ constitute only one comp-

osite nature) and reaffirmed dyophysitism: full deity and full humanity existing in Christ's person as two natures without confusion or change.

Claims that these doctrines were invented over those early centuries are easily refuted. Each council spotlighted each deviation by specifically naming the leading heretic, and separating heresy from truth. Dead branches are cut off from trees; trees aren't removed from dead branches. I recommend *The Seven Ecumenical Councils: Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series* volume 14: Hendrickson Publishers). Some believers emphasize the trinitarian hierarchy; the Son always subject to the Father; the Spirit always subject to the Son. Others emphasize their equality as an equilateral triangle or trefoil. Both concepts ring true.

It's devilishly hard to overlook Scripture's triune sentiment, crystallizing in I John 5:7. Since these scriptures have always been the bedrock of Christianity, Christianity is ipso facto Trinitarian. At Jesus' baptism where all three persons appeared at once but distinctly refutes the idea that Jesus was all three person-ages. Besides the Holy Spirit being constantly referred to as He, there are about two dozen personal attributes of the Holy Spirit in Christian Scripture, refuting the idea that the Holy Spirit is an impersonal force.

Wisdom is personified in the Hebrew Scriptures; the early Church often identified this Wisdom as Christ. But since Wisdom was seemingly referred to as being created, some attempt to make Christ a created being. However, since Wisdom's personal attributes are obviously figurative, to be consistent, any reference to Wisdom being created must also be figurative. Besides, if there was any period when wisdom did not exist, God would lack the wisdom to create wisdom; He would be a fool.

Is God Male or Female?

God is neither male nor female in the sense of having sex hormones or a reproductive configuration. Neither is God limited to either a male or female personality. However, we can deduce some things about God who, as stated previously, is revealed through nature.

We know that male and female principles, besides being interdependent, perpetuate one another, illustrated by black & white dots within the Taijitu, an Eastern religious symbol, representing seeds of Yin and Yang. For example, grain reaching its full height in summer (masculine Yang) produces seeds and dies back in winter (feminine Yin).¹⁰

Although the Yin Yang concept is brilliant, the question of whether or not there was a starting point is overlooked, since knowing God is often considered irrelevant in Asian culture. However, Christianity dictates that God is of absolute importance, and we should strive to know God's nature.

Now nature itself cannot have gone infinitely backwards in a perpetual loop since this violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics; see 4.A Third Option. Besides suggesting a spiritual gyroscope, having both masculine and feminine supernatural principles going infinitely backwards in a perpetual loop would negate both roles, since neither principle would be truly taking the initiative or yielding. Neo-pagan concepts of polytheistic dualism, where a female god takes the initiative to birth a male god who then co-create the universe or a female god creating the universe herself is illogical because taking the initiative is by definition masculine. A female god birthing the universe without taking the initiative to do so would violate the Law of Cause and Effect (see 3. Atheism Verses "God"). Therefore by process of elimination, God is male. This doesn't deprecate femininity, since the eternal and infinite universe of space can be considered feminine (the empty universe was receptive to God's creative edict, and "birthed" creation). To creation, God would be meaningless without the universe since creation needs the universe as much as creation needs God. However, this doesn't violate the previous principles, since the universe only exists and is defined from God's initiative as a hole exists and gets its definition from what encircles it. In Jewish and Christian teaching, God was always a He, and Jesus Christ, God incarnate, was He.

So without a God, social outcasts, the unloved, and the disenfranchised would be losers. With an impersonal force, those unfortunates would still be losers. Even with a personal God that was capricious or

antisocial like ancient Greek, Roman, and Norse gods, the aforementioned people would be hopeless. However, with Christianity's loving God, the hopeless can find fantastic hope. Furthermore, "We exist to know, love, and serve God in this life, and be united with Him in the next."⁽¹¹⁾ Therefore, I love this Trinity (my reason for living) who will never disappoint me, wholeheartedly. All praise, honor, and glory are yours, Almighty God, forever and ever.

