

A CRITIQUE OF DR STAVRINIDIES ON THE NATURE OF GOD

The major exponent of all this new doctrine on the nature of God is Dr Stavrinidies. Many are bamboozled by his intellectual prowess not realising how unbiblical most of his basic premises on the nature of God really are and how **bizarre** many of his conclusions are. The Dr Stavrinidies material I will be quoting from is all from a handout summarising what was spoken about on each day of a Headquarters Ministerial Conference held in June, 1993 except for a few snippets from his video series which I will point out as I go along.

Before we do look at his material I'd like to cover, by means of an introduction, some parts from a very good sermon on the nature of God by another minister. Mr Rick Railston before he left the WCG gave a sermon in the Yakima congregation in Washington State in which he expounded the nature of God. He started off with this fascinating introduction:

"Before we start, you have to understand that there are two basic approaches that you can take in this study. Now, the church has decided to take the following approach. The church recently has made the decision that it is necessary to go outside the Bible to define the nature of God. And that's a legitimate decision. You can decide to do that.

"The church has decided that the Bible does not reveal all there is necessary about the nature of God. Therefore you can study the nature of God through philosophy...You can also go to theology which could be defined as man's study about the nature of God. You can also study the nature of God through metaphysics and metaphysics is a philosophical discipline. It's not a science...The definition of which would be man's attempt at explaining that which is not available through the senses. A fourth area which you can use to define the nature of God is logic. So, the church has made the decision to go beyond the Bible and study the nature of God through philosophy, through theology, through metaphysics and through logic. All of those disciplines require one thing in common - human wisdom, human reasoning and human logic.

"Now the second approach which you can take is to rely solely on the Bible. That is to view the Bible as the source and the only source of revelation. The assumption there is that there are things about God which man never know...God gave man the Bible to reveal to him knowledge that man cannot come to on his own.

The Bible itself says in 1 Corinthians 2:9-11, 'Eye has not seen (he can't measure them) nor has entered into the heart of man (in other words, he can't even comprehend them) the things which God has prepared for those who love him. But God has revealed them to us through His Spirit...For what man knows the things of a man except the spirit of man which is in him? Even so, **NO ONE KNOWS THE THINGS OF GOD EXCEPT THE SPIRIT OF GOD.'** Now, the question which you have to answer for yourself, and this is an individual matter - I'm not telling you one way or the other - is which approach are you going to use? The reality is, you will draw different conclusions depending on which way you go. That's the way it is. I didn't make it that way. That's just the way it is...Now, in the study today I plan on staying in the Bible."

Now later on in his sermon he discusses the metaphysical arguments which are the backbone of Dr Stavrinidies' material on the nature of God. You will learn these in almost any course on metaphysics. Those metaphysical arguments are:-

<u>MATTER</u>	<u>NON-MATTER (SPIRIT)</u>
Occupies space	Cannot occupy space
Has shape	Cannot have a shape
Has a body	Cannot have a body
Has parts	Cannot have parts
Occupies time	Cannot occupy time
Has a beginning	Has no beginning
Changes	Cannot change

Now do those metaphysical ideas of non-matter sound familiar? Now before we do an overview of Dr Stavrinidies' material I will just mention a few things which show the Bible does not teach the following metaphysical ideas.

We saw before how Moses when he asked God to see Him in His glorified appearance to which was agreed to by God saw the literal back parts of God and that He has a shape and a body (Exod. 33:21-23) as John saw in the vision of the Book of Revelation (Rev. 1,4) when He saw Jesus in His glorified state.

Prior to a person receiving God's spirit and it being **IN** them the Holy Spirit can work **WITH** a person and help them to obey God. Let's notice this distinction in **John 14:17** where we read:

"The Spirit of truth, [which] the world cannot receive, because it neither sees [it] nor knows [it]; but you know [it], for [it] dwells **WITH YOU** [Present tense] and **WILL BE** [Future tense] **IN YOU.**"

The apostles had the Holy Spirit working with them but it wasn't in them until after Christ was resurrected and they received it on the Day of Pentecost. John 7:39 says: "But this He (Christ) spoke concerning the Spirit, **which those believing in him WOULD (future tense) receive; for the Holy Spirit was NOT YET given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.**"

What do we have to do to get the Holy Spirit? - "Repent and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and you **SHALL RECEIVE (not activate)** the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38).

Before baptism one does have the Holy Spirit and after it one can receive the Holy Spirit. Who says the Holy Spirit cannot occupy space?

If spirit has no beginning what about the angels? God says that Lucifer was created at some time in the past (Ezek. 28:13) and so were the angels. There came a time when Lucifer changed from good to evil.

If God supposedly cannot change then, what about when God changed his mind when He was about to destroy Israel and Moses interceded for them (Numbers 14:11-25)? And what about when He also changed His mind when Hezekiah asked for an extension on his life (2 Kings 20:1-6)?

Metaphysics, as Mr Railston pointed out, is based on man's fallible ideas about the spirit world which the Bible plainly says he cannot comprehend without the spirit of God.

Dr Stavrinidies on page 1 of his handout at that conference mentioned above makes this incredibly telling and potentially prophetic statement, "The nature of God is the foundation of church doctrine. Once you change the nature of God, you change all other doctrines, from creation and the crucifixion, to **the Holy Days** and the Kingdom of God."

In order to justify using human reason and going into this world's theology to learn about God's nature he says the following, "How can God be one and three at the same time? Do you decide to bridge this gap or not?...Should you bridge the gap? YES! Yet you can only bridge the gap using reason...You do not need theological understanding to be a sincere christian. But you do need theological understanding to have the truth...**The Bible does not tell us what spirit is. We must go outside the Bible to discuss/analyse this**" (p.1,2,3,4). On page 3 he states that the church has been wrong on the "Nature of the Holy Spirit when it said it was an essence in which Father and Son are composed of."

Almost everything Dr Stavrinidies discusses is built on the following false premise - **"Spirit has no extension (does not extend itself) in space" (p.4)** We discussed a few points that debunk this idea when we looked at whether God has a specific shape or not.

Let's notice a few more of Dr Stavrinidies statements along these lines:

"What extends in space is CREATED. Even space is created. It can be measured, therefore, it extends in space and is part of the creation. Void, too, is part of the creation...When we say something is spirit, we are denying it has extension...No such thing as a 'spirit body'. These are a contradiction of terms...

"When the Bible says God has a mouth, arms, head, etc., this is figurative language only. God does not really have these...Spirit has no extension in space, no shape, no parts (a part = an element smaller than the whole)...What has no parts cannot change. Change is to become other than what was in the past. With spirit, you can't remove a leg, add a leg, grow taller, add parts, etc. God has no parts. Anything that changes has parts. Man occupies space; God does not...When God speaks, does he move a mouth? No! (Moving a mouth would mean changing from point A to point B and God does not change). God has no mouth, no vocal chords, no parts. When God speaks all of Him 'moves' (Although He has no parts)"(p.4, 6)

Can you believe that? Is God really a blob? What does he base this all on? He quotes no scriptures to back this all up. He says the Bible doesn't discuss what spirit is anyway. Not only that, he misinterprets Malachi 3:6 where God says He changes not which, by its context, is discussing His character.

On page 10 he says, "What needs to be divinely revealed has to do with repentance, our attitudes, etc. **You do not need divine revelation to understand the nature of God...It is only through logic and this kind of reasoning that we can understand the nature of God.**"

How can we physical beings understand the spiritual realm at all with our five senses without divine revelation? This statement is ridiculous in trying to justify using reason without the Bible when the Bible gives abundant evidence, divinely revealed to us, to understand the basics of the spiritual realm. Furthermore on video tape 10 he is quoted as saying, "**I said it about 1001 times that the Bible is NOT a theological textbook and I'll say it again.**"

Let's look at a few scriptures which debunk the idea that spirit cannot have shape or extension. First of all, let's look at 2 Kings 2:9 where Elisha says, "Please let a **DOUBLE PORTION** of your spirit be upon me. So he said, You have asked a hard thing. Nevertheless, if you see me when I am taken from you, it shall be so for you."

God's spirit, we are not told how, can be given in portions. **YOUR BIBLE SAYS SO!** And after Elisha had asked for it he wasn't rebuked and told that the spirit cannot be measured out because it has no parts but he was told this is a hard thing but you will have it.

If spirit beings have no extension in the spiritual dimension that they exist in then how could the angels wrestle and fight with and be withstood by demons as we read happened to Michael and the angel who came to Daniel in Daniel 10?

How can spirit demons possess a certain person and not someone else at the same time if they don't have extension in space?

How can a certain place like where Moses approached near the burning bush or the Holy of holies be holy ground and not a another place a little further away if God's presence is everywhere and not in a certain spatial place at one time?

We read how Satan, again a spirit being, came before the throne of God when the sons of God presented themselves before God and talked about how, in his spiritual dimension, he walked to and fro on the face of the earth.

If the angels and Satan came and presented themselves before the Lord then how could they if they couldn't move from point A to point B because spirit is

changeless? The Bible shows that these ideas are plainly false and just the personal ideas of a man.

Christ Himself said the following in John 5:37, "And the Father himself, who sent me, has testified of me. You have neither heard his voice at any time, **nor seen his form.**" **Christ Himself said that the Father has a form which the Jews had not seen.**

We also read in Revelation 21:3, "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God." God will "dwell" - LIVE - for all eternity in a spatial environment, and yet somehow we are to believe that He is not a spatial being. The idea is absurd!

Following on in the same vein that God is not spatial, Dr Stavrinidies makes the following statements, "Time is a measurement of change. Change is a spatial term. What does not change is not in time. What is not in time does not change. God has no past. A reference to the past implies change. God has no future" (p.7).

Carrying on from the false premise that spirit is changeless he makes these strange statements, "Thoughts are spiritual. Thoughts cannot change. You can however have new thoughts; you replace old thoughts with new thoughts...**God cannot change, therefore God cannot learn.** To learn would mean something has been added to His storehouse of knowledge(and nothing can be added to God)"(p.7). Moving on to page 8 he continues,"God is complete: He learns nothing. There is nothing for Him to unlearn. He does not have a memory bank. He does not love more or love less. He does not create using tools or anything at all. **God does not get offended when we make mistakes.**"

On my master copy of the handout I wrote the following comment - "**WHAT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!** **God says He is a jealous God! He does have feelings!**" Again I ask, what scriptures does he base this on? Of course God is always learning. In Genesis 22:12 God says,"Do not lay your hand on the lad (after he was asked to sacrifice Isaac), or do anything to him, for **NOW I KNOW** that you fear God since you have not withheld your son, your only son from me." God did not know before then, else He wouldn't have put Abraham to the test in this way.

In his attempt to explain this scripture and explain a very legitimate question he answers it in the following way. Regarding the free moral agency of Abraham he says, "Does God have a fixed destination (in mind) in matters which are not fixed in heaven or on earth? This is contradictory, a non-question! You are asking, does God know the unknowable? Does God know what is not fixed? **All questions relating to God knowing the outcome of free will choices are non-questions**"(p.9). He completely avoids answering the question with this non-question technique numerous times throughout his videos to scriptures which don't fit in with his own ideas about God's nature.

Another technique commonly used is saying that which is clearly literal in its context is only figurative. In relation to this he says,"**To say the Bible uses figurative language**

does not mean we are spiritualising away the truth. Figurative language is not less important than literal" (p.9). Dr Meredith in an article about Satan made the following comment pertinent to Dr Stavrinidies approach to the scriptures, "**Satan's favourite reasoning says that God does not really mean what He says**" (World Ahead, Oct-Nov.1994, p.7).

He defines his hip new word "hypostasis" the following way - "That without which something cannot exist. The Father (Son, Holy Spirit) is the hypostasis of God. Without the Father (or without the Son or without the Holy Spirit) you have no God...

"Another example to help you understand the concept of hypostasis: Bill Clinton has three hypostasis: the President of the United States, husband of Hillary and father of Chelsea. These are three different roles. They are only one being, not three different beings. If you killed the president of the United States, you would also be killing the husband of Hillary and the father of Chelsea. One of the three cannot exist without the other. The three exist together"(p.13).

Are the Father and the Son only different roles in the one God entity? The very fact that Father begot the Son, Jesus prayed to His Father in heaven and Christ said His father was greater than Him clearly show that they are different thinking beings, not just different roles in one being.

Furthermore he states that the "God Is... booklet said the Holy Spirit should not be worshipped. This is a wrong statement and should not be in the booklet. **When you pray to God, you pray to all three hypostasis in the God (Father, Son and Holy Spirit).** When the New Testament church prayed to God, they prayed to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, only they just didn't know it. When you pray to God you don't separate out the three hypostasis" (p.26).

Now, we are told, when we pray to "Our Father who art in heaven" as Christ taught us to pray we are also praying to the Son and Uncle Holy Spirit.

Dr Stavrinidies gives himself away with this comment which shows just where most of his ideas come from - "What the Catholics say: Holy Spirit emanates from both the Father and the Son. This cannot be. The Holy Spirit emanates from just the Father (not also from the Son)"(p.15).

If you are at all conversant with the development of the trinity doctrine you may know that Dr Stavrinidies has highlighted the only difference between the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox teachings on the trinity. The Eastern Orthodox church from which Dr Stavrinidies "came out" from believes that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father and not the Son.

Furthermore he says, "When I came into the church, I only accepted practical terms of Mr Armstrong's message such as repentance and christian living. I did not agree with many

things such as the two gods idea"(p.10). I have doubts if he ever got the Eastern Orthodox religion out of system when he makes a comment like that.

He makes this extraordinary comment on page 15, "We should love God, but He does not need our love. The kind of love we can give to God is like the kind of love a pet canary gives to his human being pet owner. In terms of God, God is not enriched by the creation or by anything we humans do (however God is still interested in us)."

What a callous and false statement. There is much that delights and pleases God as we read in the scriptures.

On the nature of man Dr Stavrinidies says the following,"Flesh + Ruach(God's breath) = Nephesh. Ruach = individual part,spirit. Nephesh = living soul. **Soul is not the best word to use since soul has so many other meanings.** Living being is actually a better translation. Soul = essential man; the whole man...

"When God said, 'Make man in our image', He was not talking about the physical body. Our physical bodies are not in the image of God...Animals are composed of matter. Angels are composed of spirit. Mankind is made of both matter and spirit; this does not mean there are parts in man made of spirit, because spirit does not have parts. Mankind has an IMMORTAL SPIRIT which does not die"(p.17)

"In death man comes apart, a separation takes place"(p.7). What will these statements lead to? The spirit in man is now called an immortal spirit!

Could this be a transition phrase before the term immortal soul is used? We have already seen that Dr Stavrinidies believes that the word soul is not a good word to equate with Nephesh and living being. There is nothing specifically wrong with these statements but they are worded in an ambiguous way that makes it look like the immortal soul doctrine.

We have already seen that the church doesn't mind using the word person for the Holy Spirit which leads one to believe that the word "hypostasis" is merely a transition word. Again, there is nothing specifically wrong with the statement "In death man comes apart, a separation takes place" but the phraseology sounds similar to the Catholic and Protestant doctrine of the wages of being a sinner = separation from God in an eternal hellfire. Such doctrinal change may never occur but the church should not use such ambiguous language.

On page 18 he flatly denies that the spirit in man is something distinct from God's spirit. He says,"**All human beings (even criminals) are animated by the Spirit of God (also referred to as spirit in man, Holy Spirit). There is no such thing as a "Human" spirit.** Mankind is animated by God Himself."

This scripture completely contradicts Romans 8:16 and 1 Corinthians 2:11 which show God's spirit and the spirit in man are two different spirits: "**The Spirit itself bears witness WITH our spirit.**" The spirit in man is spirit essence, not an immortal soul with a separate

consciousness, and it gives man the power of a mind and intellect that separates him from the animals as 1 Corinthians 2:11 points out.

If Dr Stavrinidies says that the Holy Spirit is a self-conscious entity and denies that it is spirit essence and the spirit in man is equal to God's spirit in us then what's to stop him from denying the spirit in man is spirit essence and therefore is self-conscious spirit in us - an immortal "self-conscious" spirit or what the Protestants and Catholics would call an immortal soul?

The scriptures show that this spirit component of man is spirit essence and not self-conscious of itself. Ecclesiastes 9:5 says, "For the living know that they will die but **THE DEAD KNOW NOTHING.**"

Psalms 146:4 says, "His breath goes forth, he returns to his earth, **IN THAT VERY DAY HIS THOUGHTS PERISH.**"

Paul says about the resurrection that "this mortal must **PUT ON IMMORTALITY**" (1 Cor. 15:53). **Why do we have to put on immortality if we already have it and the spirit in man part of us is self-conscious and what then is the point of the resurrection?** 1 Timothy 6:16 plainly says that of all humans, Jesus Christ "**ONLY HAS IMMORTALITY**"!

In further denying the validity of what Mr Armstrong taught he states: "The church's old 'cassette tape' analogy of [the spirit in man] Holy Spirit recording our individual personalities and character is not valid. God does not need a cassette tape as a record of our lives. The Holy Spirit does not divide itself..."

"How does God give us His Holy Spirit? God does not give us a portion of anything at all. **The Holy Spirit does not come in portions. We are simply plugged into the Holy Spirit or we aren't...Spirit in Man, God's Spirit, Holy Spirit - all are synonyms for each other.** There is only one spirit, however, it performs a variety of operations" (p.18,19,20).

Dr Stavrinidies continues on pushing the Catholic and Protestant "fall of man" doctrine - "Adam was created perfectly. There was no unequal battle with Adam fighting against Satan. It was Adam and God together (**because Adam had the Holy Spirit dwelling in him**) fighting against Satan. They were succeeding until Adam cut off ties between him and God. When he did that, Adam began fighting Satan all by himself, it became an unequal battle and that is when Adam sinned (**the Fall of Adam**)...What would have happened had Adam not sinned? Nature would have been subordinate to God. Nations would have a different structure entirely. Each person born would receive God's supernatural gifts automatically and **would have been part of a supernatural spirit body.** [That one really cracks me up!]

"No human being would have been ruled by his passions. Tree of life = continuing flow of God's spirit. It's wrong to say, 'If Adam had taken of the Holy Spirit.' Say: 'If Adam had

continued to take of the Holy Spirit.' Adam already had the Holy Spirit dwelling in him the day he was created. Adam's only choice was to decide whether to continue to unplug his connection to the Holy Spirit...

“When a minister lays hands on a person, that is not when the Holy Spirit enters us. The Holy Spirit is in us long before that....Baptism is a symbol to show you want to be part of God's body. The laying on of hands is like an official seal that we are a member of Christ's body...Earthly body + divine nature = human nature...It is a false idea to think it is man's nature to sin.** Sin is the misuse of human nature; it is not the necessity of human nature. Adam was in a state of perfection prior to sinning. **Christ became the perfect man that Adam should have remained.** Human nature is not inherently sinful...**Christ's sacrifice was imposed by man's disruption of the order of creation/subordination**”(p.21,22,23,24).**

Did Adam really have the power of the Holy Spirit spiritually backing him up in the Garden of Eden? Do we really have the gift of the Holy Spirit long before we are baptized? Let's look at a few scriptures which debunk these ideas which, yet again, had no scriptures attempting to back them up.

First of all, let's read John 7:39. "But this he (Christ) spoke concerning the Spirit, **which those believing in him WOULD (future tense) receive; for the Holy Spirit was NOT YET given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.**"

What do we have to do to get the Holy Spirit? - "Repent and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and you **SHALL RECEIVE (not activate)** the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38).

Dr Stavrinidies makes it sound like we have to tap into and activate the Holy Spirit and learn how to **USE THE FORCE** like in Star Wars. And if you start to stray let the force be your guide!

Now who does the Bible say have the Holy Spirit? - "And we are His witnesses to these things and so also is the Holy Spirit which God has given to those who **OBEY** him." God's spirit is **only** those who are obeying him.

Man's nature uninfluenced by Satan is neutral but under the sway of the prince of the power of the air we are "by nature(human nature) children of wrath"(Eph.2:3).

If Adam was spiritually perfect as Dr Stavrinidies claims then there would have been no point in God compelling Adam to make a choice between the tree of life or the tree of good and evil.

Here are a few of his conclusions about the angelic realm based on some of the false premises we have just looked at.

"Angels belong to the created order but they are spirits. They are not spatial. They are made out of spirit. There is no substance called spirit. An angel can interact with humans irrespective of where humans are. Angels are not limited to space, ie. they can be two places at the same time...Since they have a self, they have choices (although they aren't subject to time). Angelic choice is not linear (as it is with human beings). Events in time are not lined up one after another, 1,2,3,4,etc." (p.21).

Now we come to the grand conclusion of what he covered at this ministerial conference. This is where things really get bizarre. I don't know where he comes up with the stuff but again he is very light with his use of scriptures and heavy on Greek reason.

"At death, the body separates from the Holy Spirit (=the animating principle, the basic stuff of life). The body dissolves in the ground. The Spirit goes to God. Once you separate body and **SOUL**, there is nothing left, no soul anymore. Without a physical body, there is no man. When you re-unite body and spirit (**SOUL** identity), then you will have a man. At the resurrection, the body will be re-united with the Spirit. (To say the 'same' Spirit is meaningless. There is only one Spirit that animates all life).

"Regarding the resurrected body: You cannot have the very same molecules you had in your past life, but you will have the same order of molecules so you have your old identity...God cannot destroy angels because angels have no parts to be pulled apart. But God could withhold his power and the whole universe (the creation) would disappear. So, created spirit beings(angels) can disappear if God so wills. (I would briefly comment, if that was true then God would have got rid of Satan and the demons a long time ago!) In the resurrection the spirit and the body will come together to reproduce man...**A spiritual body is not composed of spirit!!! There is no such thing as a spirit substance.** There is no such thing as a spirit body...

"Glorified body = what is meant by spiritual body = provided by God. Psychic body 'psuche'(soul) = the body that was provided at creation: an earthly body made from the dust of the ground...The body must be united with Spirit in order for an identity(soul) to exist. God does not need libraries/records/cassette tapes to keep track of us. **Jesus Christ was resurrected with a psychic (non-spirit) body.** This body could go through walls, but that's because it became a glorified psychic body. A resurrected body that does not become glorified will die. A glorified body is immortal. What stops it from dying: the limitations on the body that keep it earth-bound are removed such as weight and density. (Weight and density are part of the earthly body.) A glorified body can rise in the air, walk through walls, etc. We don't know what else a glorified body can do because scripture does not say. A glorified body can manifest itself as a physical body anytime...

"WE WILL NEVER BE GODS OR ANY KIND OF GOD-BEINGS! (Emphasis his) In the resurrection we shall have glorified bodies. We will be individuals. Jesus Christ has a glorified (**not spirit**) body.

We will be able to see Christ since we will have the same kind of body he has. We will not be able to see the Godhead(Father, Son and Holy Spirit) because God is

spirit and we will never be able to see spirit. The angels, however, can see the Godhead because they are also spirit.

“Jesus, the son of God, exists as both a finite(glorified) body and part of the infinite Godhead, now and forever. **The Son will be for eternity in two places at once: as one of three hypostasis in the infinite Godhead and as the glorified (but finite) Jesus Christ...**

“In the resurrection, we will be the children of God, a new type of creation. We will not be God or angels because they are spirit. **We will exist forever with glorified bodies**”(p.24,25,26).

We supposedly won't be able to see God the Father because of the metaphysical argument that matter cannot ever turn to spirit (supposedly because spirit cannot have a beginning and it would if matter turned into it) and we will have a glorified material body which can almost do anything but which will not be spirit. Have you ever heard anything so ridiculous?

Speaking of christians in the resurrection Pauls says in 1 Corinthians 15:44: “It is sown a natural body; **it is raised a spiritual body.** There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.” It won't just be a glorified body of matter.

If we are going to be God beings then we will have to be spirit. 1 Corinthians 15:44-50 plainly shows we will have a spirit body and we will no longer be flesh and blood matter.

In summary the following conclusions can be made about Dr Stavrinidies material:-

- He admits that the Bible has no "explicit" proof for his own ideas, using this admission as a justification for his reliance on reasoning.
- He presents a great number of analogies in an effort to prove his ideas. The fact remains: analogies are never proof for anything...they are only analogies, no more!
- He presents the term "theology" as a synonym for "philosophy", admitting that it has nothing to do with the Bible.
- His assumed premise that spirit cannot have shape or have extension in space is false. His deductions based on this false premise, that therefore God CANNOT possibly have any form or shape along with others are also wrong.
- One of the main premises he builds his whole theory on in trying to prove God is one being is Deuteronomy 6:4 which he explains incorrectly as we saw when we looked at the meaning of the words in Hebrew.
- To silence questions, he says that it is "rude and disrespectful" to question his arguments while being that way towards God's Word with the way he is misrepresenting

the nature of God. On video tape 10 given to the ministry on the nature of God he says, "To ask 'If' is rude and disrespectful of the arguments I write on the board." He then waxed eloquent and said: "Angels would have to agree with my arguments." And if an angel were to disagree with his reasoning, then, said Dr Stavrinidies, "**I would tell him HE IS WRONG!**" Such a statement reveals a certain amount of arrogance.

In referring to Psalm 110:1 he says, "IF(implying it is open to question) David wrote it, then he had a human person in mind as 'My Lord'". On two counts he is rejecting the very words of Jesus Christ who said, "How then does **DAVID** in spirit called him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If **DAVID** then called him Lord, how is he his son?" Christ is clearly referring to Himself as the Lord called My Lord at the Father's right hand.

- To discredit that the Bible actually means what it says, in places that contradict his ideas, he claims that the scriptures are:

- a figure of speech
- an analogy
- a dream or a vision
- an anthropomorphic picture(God revealing Himself in human terms for our benefit, though He has no form).
- a mistranslation

I thank God He has revealed the basics of the spiritual realm and the plain truth about our ultimate destiny in His word and we don't have to rely on the fallible ideas of Greek logic that sadly the church is constantly being subject to.