I came across this movement some years ago but didn't see any real dangers, but look at the following and see what you think...

"Sermon Addresses Doctrinal Controversy

Nixon began his "Wrath of the Lamb" sermon by stating,
"There is a conflict of doctrinal teaching going on in our church, and it has become contentious. Some among us, under the guise of 'unique truth,' are promoting error concerning the character of God and the teaching is very subtle."

Nixon went on to say that he would rather discuss a less controversial topic, but said that "the stakes are too high. One misconception about who God really is leads us down a path fraught with danger, and I cannot stand silently by."

Nixon staked out what he called "the biblical teaching on this topic."

The controversial subject at hand is whether God's wrath includes "active" punishment of sin (i.e. God
destroys the wicked) or "passive" punishment of sin (i.e. God withdraws protection, allowing the unrepentant to reap the natural consequences of sin). For Nixon, divine justice demands that God destroy the wicked for the sake of the weak and vulnerable.

Dr. Timothy Jennings, a psychiatrist and creator of ComeAndReason.com, sees things differently. His website advances the idea that if it is unremedied, sin, not God ultimately destroys human beings.

Jennings teaches a popular Sabbath School class that was recently moved from the Collegedale Church to Ackerman Auditorium on Southern's campus across the street. Jennings also authored two books: The Healing of the Mind, and Could it Be This Simple?

Debating God's Character

Without naming Jennings, Nixon in his sermon categorically and emphatically rejected any teaching that does not make room for God's active punishment of evil. Scripture reveals God as the God of mercy and justice, the God of life and death, the God of giving and of taking away, Nixon said.

God is compassionate and gracious, forgiving rebellion and sin. God's love is unearned and extravagant. However, Nixon said, God is also the God of justice and judgment. God's character is only complete in light of rejection and destruction of those who refuse divine mercy, he insisted. God does not leave the guilty unpunished.
For Nixon, interpretations that contradict this punitive view of God "explain away the portion we do not like," or "pretend the Bible does not mean what it says."

We must "face the uncomfortable truth with humility."....

In a blog post entitled "Two Pictures of God," Jennings responded to the sermon.....

In the article dated April 28 ... Jennings quoted his eleven-year-old nephew and fourteen-year-old niece who both reported feeling scared by the God Nixon preached about. Jennings offered a quotation from Ellen White that cautioned against terrifying children with the wrath of God.

He then asked how to tell which portrait of God is accurate:

"Should we look for miracles and signs that accompany the message? Miraculous signs are not reliable evidence, because miracles can be counterfeited (remember a talking serpent). The best approach is to examine the facts, the concepts, the ideas put forth and compare them with scripture and other evidences God has provided."

http://spectrummagazine.org/blog/2010/05/26/pastor-passes-out-while-preaching-twice (Link: http://spectrummagazine.org/blog/2010/05/26/pastor-passes-out-while-preaching-twice)
Steve Wohlberg and Dr. Chris Lewis of Loma Linda University recently published a book about what they feel is the counterfeit Character of God Movement in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

'The Character Of God Controversy'

Also read the following on it:

http://spectrummagazine.org/node/922 (Link: http://spectrummagazine.org/node/922)

"The controversy, Pacific Press says, is that Adventists are increasingly open to the notion that God does not kill. Quoting again from the press release, “The Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference has long expressed concerns about this theory, but no mainstream Adventist author has publicly addressed these issues until now.”

"The Character of God Controversy" seems to be a frontal attack on the idea that God cannot resort to violent destruction of humanity, arguing instead that God’s wrath, a central concept in the book, is an active wrath against evil, not a passive, withdrawn wrath. Still, the book seeks to present a picture of a loving and just God.
Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/06/11 11:21 AM

I have been abundantly blessed studying with people who believe, as Dr. Jennings seems to believe, God does not actively, directly cause death and destruction. What they say about God as a loving, compassionate, sin-pardoning Savior is absolutely beautiful and ingratiating. Who can find fault with late, great Dr. Graham Maxwell's endearing portrayal of God! However, I also happen to believe God has, does, and will actively, directly cause death and destruction. It in no way diminishes the love of God. Tough love is love.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/06/11 03:54 PM

Originally Posted By: Mountain Man
I have been abundantly blessed studying with people who believe, as Dr. Jennings seems to believe, God does not actively, directly cause death and destruction. What they say about God as a loving, compassionate, sin-pardoning Savior is absolutely beautiful and ingratiating. Who can find fault with late, great Dr. Graham Maxwell's endearing portrayal of God! However, I also happen to believe God has, does, and will actively, directly cause death and destruction. It in no way diminishes the love of God. Tough love is love.

The problem is that like A.F. Ballenger who Ellen White tried to help to keep from error, he kept on and found himself on the path to Universalism which is a treacherous and slippery one and just takes a few steps to get there. This Character of God Movement is taking just one step which in my estimation is in that direction, so you have to know where they are headed or you may find yourself someplace completely different than what you expected.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/07/11 11:35 AM

So true. God help us.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/07/11 09:59 PM

I believe that people such as Graham Maxwell were teaching the truth. Sadly he did not give his students a
strong exegetical foundation to continue to build on, and while, if you listen to his tapes you find that he presented a complete message, he tended to emphasise part of the message more than others.

Then to add to this there were theologians who were critical of what they assumed he was teaching... Actually they had come across some liberal theology, the Moral Influence Theory and some of the ways liberal theology tries to explain hell away, and they jumped to the conclusion that Graham Maxwell was teaching these things and trying to squeeze his words into these views. He tells about one professor at the Seminary who was very critical of him in class and was using this approach. Dr. Maxwell called him and asked this professor what problems he had with what Dr. Maxwell was teaching. The professor gave him a list of things and Dr. Maxwell replied "I do not believe nor do I believe any of what you are accusing me of teaching" The professor yelled to Dr. Maxwell over the phone "Oh yes you do" and slammed down the phone on him, refused all other phone calls and attempts by Dr. Maxwell to visit him.

Some books such as Webber's "Who's got the truth" tended to repeat what the professor was saying he was teaching. It was noted that all the others who Webber wrote about took a chance to defend their views. Dr. Maxwell refused to. He said "What could I do? I was expected to defend beliefs that I do not believe. I do not recognize my views in what he was writing about me, I did not know any response I could give to such misrepresentation."
Well, people have been hearing this professor's so-called criticisms of Dr. Maxwell, or reading books such as Webber's or articles that were siding with that seminary professor, and these readers finding themselves attracted to Dr. Maxwell have made sort of a mish-mash of what Dr. Maxwell has actually been teaching and the things this seminary professor falsely accused Dr. Maxwell of teaching. It is more this mish-mash which has been causing the problems.

As I said, while Dr. Maxwell could have done a better job with teaching Biblical exegeses and emphasized all the aspects of the truth rather than emphasizing some and touching on others, but what Dr. Maxwell was teaching was truth, important truths that we need to know.

However I'm saddened as to how the mixture of what Dr. Maxwell was really teaching mixed with the stuff the seminary professor said that Dr. Maxwell was teaching, has been spreading in the church. While I am willing to passionately defend Graham Maxwell, I am not that willing to identify with several of his "followers" because of the extreme that they have gone to and how they are actually teaching some of the things that the professor was trying to pin on Maxwell.

What Dr. Maxwell taught was true and truth that we need to know. However this mish-mash of what Dr. Maxwell was teaching and what the professor accused him of teaching is Satan's attack on this important truth and is a dangerous counterfeit.
Oh, who is this "Nixon"? There was a pastor Nixon who used to be pastor of AUC in the early 1990s who I have heard some good things about. Is this the same man or a different one?

The issue is we have basically 3 views of hell.

The first view of hell is the traditional God either lets you into heaven or sends you to hell, where hell is some kind of divine spanking, a punishment, traditionally a fire such as you would see when you light a match or build a campfire or a volcano. Whether it is the traditional Catholic-Baptist eternal literal fire, physically hot burning hell, or our shortened version of this, it is still focused on the physical and the heat and God actively punishing in this way.

A second view is repulsed by the above views, and tries to explain away hell, maybe goes to universalism, or at least has God completely passive in the destruction of the wicked. A lot of liberal theologians go here and this is what that Seminary Professor has tried to twist Dr. Maxwell's view into teaching, and which is reaching into some of Maxwell's followers.

A third view God himself is the consuming fire. The fire is the brightness and glory and beauty and love of God. When prophets first saw God they felt like they were
being burned alive, but as time came by they found that they could not only survive but thrive in that fire and hated to leave it. I could go into more detail but too tired right now. But Jesus is our deepest desire. But just as when Jesus was on earth some loved to be with Jesus, others felt very uncomfortable in his presence. At the Second Coming when we see Jesus we, all of us, ask "Who shall be able to stand?" and there is a horrible moment of silence, then Jesus says [sings?] "My grace is sufficient for you." To those words we find two responses: Some say "Yes, his grace is sufficient for us, this is our friend Jesus, this is my God and he will save us!" others say "No, Jesus is lieing, his grace is not sufficient for us, he is going to get us from our sins and run to the rocks and caves and say "fall on us and hide us from the one who sits on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb"

The wrath of the lamb: Can you picture turning on CNN and hearing "A lamb escaped from the central park zoo and is terrorizing the city" John and Mrs. White give a picture that they have no more need to be afraid of Jesus than of a little lamb. However their character make them respond to the beauty, love, purity (in contrast to their sinfulness), the glory of God, that fire that made the prophets feel like they were being burned alive, but refusing to have the healing relationship with this fire, but insist in staying out of harmony with this fire are in a horrible situation. Hell fire is the same as what we see in that situation at the second coming, but at the end of the time there is no place to run.

We have two attitudes inside of us, our sinful nature or
as Mrs. White says in the communion chapter of DA "There is in man a disposition to esteam himself more highly than his brethren, to serve self, to seek the highest place and often this results in evil surmising and bitterness of spirit." or as the poet/philosopher Eli Siegel said "There is in every person a disposition to think they are for themselves by making less of the outside world"

Fighting this is our deepest desire that God gave us in Gen. 3:15, something in us that is at enmity with Satan and our sinful nature. That in us that wants to be like and with Jesus. That the Psalist describes as more desirable than gold and sweeter than honey. Haggi called Jesus the Desire of all nations. Daniel called him "The one beloved [or desired] by women" and Mrs. White called him "The desire of ages" (It would be useful to spend an hour contemplating just those 4 words on the cover of the book). As Mrs. White says in DA pg 641 "When we love the world as Jesus has loved it, then for us his mission is accomplished; we are fitted for heaven for we have heaven in our hearts"

So we either develope characters of making less of the outside world, or loving the outside world as Jesus has loved it. We keep choosing between the two. One develops as our characteristics. When we see Jesus in person, when we see God not vieled by humanity but in full glory, it will be awesom. But we still see the 2 results. Despite initially feeling like we are being burned alive, some like the prophets end up thriving in this fire. But what about those who have set themselves out of harmony with this fire?
Jesus is their deepest desire and they want to come, but they have always resisted the Holy Spirit's prompting and so they continue to resist. They want to come but they won't. They see the beauty of Jesus and are attracted to him, but they are unforgiving and cannot comprehend how Jesus can forgive them. They feel that sooner or later God will get them for their sins, and they see their sins in contrast to Jesus' purity, so they want to get away. But Jesus is still their deepest desire.

They see loved ones around the throne who they long to be reunited with, but they see others who they abused and even see how they used their loved ones for their own selfish purposes, and how they would still use their loved ones for their own selfish purposes, and see the selfishness of that in contrast to the self sacrificing love that Jesus has for their loved ones and they see the ugliness of their sins and know that the one who sits on the throne knows the deepest darkest recesses of their mind. God treats them the same but there are two different results.

I hope this helps.

---

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit?  06/08/11 09:42 AM

Originally Posted By: Kevin H

The issue is we have basically 3 views of hell.

The first view of hell is the traditional God either lets you into heaven or sends you to hell, where hell is some kind of divine
hell, where hell is some kind of divine spanking, a punishment, traditionally a fire such as you would see when you light a match or build a campfire or a volcano. Whether it is the traditional Catholic-Baptist eternal literal fire, physically hot burning hell, or our shortened version of this, it is still focused on the physical and the heat and God actively punishing in this way.

A second view is repulsed by the above views, and tries to explain away hell, maybe goes to universalism, or at least has God completely passive in the destruction of the wicked. A lot of liberal theologians go here and this is what that Seminary Professor has tried to twist Dr. Maxwell's view into teaching, and which is reacing into some of Maxwell's followers.

A third view God himself is the consuming fire. The fire is the brightness and glory and beauty and love of God. When prophets first saw God they felt like they were being burned alive, but as time came by they found that they could not only survive but thrive in that fire and hated to leave it. I could go into more detail but too tired right now. But Jesus is our deepest desire. But just as when Jesus was on earth some loved to be with Jesus, others felt very uncomfortable in his presence. At the Second Coming when we see Jesus we, all of us, ask "Who shall be able to stand?" and there is a horrible moment of silence,
then Jesus says [sings?] "My grace is sufficient for you." To those words we find two responses: Some say "Yes, his grace is sufficient for us, this is our friend Jesus, this is my God and he will save us!" others say "No, Jesus is lieing, his grace is not sufficient for us, he is going to get us from our sins and run to the rocks and caves and say "fall on us and hide us from the one who sits on the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb"

The wrath of the lamb: Can you picture turning on CNN and hearing "A lamb escaped from the central park zoo and is terrorizing the city" John and Mrs. White give a picture that they have no more need to be afraid of Jesus than of a little lamb. However their character make them respond to the beauty, love, purety (incontrast to their sinfulness), the glory of God, that fire that made the prophets feel like they were being burned alive, but refusing to have the healing relationship with this fire, but insist in staying out of harmony with this fire are in a horrible situation. Hell fire is the same as what we see in that situation at the second coming, but at the end of the time there is no place to run.

We have two attitudes inside of us, our sinful nature or as Mrs. White says in the communion chapter of DA "There is in man a disposition to esteam himself more highly than his brethren, to serve self, to seek the
highest place and often this results in evil surmising and bitterness of spirit." or as the poet/philosopher Eli Siegel said "There is in every person a disposition to think they are for themselves by making less of the outside world"

Fighting this is our deepest desire that God gave us in Gen. 3:15, something in us that is at enemity with Satan and our sinful nature. That in us that wants to be like and with Jesus. That the Psalist describes as more desirable than gold and sweeter than honey. Haggi called Jesus the Desire of all nations. Daniel called him "The one beloved [or desired] by women" and Mrs. White called him "The desire of ages" (It would be useful to spend an hour contemplating just those 4 words on the cover of the book). As Mrs. White says in DA pg 641 "When we love the world as Jesus has loved it, then for us his mission is accomplished; we are fitted for heaven for we have heaven in our hearts"

So we either develope characters of making less of the outside world, or loving the outside world as Jesus has loved it. We keep choosing between the two. One develops as our characteristics. When we see Jesus in person, when we see God not vieled by humanity but in full glory, it will be awesom. But we still see the 2 results. Despite initially feeling like we are being burned alive, some like the prophets end up thriving in this fire.
But what about those who have set themselves out of harmony with this fire?

Jesus is their deepest desire and they want to come, but they have always resisted the Holy Spirit's prompting and so they continue to resist. They want to come but they won't. They see the beauty of Jesus and are attracted to him, but they are unforgiving and cannot comprehend how Jesus can forgive them. They feel that sooner or later God will get them for their sins, and they see their sins in contrast to Jesus' purity, so they want to get away. But Jesus is still their deepest desire.

They see loved ones around the throne who they long to be reunited with, but they see others who they abused and even see how they used their loved ones for their own selfish purposes, and how they would still use their loved ones for their own selfish purposes, and see the selfishness of that in contrast to the self sacrificing love that Jesus has for their loved ones and they see the ugliness of their sins and know that the one who sits on the throne knows the deepest darkest recesses of their mind. God treats them the same but there are two different results.

I hope this helps.

Excellent points, i like the 'alive and thriving in the fire' but we also have to keep in mind that the wicked will
but we also have to keep in mind that the wicked will ask to perish, anything to get away from the brightness 'fire' of God. They do not want to be with God, and thus at the end, it is their choice to die eternally.

Re: The Character of God  Posted by: Kevin H
Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/08/11 09:31 PM

Yes Rick, it is a oneness of God being both active and passive, it is his glory that is the fire, yet it is the same activity that makes his presence heaven for the saved that makes it hell and a choice for destruction for the lost. The problem is that we tend to choose one side or the other, either an active God or a passive one. Dr. Maxwell had them oned, but his critics tended to err on the active side and pictured his view as passive, and those who hold the mish-mash of what Dr. Maxwell was actually teaching mixed with what his critics was claiming he was teaching tend to err on the passive side.

Re: The Character of God  Posted by: NJK Project
Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/09/11 05:23 PM

Manifestly, the present discussion in the thread entitled “Why did God command people to stone, scorch, and smite sinners to death?” (Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=134219#Post134219) (currently mainly by me (NJK Project), Mountain Man and Tom) are dealing with this controversy at a detailed level. So the points made there may be helpful here. I had heard John Nixon’s sermon on this (from the Southern Ad. Un. Church) but didn’t realize until reading this thread here that this was the same issue of controversy.
One thing I've noticed regarding the "other" side of the question, is that that "other" side frames the issue in terms which are different than "this" side. That is, I seem the "other" side disagreeing with things that I don't actually believe.

Also, I think a way of tackling the issue which may be beneficial is to consider multiple things. For example:

1. What happens in the final judgment?
2. What caused Christ's death?
3. The issue in question (regarding God's judgments from when Adam sinned until Christ's second coming).

Although there are few who see item 3 as I do, there are many who see Item 1 similarly, and also quite a few who see Item 2 as I do. No one who sees Item 1 differently than I do will see Item 3 as I do, which makes we wonder if it's even worth discussing Item 3, if that's the case. Item 3 would be a bridge too far. It's difficult to even discuss the issue in such a way that both sides are talking about the same thing, because the viewpoints are so different.

How does one really determine whether or not this movement is a counterfeit movement?

In other words, what are the elements that make it a
counterfeit movement, or what are the elements that makes it NOT a counterfeit movement?

**Re: The Character of God**  
**Movement, is it Counterfeit?** - 06/15/11 12:21 PM

As always, it is “by their fruit” that one comes to differentiate False and True Teaching (Matt 7:15-20). The Character of God Movement has to foundationally ignore the word of God as it exegetically read, including statements made by God Himself (which are further corroborated by the SOP testimony). That unbiblical, partially or wholly ignoring and/or rewording, approach is what Satan used to try to deceive Jesus in the wilderness, as he also uses to deceive all humans from the beginning. Biblical Truth is built upon, and established by, ‘every word that proceeds from the mouth of God’ and not ‘only those that one privately/subjectively finds acceptable’.

**Re: The Character of God**  
**Movement, is it Counterfeit?** - 06/16/11 10:57 AM

NJK Project: First which texts do you have in mind. And second, the "Character of God Movement" is NOT one movement, but different groups having developed here and there with a few points in common, but also differences. Third, there are those lies that have been told about one (the most famous but I would not say the most exegetical of these theologians) of these theologians, and the fact that there are church members who have accepted the "Character of God Movement" who have indeed incorporated these lies into their belief system, thus making the criticism a self-fulfilling prophecy.
NJK, Normally I'd be willing to get into a strong argument with you, but since the rise of this sub-group among the "Character of God Movement" that have mixed the ideas of the "Character of God Movement" with the lies about the character of god movement. I can not fully disagree with you. However I can say that your criticism fits as a blanket coverage for the whole movement.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/16/11 11:40 AM

Originally Posted By: Kevin H

NJK Project: First which texts do you have in mind.

From what I've read from those who hold this view, they commonly do not accept passages which speak of God (and/or His commissioned angels) commanding or actively doing an act of destruction. However to hold such a view involves ignoring what the Bible exegetically says in those statements. I have already gone through many of those statements and Bible episodes in this related thread (Link: http://www.maritime-sda-online.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=134219#Post134219).

The Bible and SOP episode of the War in Heaven (Link: http://njkproject.blogspot.com/2009/11/commentary-war-in-heaven.html) is a classic example of not...
war-in-heaven.html) is a classic example of not accepting those statements as they read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originally Posted By: Kevin H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And second, the &quot;Character of God Movement&quot; is NOT one movement, but different groups having developed here and there with a few points in common, but also differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I didn’t realize that there were different “branches” of this movement. It would be interesting to hear what main issue(s) are dividing those groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originally Posted By: Kevin H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third, there are those lies that have been told about one (the most famous but I would not say the most exegetical of these theologians) of these theologians, and the fact that there are church members who have accepted the &quot;Character of God Movement&quot; who have indeed incorporated these lies into their belief system, thus making the criticism a self fullfilling prophecy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interesting. Who exactly are you referring to? (I.e., who is this ‘most famous of these theologians’). I could probably look up his work, if available only to see exactly what he is teaching.
NJK, Normally I'd be willing to get into a strong argument with you, but since the rise of this sub-group among the "Character of God Movement" that have mixed the ideas of the "Character of God Movement" with the lies about the character of god movement. I can not fully disagree with you. However I can say that your criticism fits as a blanket coverage for the whole movement.

Perhaps, when you have the chance, you can defend what you yourself believe/accept as true. (I am assuming here that this is a view of yours.

They are not "Branches" but different theologians from different places, thus you would expect differences, what is uniting is the view they have come to believe that the Bible and Mrs. White teach about hell.

An Elder Fifefield (spelling) was a friend of Mrs. White and was teaching this in the 1800s. In 1920 Lynn Harper Wood (who Lynn Wood Hall at Southern is named after) developed this view. Several of Lynn Wood's students, such as Paul Heubech took it and started teaching it. When Graham Maxwell and Jack Provonsha were students at PUC Lynn Wood gave a week of prayer that very much impressed them. Neither can remember of Wood taught these things if it he...
Can remember of Wood taught these things if it he influenced their later views, Dr. Maxwell says that he does not think that Lynn Wood did, but that week of prayer gave Maxwell a huge respect for Lynn Wood and as they got older Graham got to know Lynn Wood when he retired to Loma Linda and they found out the similarities between their views.

Maxwell and Provonsha were apart several years after PUC, when they got back together they had differences in their views, but found that they had a lot in common as well and became very close friends. (Graham Maxwell did say that Provonsha is a bit more liberal than he is and that some of Provonsha's views are closer to what the critics are saying, but that Provonsha was still not teaching what they are being accused of teaching, and that Dr. Maxwell was being unjustly attacked because Provonsha was a little closer to the critic's concern and that they were close friends)

Probably under Lynn Wood's influence but a number of our leading theologians in the 1950s held this view of hell, including some of those who contributed to the SDA Bible Commentary. (Lynn Wood wrote the notes on either first or second Samuel, Graham Maxwell wrote Romans, and I don't know who it was but the author of the notes on Galatians held this view of hell) Edward Hepenstall could not decide between the two views and would teach both views knowing that he had two different views that he could not decide between.

Richard Nies, MA in Religion and PhD. in psychology, developed a similar view and became close friends with Maxwell and Provonsha, although was still some what
on his own.

John W. Wood-McCall developed this in New England in the 1960s and taught it at AUC but very much distances himself from Maxwell and even more so Provontsha, saying that while Maxwell has come to correct conclusions, that his methods are too superficial and that Maxwell could have done a much better job in building up exegeses in the church instead of just the traditional methods. And that while Maxwell's students have a lot of the correct conclusions that they do not have the strong Biblical foundation they need to build on and that they are therefore in danger of getting off track.

Daniel Dudah living under the iron curtain had gotten premission from the Communists to attend a Lutheran Seminary. While there he brought several of Mrs. White's books to study to compare and contrast what she was teaching with what he was learning in the Lutheran Seminary. He developed this view about hell during this study and thought that all Seventh-day Adventists believed this. He was surprised when the Iron Curtain was raised that it was not held in common by all Seventh-day Adventists, then for a while felt that it was original with him and that he was the only person who believed it, then he learned about Graham Maxwell. There is a similar story about Johnathan Gallager in England, as well as others from different parts of the world.

So it is not one movement that branched out, but different people in different parts of the world, only studying the Bible and Ellen White, frequently among
our theologians and professors of our colleges. The Loma Linda version has become the most famous, but even the Loma Linda version is Maxwell and Provonsha and their individual differences and I am more comfortable with Maxwell than I am with Provonsha, but still a fan of Provonsha. I need to become more familiar with Fifefield. Although less famous, I think that Lynn Wood and John Wood-McCall did better jobs than the Loma Linda version. I hope this helps.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/18/11 12:13 AM

This historical overview was quite worthwhile and helpful. Thanks. However, like I said in another thread in regards to this similar response, I determine truth by proper exegesis, and in many factual ways, there is a great and crucial chasm in this regards amongst even SDA Theologians as they only do exegesis according to what they had learned about, especially, the original languages, while in school. So I’ll loo up the views of these people, if available online, especially (the recently late (Dec. 2010)) Graham Maxwell, as he does have many things posted online, and exegetically examine what they are teaching. (Acts 17:11)

So thanks again for these names citings as well as a brief indication of from where they came to their view.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/18/11 12:50 AM

Two more points that I wanted to add: With the different sub-groups, Gerhard Haskel was a critic of both Lynn HW d d G h M l l l
Harper Wood and Graham Maxwell, yet a very close friend to John Wood-McCall. So even the critics like some more than others.

The second point as I keep repeating here, there is a branch of the Loma Linda version that has blended Maxwell with Provonsha with the lies that their critics have said about them and are actually believing and teaching this mish-mash. While I am a supporter of most of those on the above list (I have not read Fifefield, and outside of his views of hell, I find Gallager to be a bit caught up on tradition instead of exegeses and serious Bible study) I am worried about this branch of the Loma Linda version.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/18/11 06:59 AM

By the way, do you know in which of the sermon series titles on this Pine Knoll resources Page (Link: http://www.pineknoll.org/all-audio-resources) either, Maxwell, Nies, Gallagher, and/or Provonsha may be focusing on their view on this topic?

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/18/11 10:30 AM

Another person who really pushed the teaching that "God Does Not Kill" was Fred Wright - an offshoot from Australia.... He wrote a book called "Behold Your God" and he appeared to have an answer for every Bible account.... It was filled with error!
Interesting additional citing Tammy. The following internet expositions which either in whole or in part address Fred Wright’s view are quite interesting (in “partial treatise”, search for “Wright” in your browser”:

Daniel Winters, GC Blog - “Behold Your God” by Fred Wright review (Link: http://great-controversy-movie.com/blog/?p=249)
Gerald L. Finneman - “Threads From the East” (Link: http://www.gospel-herald.com/finneman/threads_from_the_east.htm)

By the way, do you know in which of the sermon series titles on this Pine Knoll resources Page (Link: http://www.pineknoll.org/all-audio-resources) either, Maxwell, Nies, Gallagher, and/or Provonsha may be focusing on their view on this topic?

Graham Maxwell's "Servants or Friends" series,
although Richard Nies has a wonderful sermon titled "Is the end of the wicked a barbecue" he does a pretty good job in his spiritual fitness series. I have not listened to Provonsha's tapes (I heard him give series in person a couple of times. One did not impress me the second one did but I don't know if they were recorded) and while I got a couple of Johnathan Gallager's tapes when he took over Graham Maxwell's Sabbath School class, they seemed too much the same and focused on tradition. I think he would do a lot better if he would listen to John Wood-McCall's Last Day Events from the Southern New England Campmeeting (1976) and (especially to clear up all his misunderstandings of history of first century Judaism) Jim Fleming's "The death of Jesus and the Jews" to get him back on track.

I have not listened to any of his other tapes. I've herd him tell his testimony in person that was good.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/18/11 09:50 PM

Originally Posted By: Tammy Roesch

Another person who really pushed the teaching that "God Does Not Kill" was Fred Wright - an offshoot from Australia.... He wrote a book called "Behold Your God" and he appeared to have an answer for every Bible account.... It was filled with error!

Although I know that some of the neo=Loma Linda version group has gone over to God does not kill, most...
of the people, including Maxwell and Nies disagree with the God does not kill camp. Their issue is "How does God kill; a literal fire, or is his presence and glory the 'fire'"

The "God does not kill" group is once again taking part of the truth but getting it out of balance with the rest of the truth. On my list that I gave none of them belong to the God does not kill camp.

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/19/11 06:04 AM

Glad to see Daniel Winters didn't buy into Fred Wright's belief...

Re: The Character of God Movement, is it Counterfeit? - 06/22/11 12:24 PM

Originally Posted By: Kevin H

dissagree with the God does not kill camp. Their issue is "How does God kill; a literal fire, or is his presence and glory the 'fire'?"

Regarding if God "actively" kills, is there a difference between God saying, enough is enough and zapping people, and contrasted with just His presence is a consuming fire and He tried His best to get people to change their character as is His, but they rejected that and are so out of line with Him, that His character is as a consuming fire?

To me, "actively" means an intent, a desire, an activity which targets certain people and not others. "Passive"
which targets certain people and not others? Passive means a cause and effect, whether it is sinners ceasing to live because they are no longer connected to the Life Giver, or whether they are so out of harmony, they cannot exist in His presence.

Yes, you could say that the sun "melts" wax and therefore is "active", but that's different than someone with a blow torch.

---

**Re: The Character of God**  
**Movement, is it Counterfeit?** - 06/22/11 09:04 PM

**Originally Posted By: kland**

Yes, you could say that the sun "melts" wax and therefore is "active", but that's different than someone with a blow torch.

To me, and in purely a figurative sense it indeed does matter what “material” one’s character is composed of in the end. However I see, as seen in the Bible’s including Jesus, and the SOP’s literal descriptions for Hell Fire, the actual effectuation of the judgement is, “active” in the sense that you understand it. I.e., that “consuming fire” statement to me in its full context means: One’s character is so out of harmony with God that there is nothing to make them avoid his judgement.

Interestingly enough this threat of a justly, and not sadistically, viewed Hell Destruction has in many ways served to purify the character of many, if not all, just as fire can serve to purify some materials of impurities,
especially for the believer, in times when one faith or even love of an unseen God, is honestly/realistically, not enough in a specific circumstance. At the very least, it can serve as ‘a beginning towards obtaining Godly knowledge and wisdom’. (e.g, Rev 14:9-11|EW 254.1 vs. Job 28:28; Psa 1111:10; Pro 1:7; 9:10; 15:33).