

# The Tyranny of the Trinity

by Barbara Buzzard

We do need angry people: righteous anger is an incredible motivator. Our great heroine, Rosa Parks, was peaceful, calm, and deliberate but I daresay that when she boarded that bus, she was angry and she was confrontational. We need people who will stand and call the emperor naked if need be. Ms. Lackey is angry and she makes a creditable plea in her book "The Tyranny of the Trinity" for us to examine her case and join her in her outrage.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes is quoted as saying that "the mark of a civilized man is his willingness to re-examine his most cherished beliefs." Ms. Lackey points out that in her personal research she did not find one single person who knew the origin of the Trinity nor how it came to be installed as the foundational non-optional statement of Christendom. This author refuses to "surrender to the precepts of men." What is her beef? Simply this:

"I find it deplorable that so many Christians have absolutely no idea of the origin of the Trinity or the purpose for its inception, and sadly, out of their ignorance on this issue, they have taken liberties in judging both unjustly and harshly their unitarian brethren. I and those of like mind have been vilified, demonized, scorned, and ostracized, refused communion, and referred to as heretics, cultists, unsaved, anti-Christ, and non-Christian." She feels that "if we non-Trinitarians had no *viable* basis for our belief, then our Christian brethren might be justified in their condemnation, yet we have far more scriptural evidence for our stance than those who would condemn and judge based on their own *tenuous* belief system — a doctrine considered even within their own camp to be a "mystery." In their ignorance, they go so far as to claim that *God didn't mean for His own children to understand Him — He's a mystery!*"

Ms. Lackey brings to this controversy all of her gifts of southern humor, sarcasm, shoot-from-the-hip mentality, and a most colorful descriptive talent in calling a spade a spade. The experiences she has had in researching and addressing the question of the Trinity are very revealing of a system that has closed ranks against all questioning and behaved in an uncivilized, barbaric, shoot-the-questioner fashion. Athanasius, having trouble with his own definitions, wrote "the more I thought the less I comprehended; as the more I wrote the less capable was I of expressing my thoughts." Lackey says the Council of Nicea "shanghaid" through this piece of incomprehensible language and

furthermore attached to it an anathema for anyone doubting any part of it. Were it not so serious and cruelly painful, it could almost be funny.

Ms. Lackey says that “As long as Christians persist in teaching that God is essentially outside the realm of reason, even to the point that He embraces contradiction and absurdity, many will be limited in their ability to grow in real and practical knowledge of Him...Many dedicated Christians are currently exercised about the Gnostic and mystical tendencies affecting the Church. But many are unaware that philosophical, mystical ideas invaded the Church from the second century onwards via the ‘Church Fathers,’ who were steeped in pagan philosophy and laid the foundation of the creeds now called ‘orthodox.’”

Ms. Lackey addresses the central point which is often overlooked when “mystery” is given as a defense — that as Deuteronomy 29:29 states: “The secret things belong to the Lord our God, *but the things revealed belong to us and to our children forever.*” Since God has revealed His unity in the Bible in more than 11,000 places, it might be good to remember that, as Lackey puts it: “By what right have churches determined that their *creeds and doctrines* are beyond dispute and outweigh the *explicit words of God?*”

“Since the words: God the Son, eternal Son, triune God and God-man appear nowhere in the Scriptures, would not an inquiring mind be somewhat curious?” Ought we not take most soberly and seriously words like these from William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania: “I should inform you, reader, concerning the origin of the Trinitarian doctrine: Thou mayest assure thyself, it is neither from the Scriptures nor reason.”

“Over the centuries millions have died because their loyalty to the Bible precluded their acceptance of the unscriptural formulas of Nicea and Chalcedon. They could not accept the “triune” Being of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. As impressive as it might sound, it is not found in the Scriptures. If this Trinitarian formula created in the fourth century was of the Holy Spirit, why did it produce centuries of hatred and bloodshed?...It is important to note that a false view of who Jesus is would foster an antichristian spirit (1 John 4:2-3).” This is a challenging paragraph as it not only gives the historical facts, but it ties those facts into events, providing an understanding necessary to correctly assess world events past and present.

Ms. Lackey makes her case with no little passion, research, scripture and testimony. She calls the simplicity of her exercise “See Spot run theology.” She states for example: “God is God because of certain attributes that He has. If Jesus Christ were God, he would have to have the attributes of God. Most theologians agree that for God, these attributes are: unoriginated, self-existent, immortal, unchanging, omniscient, all wise, all good, all-powerful and omnipresent. But Jesus denied every one of these.” She continues with Theology 101 in examining who the lamb of God is, who anointed Jesus (indeed, why he

needed anointing), who gave the Revelation to Jesus, how and why did Jesus have a God, and many other challenging questions. She quotes from *One God & One Lord, Reconsidering the Cornerstone of the Christian Faith*: “47 Reasons Why Our Heavenly Father Has No Equals or Co-Equals.” From that source also comes this thought-provoking quotation: “It has been well said that when a man who is honestly mistaken hears the truth he either ceases to be mistaken or he ceases to be honest.”

Author Lackey puts a huge emphasis on believing Jesus and returns time and time again to the simplicity of believing his words. She asks her readers (to whom she writes as friends) to consider whether it is really possible to accept Jesus’ teachings if his own teachings reject who he claims to be? “How does a professing Christian separate Christ from his teachings?” Her very straightforward answer is that we have been duped into believing in a “God-man – a myth,” or in a very thinly veiled polytheism. Jesus says in John 8:45, “If I am telling the truth, why don’t you believe me?” Again, hammering her point, she asks, “Did Jesus not know who he was? Did the Nicene fathers know more than Jesus? What about Jesus’ apostles and disciples — who did they believe him to be? Did any disciple refer to him as ‘Father’ or Holy Father? They did not.”

She recommends Brian Holt’s unique approach in *Is Jesus God or the Son of God?* Holt states: “Consider [the irrationality] of what is being said by the Trinity doctrine: Jesus can be God’s Son and still be God. He can be at God’s right hand and still be God. He can have a God and still be God. He can be sent and told what to do and still be God. He can have limited knowledge on earth and in heaven and still be God. He can have a different will from God and still be God. He can die while God cannot die and still be God. He can call his Father the ‘only true God’ and yet he is the only true God (John 17:3). Think about what this means. Nothing can refute the Trinity doctrine! No matter how many times Peter, Paul, or Jesus himself says Jesus has a God, [to the Trinitarian zealot] it does not refute the idea that Jesus is God. No matter how many times he is called God’s Son, he is still God. Do not worry about how many times the Bible says he is in subjection to God, the Trinity allows for this too...In other words, if there were 800, 1600 or even 3200 verses that state Jesus is not God, it would not matter because the Trinity doctrine allows for all of these! With that in mind, one [who subscribes to such an ideology] must really ask himself..., ‘Am I allowing the Bible to shape my viewpoint of Jesus or am I allowing a preconceived doctrine to shape it?’”

Ms. Lackey’s second point of emphasis has to do with "what" and "who" Christians choose to base their beliefs on, and she pleads with her readers to obey God rather than men. She gives this example: “1 John 5:1 clearly states that Jesus is the Christ and that [he is] the child born of God. Is this verse a mystery? The translator's [interpretation] proceeds to state that ‘He is God’! Now who should I believe? What should you believe?”

Is Jesus the child born of God, or is he God? One declaration comes directly from scripture, while the other is a translator's interpretation." Have we been wise to accept the cry of *mystery*? Remember Romans 1:19: "For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them." Obfuscation is not a tool which God uses! Ms. Lackey continues: "If what I have presented to you from these commentaries and translators' interpretations isn't enough to get your attention and convince you of the hypocrisy and blatant lack of sensible reasoning, then obviously the god of this age has *willing followers*. I believe that far too many Christians simply do not care enough to see the deplorable duplicity."

I have to ask do we really have freedom of thought? I think not, especially here in the Bible belt. The "thought police" descend on one immediately to convince one that although God is the author of logic and rationality, He does not conduct Himself by these principles. (It's a mystery! But in Eph. 5:6 we are warned not to be deceived with empty words and I can think of none more empty.) As important to us as freedom of speech is, the accompanying freedom of inquiry is notably absent, or to quote Ben Stein: "No intelligence allowed." Christians cannot have it both ways: Jesus can either be God or the Son of God, but He could not be God and *have* [a God] (John 20:17). Those in authority, in defensive mode, solve the problem by "heresy-making."

Ms. Lackey has suffered brutality and hostility at the hands of the Christian church for her inquiring mind. "Let the reader understand." Why can "the church" not be questioned? Be assured that this hostile approach is not of Jesus. Hers is the pain of seeing that we *do* have revelation on this matter and yet we continue to be misdirected, deceived and patronized into thinking that it is a mystery as if there *was* no revelation. It is *not lack of revelation*; it is *unbelief*.

As Greg Deuble says, "Truth has nothing to fear from an honest search under God's light." Ms. Lackey is one brave lady; a veritable steel magnolia. I stand in admiration of her witness. She defends the cause of the weak against the strong, and mercy and tolerance against brutality and tyranny.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Buzzard