



Diakrisis (Australia)

'But strong meat belongs to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern [diakrisis] both good and evil', (Heb.5:14)

PO Box 1499, Hervey Bay, Qld. Australia, 4655.
E-mail: taministries@bigpond.com Ph. 0411489472
Website: taministries.net

Newsletter of TA Ministries Vol .3, No. 28 July/August 2012

TA Ministries is a non-denominational faith ministry,
teaching, informing and equipping the church.
Editor: Terry Arnold (MABS; Dip. Bib. & Min., Dip. Teaching)

The editor may not necessarily agree with all the views expressed by subscribers in this newsletter.

We welcome comments and items contributed by readers. Unless otherwise requested, these may be included in following newsletters at the discretion of the editor.

Articles in this newsletter may be copied or reproduced provided it is in context and proper credit and references are given. We encourage distribution of this newsletter that others might be taught, informed and equipped.

This Newsletter is distributed bi-monthly *free* of charge. The cost to this ministry is approximately \$20.00 per subscriber annually. Any donations to help with these expenses is received with gratitude.

Contents

P.2,3 Editor's Comment

P.4 The Backflips of 'Christian' Politicians; Majority of Christians Hate Christian TV, Survey Finds

P.5 Benny Hinn To Reconcile With Former Wife?; Snake-Handling Christians: Faith, Prophecy and Obedience

P.6-10 The Fruits of Postmodern Thinking

P.11-14 The Art of Misquoting (Part 1)

P.15-20 Your Comments and Questions

Brisbane Seminar

July 14 (Sat) 2-5pm Corinda Brethren (Hassall St), Brisbane: Seminar - 'Unity, Union and Ecumenism - At What Price?': The Ecumenical Movement; History; 'union' or true 'unity'; Justification /Imputation and the 'Philosophy' of the Gospel; Separation/Holiness ('*ekklesia*' or '*oikoumenikos*'?)
Ph.(07)37256458

Editor's Comment

I have been involved in the work of eldership, leadership and some pastoring in church life for most of 20 years. I have travelled amongst hundreds of churches of various persuasions and talked with countless pastors. In that time I have witnessed many changes in church life as a whole...

There has been a change in doctrine...

Worse, 'doctrine' is now viewed as a negative word in many assemblies. Yet the Greek word for 'doctrine' ('*didache*') is 'teaching'. It is what God holds forth as truth. Christianity without doctrine is like a brain without thought. The church has *left* its teachings and added *new* doctrines. Worship is increasingly centred in music, feelings and performance. Before the middle of the second half of the 20th Century, the qualifications for elders/pastors was generally that they be male ('*husband of one wife*'), yet in the last few decades, scripture and centuries of biblical orthodoxy have been overturned. New teaching on the Holy Spirit, 'tongues' and 'baptisms' is little more than 100 years old. Marriage is now hardly 'unto death do us part'. The divorce rate amongst Christians differs little from that in the secular world. We are now quite ecumenical in thought, word and deed; yet, I can remember as a young Christian when most 'Protestant' churches were warning of the World Council of Churches and the Romish ecumenical movement. *Widespread apostasy has given us a modern church that would not be recognised by the first century apostles!*

There has been a change in the mission of the church...

We are more focused on meeting physical, mental and social needs than meeting spiritual needs. Churches feed the poor, engage in enterprises to meet community needs and offer 'therapies' for the consequences of sin, but often pay little attention to the soul Hell-bound in unbelief. Although many of these activities are good in themselves, gospel focused projects are not popular today.

The church is becoming a saltless wonder. The media kicks it to and fro and people scoff, just as the heathen scoffed at Israel when it backslid into idolatry. The silence of most churches on the '*same sex marriage*' issue is embarrassing. Very few pastors are arming their people with biblical, historical and logical answers against the choruses of those intent on ridding society of what was originally a God ordained institution. Worse, many churches actually advocate and argue *for* same sex unions - something almost unheard of just decades ago.

There has been a change in pastoring...

Pastoring is now viewed more as a CEO appointment rather than a shepherd of God's precious sheep. They are more like peacekeepers and don't intervene in people's lives unless their own kingdoms are threatened. Pastors are market oriented. The cowardice of many elder/pastors today is sickening. Few churches

discipline attendees for adultery, fornication or blatant sin which affects the purity of the body of Christ. Love prevails at the expense of truth. Is it any wonder that women are taking over leadership roles in the church when many of our men are passive in their resolve to stand for truth?

Most people leave churches today for selfish reasons. If they are told truth about their sinful behaviour and shown any affect it has on the church family, they leave to take the problem somewhere else. ‘*Dummy spitting*’ is common.

There has been a change in preaching...

Sermons are shorter and are topically shallow rather than expositional and deep. The listeners now bleat for more milk than meat. Thus most people in churches today are ignorant of sound doctrine, because the preacher has not informed, taught and equipped them. Preachers tickle ears with stories and powerpoints but do not want to engage in the passionate scriptural battle for the minds of the saints. We are supposed to be in a ‘*warfare*’ and ‘*contending*’ for the faith (1Tim.1:18; 2Cor.10:4; Jude 1:3; Phil.1:17). Yet many preach as if it were at a fun filled picnic in the park. I wonder how some can sing ‘*Onward Christian Soldiers*’...perhaps most are too busy with the ‘*God is my friend, he makes me feel good*’ music of the wealth/health/success *Hillsong* genre?

There has been a change in church attendees...

The doors of most churches are now wider and faster ‘*revolving*’. ‘*Church hopping*’ and ‘*shopping*’ is rampant. We must meet our needs rather than serve the church. The lifestyles of church attendees are often little different to the culture of the world in which they live.

Our churches are producing passive people! I have been told I should be more ‘*pro-active*’ instead of ‘*reactive*’. ‘*Pro-active*’ is a ‘*psychological*’ term that means to be ‘*positive*’ in the face of the quite obvious ‘*negative*’. But it’s often postmodern jargon for ‘*don’t challenge me or expose error...Don’t make enemies...even though you might be telling the truth*’ (Jn.8:45).

We have a lot of *professors* today but few *possessors*. Many hearts have simply not been regenerated. I know I will be accused of being judgmental for saying this, but if I am wrong then why is it that the western church is so much like the world? My apologies for not sounding very ‘*loving*’, but I grieve for the plight of the Laodicean church in these last days.

First-century Christians used the gospel to turn the world upside down. Today we have a gospel designed to appease rather than confront; a gospel of love without judgement; a gospel that tickles without offense; and a gospel more about *us* than the crucified Christ.

Oh Christian, be a part of the remnant, be overcomers, holy unto the Lord! ‘***Wherefore come out from among them, and be you separate, says the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you***’ (2Cor.6:17).

Terry Arnold

The Backflips of ‘Christian’ Politicians

Back in 2008 (when he was trying to convince Christians that he was one of them), candidate Barack Hussein Obama told **Rick Warren’s** massive audience at the Saddleback megachurch, (to the resounding cheers of the church audience in attendance) **that he opposed same-sex marriage: ‘I believe that marriage is the union between a man and a woman. Now, for me as a Christian - for me - for me as a Christian, it is also a sacred union. God’s in the mix’.**

Four years later, Obama decided that marriage is no longer a sacred union. And evidently, God has been evolved out of the mix, somehow. Obama told *ABC News* that his position on gay marriage has **‘evolved’** - evidently since March, following intense discussions by his *campaign inner circle*.

Rights, rights, rights. Rights are very important. Gays have the right to marry. Women have the right to choose to abort their babies. Muslims have the right not to be profiled. Atheists have a right to be protected from God.

It would appear, however, that some rights are more important than others. Americans do not have the right to unrestricted travel. **Christians do not have the right to freely practice their faith on public property. Students do not have a right to pray, unless they are Muslim.** Unborn babies do not have the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I evidently do **NOT** have the right to **NOT** know what somebody else does in their bedroom. I must be informed of what they do in their bedroom **and I must agree with it.** Otherwise, I am an **intolerant bigot** and not to be **tolerated** by the **tolerant** who won’t **tolerate** my **intolerance**.

In this generation, truth doesn’t mean what is factual, but rather, **what is fashionable.** It is fashionable to lie, provided one frames it properly. It is fashionable to pander, provided one is pandering to a fashionable constituency. What is **not** fashionable is not to be spoken aloud. Welcome to Laodicea!...

(Israel Report, May/2012)

Majority of Christians Hate Christian TV, Survey Finds



‘...The vast majority said they hate Christian TV and do not watch it...90 % of the feedback to...[the] poll was negative...Major turn-offs [were]...Too much begging for money and fund-raising telethons; False prosperity teachers manipulating people for offerings...Lack of integrity of Christian leaders...‘Unfortunately, the greed for money has replaced the need for ministry among many of our ministers

and Christian TV networks. People are fed up with the lust for material things’... ‘We can’t have pastors indulging in sin and expect people not to be turned off’... (Christian Today June 07, 2012; cited in Apostasy Alert 9th June/2012)

Editor’s comment: The secular media has for years exposed this. Yet the modern church sadly is far more accepting of such (Lk.16:8)?

Benny Hinn To Reconcile With Former Wife?



Televangelist Benny Hinn announced that he and his former wife are on a path to reconciliation after the couple decided two years ago to end their 30-year marriage. Suzanne separated from Benny Jan.26, 2010 and filed for divorce...citing irreconcilable differences...

A year after the separation announcement, Benny Hinn was reported to have been in a relationship with megachurch pastor Paula White, who herself went through a divorce in 2010. Hinn and White were pictured last summer in the National Enquirer leaving a hotel in Italy holding hands...Hinn admitted to having a friendship with White while he was still married, but said...‘There was nothing inappropriate or morally improper about my friendship with Paula White. There has been no immorality whatsoever’.

(Christian Post and excerpted in Apostasy Alert (Australia), 31st May/2012)

Editor’s Comment: Lest we forget that this is the man who has taught some of the most bizarre doctrine, issued *many* false prophecies, been exposed for his fraudulent healing’s and has been caught lying on several occasions. Yet he still captures millions of Christians to his ministry...and their millions of dollars. (There are two articles on Benny Hinn on our website: www.taministries.net)

Snake-Handling Christians: Faith, Prophecy and Obedience



‘Pastor Mark Randall ‘Mack’ Wolford died May 27, about eight hours after being bitten by this snake. [He] believed that the Bible instructs the faithful to handle snakes and drink poison...[but] Christians have argued snake handlers are wrong to take Jesus’ words in Mark 16:17-18 literally...Mark Randall...pastor of House of the Lord Jesus in Matoaka, was passionate about handling snakes during worship services ...Wolford, 44, died...eight hours after being bitten by one of his poisonous yellow timber rattlesnakes during an outdoor Sunday service...Despite his agonising death Wolford had refused medical help...as in the similar death of his serpent-handling father nearly 30 years ago. Wolford’s mother indicated...that her faith had not been shaken...‘I want to go on doing what the Word says’. Serpent handling comes out of that Pentecostal tradition which looked for biblical evidence of possession of the Holy Spirit, initial evidence of baptism of the Holy Spirit. They sought that evidence, which they settled upon as glossolalia or speaking in tongues’, explained Ralph Hood, who is considered the foremost expert on snake handling’.

(Apostasy Alert, 7th June 2012)

Editor’s Comment: Mark 16:17,18 is addressed to *‘the eleven’* (vs.14). The *‘signs’* here were later fulfilled (healings Acts 5:14-16; Tongues Acts ch.2,10 and 19; and snakes Acts 28:3-6).

The Fruits of Postmodern Thinking

I once remember receiving two letters in the mail on the same day. They were responses to a certain edition of our newsletter '*Diakrisis*'. The first read: '*Terry, Please remove me from your mailing list, your material is depressing, and never has a word of encouragement. Let the dead bury the dead, get on the with that which is important*'. The second letter read: '*Terry, I am really enjoying the reading of your publication 'Diakrisis'. Bless you for your tireless endeavours towards the courageous upholding of His glorious truths*'.

This is a common anomaly in this ministry. One person is depressed and sees our writings as 'negative'; the other is encouraged by the truth in *the same newsletter!* The difference is in the mindset and the 'filter' we use for truth and encouragement. Should not truth and scripture encourage us whether it is found to be 'positive' or 'negative'? If we only want the 'positive' or 'encouraging' then we might need to rip out huge sections of the Bible! We might need to delete the first few chapters of Romans which itemise, detail and expose nearly every sin on this planet! By the end of chapter 3 one would be begging for relief! And yet the writer gives it in chapter 4 with the doctrine of Justification to all those who believe. But notice the negative comes first. This is often the case in the apostle Paul's writings. Paul was *not* a postmodern thinker!

The way Christians *think* has always fascinated me. We are living in an age in which thinking processes are rapidly changing. Subjective thinking, experiences and feelings rule the day. This is the fruit of Postmodern thinking.

The history

The era of 'Modernism' was heralded by the 'Renaissance' period which exalted man and his abilities. The 'Enlightenment' period which began in the 1600's exalted human reasoning. Human values increasingly replaced religious values. Individualism or 'free thinking' was encouraged. The great preacher and pastor, John Newton, was for a time influenced by this thought and saw himself as a 'free thinker', giving up any religious thoughts learned as a child. This led him to a godless life of profanity until he was rescued and saved by the grace of God.

The 'Industrial Revolution' from the 1700's to the 1800's saw great advances in technology and caused man to depend on and esteem his own abilities. This caused him to think inward to self and away from absolutes. 'Darwinism' then furthered this 'ability' of man and helped him to explain away his beginnings and thus his destiny with God. But it is 'Postmodernism' in the late 20th century that has cemented this shift in thinking.

Postmodernism came after the liberal movement which inflicted much damage on the church late in the 19th Century and early 20th Century. Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) is considered the father of theological liberalism.

Continued next page >

From that time onwards nearly all major doctrines were challenged by liberal theologians, many who were involved in German Rationalism and 'Higher Criticism' which reduced the 'inspiration' of the Bible to a more 'human' level. The consequences of this can still be seen in the modern church where today life and experience (orthopraxy) have increasingly become more important than matters of belief (orthodoxy/doctrine).

Richard Rorty (1931-2007) is considered by many to be one of the originators of 'Postmodernism'. Postmodern philosophy teaches that there are no absolutes and we cannot know truth in any final sense. Modernism has brought in the thinking that truth can be discerned by reason and logical argumentation...truth is not objective. Everyone's view is right. The new tolerance found in Postmodernism claims that there is no such thing as objective truth.

By the second half of the twentieth century a generation of people, particularly young people, questioned everything, including God. In religion, *scripture became subservient to reason*. The hypocrisy and backflips of politicians and religious leaders no doubt have not helped young minds think towards absolutes. Alongside this has been the general moral decline in society. The fleshly desire to be 'free' from moral and religious restraints, even those set by God, drove a generation into the false 'freedom' of Postmodern thought. Interestingly, the music at the beginning of the Postmodern era demonstrated the thought of the day - moral 'freedom' (sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll). Homosexuality and abortion were legalised and divorce was made something that is now ones 'right'. The thinking was now *if we think it is right, then it is right*. **'...Every man did that which was right in his own eyes'** (Jdgs.21:25). Today such Postmodern thinking abounds. There are no absolutes. There is a 'new tolerance'.

The hypocrisy of Postmodernism

The Postmodern cry of '*There is no such thing as absolute truth*' is self contradictory. The statement itself is an 'absolute truth'. Postmodernists claim to be non judgemental in interpretations of thinking, yet they judge those who have a definite interpretation. Postmodernism supposedly has a new tolerance and tolerates everything, yet cannot tolerate those who do not tolerate something. Just try to state religious views on homosexuality or same sex marriage on a TV discussion panel or in a public forum and see what reaction you get! Everyone now has 'rights': 'Gays' have the right to marry and women have the right to choose to abort their babies. But woe if I decide I have the right to speak against these 'rights' as being immoral, or if I speak for the rights of babies (do unborn babies have the right to life?). I must agree with many of these 'rights' or I am an intolerant religious bigot and not to be tolerated by the tolerant who will not tolerate my intolerance. Postmodernism is self contradictory - it simply does not tolerate intolerance.

Continued next page >

Postmodernism and the Ecumenical movement

Postmodern thinking has flowed over into the ecumenical movement. This thinking endeavours to have us embrace the post-modern and unscriptural lie that dialogue is superior to debate or any controversy. *Unity in fellowship is better than separation in differences*. But look at the fruit in those denominations who ‘dialogued’ with the homosexual lobbies and the ‘women in ministry’ advocates. Those denominations have been racked with division and some have been decimated!

According to Postmodern thinking the Reformation was a mistake. Catholicism is now ‘Christian’. Yet the Reformation leaders fought to bring the church back to the Bible. Despite this, we must now ignore the differences that men believed were worth dying for and unite on similarities. The problem with this is that the ecumenical mix involves different gospels and different Jesus’. The ecumenical Jesus focuses on love at the expense of truth, ignoring false doctrine and sin. A decision or a profession for Jesus is now counted as salvation. Hence, Catholicism now becomes ‘Christian’. Yet the real Jesus of the Bible is rather intolerant of other religions and false teaching - just read the Old Testament history of Israel and Paul’s warnings of false teachers and his naming and shaming them, as well as his commands to avoid such and separate. The real Jesus speaks of separation, not union (Rom.16:17; 2Thess.3:6-15). In the days before Postmodernism, Spurgeon warned about the coming ecumenism: *‘The mood of the moment is unity...a chorus of ecumenical voices keep harping the unity tune. What they are saying is, ‘Christians of all doctrinal shades and beliefs must come together in one visible organisation, regardless...Such teaching is false, reckless and dangerous. Truth alone must determine our alignments. Truth comes before unity. Unity without truth is hazardous. Our Lords prayer in John 17 must be read in full context. Look at verse 17: ‘Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.’ Only those sanctified through the word can be one in Christ. To teach otherwise is to betray the Gospel.’* (1)

According to God himself, false teaching and false teachers are to be opposed, refuted (Eph.5:11; Tit.1:9; Jude 3; Rom.16:17) and even at times named and shamed (2Tim.2:17; 4:14) - *so that the people of God would be protected*. It sometimes seems to me that we care more about the false teachers and prophets than we do the flock of God, for we have little or no resistance to false religion in the ecumenical movement.

‘Ecumenical unity in diversity’ is today's Postmodern philosophy. The recent ‘Emergent Church’ has taken up this philosophy with its view that ‘absolute truth is relative, even unattainable’, and those who hold to absolutes are viewed as arrogant. These days if you expose a person, their false teaching, or if you oppose the ecumenical movement head on, you are unloving, intolerant and divisive.

History records the fate of those early Christians who opposed the social

(1) Spurgeon, *‘The Essence of Separation’*.

Continued next page >

thought of the day and refused to be inclusive. The first and second century church was persecuted because it refused to adopt the inclusive thinking of the Roman empire of the day which would have them worship their gods *as well as* the exclusive God of the Bible. Christians were persecuted for their objective and narrow thinking. Interestingly, *the church grew* and the Roman empire became largely lawless and immoral and eventually self destructed.

Postmodernism and Bible hermeneutics

Many Bible studies today are more about ‘*what does this text say to you*’ rather than ‘*what does this text say?*’ The switch here is *from the text to the individual; from objective exegesis to subjective eisegesis*. But it is not what we think of the text that really matters to God, but what He said through the original writer. Bible teachers today must lovingly challenge Postmodern thinking which is not producing fruit but confusion, as is seen in the multitude of varying doctrines now derived from some passages. If one studies the commentaries of yesteryear, a uniformity of interpretation is found upon *most* passages of Scripture. Common ground was to be found on most occasions - even within the more ‘difficult’ passages. Not so in the 20th Century. At the root of why Christians increasingly interpret Scripture so differently is because Scripture no longer is something in which God is sovereign and man is subservient to God’s word; but rather man is now able to interpret Scripture to satisfy himself. But what happened to the ‘*Spirit of truth*’ to lead and ‘*guide us into all truth*’ (Jn.16:13)? Is it any wonder that so many teach that Genesis is only a ‘story’ and it does not contain any absolute truths? Is it any wonder that the doctrines of sovereign election and predestination are no longer in the majority view? Postmodern thought will simply find these doctrines unloving, intolerable and not *inclusive* enough for this modern age.

Postmodernism and the ‘church’

Postmodern thought will have a distaste for preaching that causes people to *think* and grapple with scripture. Cerebral arguments and theological terminology is ‘boring’. Postmodern churchgoers want to ‘experience’ the Spirit and ‘feel the music’, rather than acquire knowledge of Scripture, study truth and thus know God more. Jesus once said ‘***You do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God***’ (Matt.22:29).

Evangelism has also become Postmodern in thought and in practise. The focus is on ‘decisions’ rather than expounding on the truth of mans depravity. Much of today’s evangelistic writing and preaching waters down the very reason why man needs a saviour - because of his sin nature. The ‘decision’ too is more important than the fruit of a changed life. It plays into the Postmodern concept that we have the right to choose our own destiny. The Postmodern theology is more like ‘*God has voted for you...the devil has voted against you...you have the casting vote*’. But who is in control, the Potter or the pot? Has the Potter

made the offer to unsaved man and He is waiting to see which way the pot will act? Or is there an absolute truth - that God can enter into a person's life and change his heart so that he is willing to receive free grace? Is God not the '*author and the finisher of our faith*' (Heb.12:2; 5:9)?

Conclusion:

The error of Postmodern thought is seen in the Fall of man. Adam and Eve were given an *absolute* concerning the forbidden tree. Satan cast *doubt* on that Word of God, *questioned* it and challenged Eve to *think differently*. As the apostasy in Christendom deepens we will see the effects of Postmodern thinking abound - absolutes will be minimised (already seen wholesale in the Emergent Church Movement); being a 'Christian' will be widened to anyone who professes to 'believe' (the ecumenical movement already teaches this); the belief that people who have not heard the Gospel can still be saved; the tolerance of homosexuality within the denominations; and the felt needs of the world increasingly adopted (as seen in the success, health, wealth gospels).

When will the church wake up to the fact that the church is not growing in numbers or in strength? Statistics prove this conclusively. It is racked by division and '*every wind of doctrine*'. What has the ecumenical movement done to turn this around? Has the Postmodern movement changed the church for the better? If so, where is the revival? Why is the church in the west so sickly, even in the eyes of the world? Why is the church so much like the world? Where is the separation and distinctiveness that the Bible demands?

The good news is that there is a remnant! Amazingly I find this remnant in nearly every town I travel to. They have a mindset from scripture that opposes the Postmodern and ecumenical thought. I venture to say the 'spirit' is different!

The church must get back to basics. It has become like the Hebrew Christians who had fallen away and had become '*dull of hearing*' and needing '*one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat*' (Heb.5:11,12).

We must hold to biblical Christianity as being exclusive, not inclusive. It is unique, narrow, in that Jesus is the only way. The language of the Bible is precise in its message to man in eternal issues. Man's ideas may change; but the Bible is eternal. Its word changes not because the Lord changes not. The fashions and the thinking of the world will change but '*the Word of the Lord endures forever*' (1Pet.1:25; Lk.21:33). Postmodern and ecumenical thinking will attempt to minimise and do away with the seriousness of sin, but the Bible will always depict a sin hating God who issues a call for all to repent.

Christ is knocking at the door of the churches (Rev.3:20), calling them back to the 'Faith' once delivered 2,000 years ago (Jude 3). That 'Faith' is the seed bed of discernment. Christians will never have discernment while they traffic in the uncertainty of Postmodern thinking.

Terry Arnold

The Art of Misquoting (Part 1)

I recently received this comment from a reader responding to our article ‘*More of Dave Hunt’s Calvinism*’ (May/June *Diakrisis*): ‘*You falsely misrepresent Hunt’s quoting of Spurgeon as ‘selective, cut and paste, even shameful and dishonest’...Please provide the exact documented quotations from Spurgeon you believe to be ‘shamefully misquoted and mishandled...’*’

In recent years I have been stunned by some of the misquotes by prominent authors. But worse, I have been dismayed by their refusal to correct such errors. Because of a lack of space, we can only show parts of the examples of misquoting here. (We will provide the full details to any who ask). In any misquoting there is a principle of integrity that surely must be upheld in *Christian* literature.

In this article (Part 1) we expose one author (Dave Hunt) and in Part 2 (next issue) we will expose a Brethren publication (‘*Precious Seed International*’). Some of the misquotes highlighted in these articles have not been exposed without much correspondence and requests for the authors to correct the errors. It is a warning to all readers that quotes today may need to be verified. With the aid of searches such as ‘Google’, this can now be done easily within seconds.

Dave Hunt on Spurgeon:

Dave Hunt has done much good work in exposing false religions, cults, etc. However, an increasing number of authors are drawing attention to his misuse of quotes and the cutting and pasting of sections to suit a bias. There are some quotes that have been made to say the *opposite* of what the original authors meant! In his book ‘*What Love Is This*’ which is a confusing misrepresentation of historic Calvinism and hyper-Calvinism, Hunt in early pages makes the amazing statement that Spurgeon ‘*rejected Limited Atonement*’ and that ‘*he did so in unequivocal language*’. (1) Later Hunt writes: ‘*Some of what Calvin taught (such as limited atonement) was repugnant to Spurgeon*’ (2) and that Spurgeon ‘*rejected it [limited atonement] as heresy*’. (3) The quote given by Hunt for this cuts out a middle and an end section of the original quote and then fails to continue the context and so shockingly misrepresents Spurgeon! Here is the quote from Hunt - I have put in **bold** the material Hunt deleted. ‘*I know there are some who think it necessary to their system of theology to limit the merit of the blood of Jesus: if my theological system needed such a limitation, I would cast it to the winds. I cannot, I dare not allow the thought to find a lodging in my mind, it seems so near akin to blasphemy. In Christ’s finished work I see an ocean of merit; my plummet finds no bottom, my eye discovers no shore. **There must be sufficient efficacy in the blood of Christ, if God had so willed it, to have saved not only all in this world, but all in ten thousand worlds, had they transgressed their Maker’s law. Once admit infinity into the matter, and limit***’

Continued next page >

(1) ‘*What Love Is This*’ by Dave Hunt, P.19; (2) *Ibid* P.35; (3) *Ibid* P.241

is out of the question. Having a Divine Person for an offering, it is not consistent to conceive of limited value; bound and measure are terms inapplicable to the Divine sacrifice. **The intent of the Divine purpose fixes the application of the infinite offering, but does not change it into a finite work**. (1)

However, Spurgeon here was NOT arguing for the 'extent' of the atonement, but rather the *sufficiency* or the worth of it. If the quote is continued in the *same passage* Spurgeon teaches a *limit* to the atonement! Just a few paragraphs down, he says: 'Some persons love the doctrine of universal atonement [but] *If the doctrine be true, that He died for all men, then He died for some who were in hell...if it was Christ's intention to save all men, how deplorably has He been disappointed, for...there is a lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, and into that pit of woe have been cast some of the very persons who, according to the theory of universal redemption, were bought with His blood. That seems to me a conception a thousand times more repulsive than any of those consequences which are said to be associated with the Calvinistic and Christian doctrine of special and particular redemption. To think that my Saviour died for men who were or are in hell, seems a supposition too horrible for me to entertain...That Christ should offer an atonement and satisfaction for the sins of all men, and that afterwards some of those very men should be punished for the sins for which Christ had already atoned, appears to me to be the most monstrous iniquity ...*

There is no soul living who holds more firmly to the Doctrines of Grace than I do, and if any man asks me whether I am ashamed to be called a Calvinist, I answer - I wish to be called nothing but a Christian; but if you ask me, do I hold the doctrinal views which were held by John Calvin, I reply, I do in the main hold them, and rejoice to avow it' (Our underlining). (2)

One expert who operates a website specifically devoted to Spurgeon and his sermons responded thus: '*Dave Hunt WAS dishonest about Spurgeon on multiple occasions in 'What Love is This'. I believe I am qualified to say this. I have read Hunts book - and am well versed in the writings of Mr. Spurgeon...I don't claim to be an expert, but it's fairly safe to say I know more about Spurgeon than just about anyone on this board. Our site has nearly 5,000 topically arranged documented quotes by the Prince of Preachers [Spurgeon]. He was not giving credence to Unlimited Atonement in this statement or context. Spurgeon spoke more in favour of Limited Atonement than just about any preacher ever has. On the inaugural service at the Met [Metropolitan Tabernacle], Spurgeon had 5 preacher friends of his come in and preach a sermon on each of the 5 points of Calvinism. He then stood up and presented arguments in favour of all 5 himself...take the time to read 'A defense of Calvinism' (the sermon that [Hunt's] quote was pulled from)...'*' (3)

That Hunt has misquoted Spurgeon is irrefutable by the mouth and the pen of

(1) Spurgeon 'A Defence of Calvinism' (2) Ibid (3) Daniel Allen from www.spurgeon.us (comment on BaptistBoard.com)

Spurgeon himself in the following specific statements on the atonement:

'I had rather believe a limited atonement that is efficacious for all men for whom it was intended, than a universal atonement that is not efficacious for anybody'. (1) *'But, you ask me, is there any limit to the atonement at all? I say I think there is; and the limit seems to be, not in the value, but in the purpose. The limit seems to be this theory - for whom did he die? In whose place and stead did he stand? If he stood in the place and stead of the whole world, then he made atonement for the sins of the whole world, and the whole world will be saved. If he stood in the place and stead of his Church, then he made atonement for his Church, and the whole Church will be saved. We believe that Christ took the place and stead of every believer, that the believer's sin was put on him, and thus the ex-sinner can go forth free...there is not, in another word, salvation and redemption for those who are lost for ever'*. (2)

The historic Calvinists such as Spurgeon clearly distinguished between the *sufficiency* and the *efficacy* of the atonement. The atonement was unlimited in its *sufficiency* to save all, but limited in that it is *effectively* applied to some. And this is exactly what Spurgeon believed! *He did not believe the extent of the atonement was universal but that it was a 'special and particular redemption'*.

Whether we agree with Spurgeon or not, to misquote Spurgeon as *'rejecting Limited Atonement'*, that *'he did so in unequivocal language'*, that *'some of what Calvin taught (such as limited atonement) was repugnant to Spurgeon'* and that Spurgeon *'rejected it [limited atonement] as heresy'* is simply dishonest to what Spurgeon believed! Prominent authors have taken Dave Hunt to task over this quote, yet to date no admission of error has been acknowledged.

Dave Hunt on Strong, Hodge, Calvin...:

Space here does not permit full details of where Hunt in similar fashion misquotes Strong and A. Hodge (P.110, 128). Hunt claims Strong (who wrote *Strong's Concordance*) held to a *'non Calvinist understanding...concerning human responsibility and ability'*. Yet on the very same page Strong teaches otherwise. Strong was in fact a 'Calvinist'.

Similarly, Dave Hunt misquotes A. Hodge where a quote is not directly from Hodge but from a secondary source which denies what Hunt says. Neither of these two men (Strong or Hodge) believed what Hunt claims they taught.

Similar discrepancies can be found in Hunt's quoting of Calvin. After castigating Calvin for his teaching on election and predestination, Hunt quotes Calvin as teaching unlimited atonement! (3) But the quote is actually not a primary quote, but a quote by a Calvinist, Augustus Strong, who is then quoting Laurence Vance. Hunt in his footnote writes: *'For proof that this is an authentic quotation, see Vance, op. cit., 467-68'*. However, when one goes to Vance (a

Continued next page >

(1) Spurgeon, 1858 (2) Spurgeon, 1861 *'Exposition of the Doctrines of Grace - Particular Redemption'* (3) *'What Love Is This'* by Dave Hunt, P.253

non Calvinist), he himself argues that the quote is spurious!

Dave Hunt on Acts 13:48 and A.T. Robertson:

In his book Hunt attacks the King James version in Acts 13:48 *‘And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed’*. Hunt says the KJV is ‘tainted’ and that *‘many Greek scholars call it a wrong translation’*, that it should be translated *‘as many as disposed themselves’*. However, the ‘many’ are actually a few in comparison to the massive weight of *most* translators, commentators who agree with ‘ordained’ or ‘appointed’. This list is long and includes Bloomfield, Barnes, Alford, Brown & Faussett, Thayers, Liddell and Scott, Green...as well as most of Bible versions: ASV (1901), RSV (1952), JN Darby, Moffatt, Sir Edward Clarke and S. Sharpe, NIV, Youngs Literal, Berkeley, Wuests and the NAS. The word ‘ordained’ or ‘appointed’ was used because it is accurate to the Greek perfect tense and passive voice which has *God doing it to man* (passive voice) and in the past with continuing results to the present (perfect tense). The verse *cannot* be translated as *‘disposed themselves’*!

Hunt’s ‘many’ are actually only a *few* which diverge from ‘ordained’ or ‘appointed’. The 1864 ‘Emphatic Diaglott’ is one example - the Jehovah Witnesses later used it as it suited their erroneous doctrines! (The Diaglott changes words like ‘Lord’ (‘kurios’) to ‘Jehovah’).

But Hunt does not leave his error there. He then misquotes from an A.T. Robertson (*Word Pictures of The New Testament*). The words in bold are those which Hunt deletes from the quote: *‘The word ‘ordain’ is not the best translation here ‘**appointed**’ as Hacket suggests is better...There is no evidence that Luke had in mind an absolutum decretum of personal salvation...’* Hunt also fails to continue the quote where Robertson says: *‘...It was **saving faith that was exercised only by those who were appointed** unto eternal life...who were thus revealed as the **SUBJECTS OF God’s grace by the stand they took on this day...**’* (capitals and underlining ours). (1) A.T. Robertson is simply not entirely arguing for what Hunt requires from this verse! Other authors also misuse this quote. (2)

There are other instances in Dave Hunt’s works where I have found the quotations highly selective and not a fair representation of the original author’s views. I pray that this misquoting may be simply unscholarly rather than dishonest. Many no doubt are regurgitating material from other sources which contain the errors. But there is a principle of integrity here that cannot be ignored. Spurgeon said *‘A magazine which is not outspoken, and is destitute of principle, is a literary nuisance’*.

Terry Arnold

(1) *‘What Love Is This’* by Dave Hunt, P.210,211 (2) The Australian Keith Piper’s *‘Answers’* (P.659) has the same quote in which he cuts two sentences out, joins them together, leaving out a middle sentence and ignores the sentence above which I have shown in bold.

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

Re: Women in Ministry; Joyce Meyers: *Terry, I love the format for the 'Diakrisis' magazine...I love your articles. I had been brought up in the Pentecostal, Assemblies of God...The people in these mega churches think we are looney but everything you have written I know is accurate. The only topic I am unsure about is women in ministry. God used women in the Bible to lead Israel...prominent queens, prophetesses and leaders. So why is it not right to have women ministers? My view is God will use whoever is willing...Joyce Meyer comes to mind. If she did not step up, who would be there in her place?*

Editor's reply: The women used in the OT are really very few. Any 'exception' arguments from the Old Testament must be interpreted by the *clear* in the New Testament...

Deborah was more of a 'prophet' than anything else and *nowhere is it written that she ever prophesied or taught in public*. Her prophetic role was limited to *private* or individual instruction (Jdg.4:5). She deferred to men when in battle although Barak was a weak leader. Interestingly, Deborah is also not mentioned in the line up of heroes in Hebrews 11, but Barak is.

Many fail to see that the Bible views Deborah's judgeship as a rebuke against the weak or absence of male leadership (eg. Judges 4:9). We must be careful in drawing conclusions about women leadership from the book of Judges when it has examples of things *not* to imitate - such as Samson's marriage to a Philistine woman (14:1-4); his visiting a prostitute (16:1); Jephthah's foolish vow (11:30-31; 34-39); and the wrong doing of the men of Benjamin at Shiloh (21:19-23), etc.

Such isolated references to women such as Deborah should not make a rule *when there is clear teaching in NT as to women in ministry*. I Timothy 3 is clear that elders/pastors are to be male - '*the husband of one wife*', not the 'wife of one husband'. Other scriptures are also clear that a woman is not to '*teach*' or '*usurp authority over a man*' (1Tim.2). The weight of evidence in the New testament interprets any seeming 'exceptions' in the Old. Having said this, there will be circumstances where the question will come up - can a women do this or that in the church? My answer to all these scenarios is *firstly* in each situation to ask this question: '*Is the women teaching or usurping authority over the man*'?...Then the right Biblical decision is usually made. Teaching, preaching and pastoring will '*usurp authority*' over man since these roles carry with them much public teaching and authority.

You say '*God will use whoever is willing*'. But will He give a gift to a women to teach/pastor men? The answer...will He contradict His own word?

Re: Joyce Meyers: Joyce Meyers teaches much psychology and heresy. Her Word-Faith teaching copies much of what Copeland, Hagin, Hinn and other false prophets have taught. Here is a sample of what she has taught:

‘During that time He entered hell, where you and I deserved to go (legally) because of our sin. He paid the price there...Jesus paid on the cross and in hell.’ (1) ‘God ...said to demon powers tormenting the sinless son of God, ‘Let Him go’. Then the resurrection power of almighty God went through hell and filled Jesus...he was resurrected from the dead - the first born-again man.’ (2) ‘...you cannot go to heaven unless you believe with all your heart that Jesus took your place in hell...Jesus went to hell for you.’ (3) ‘...For three days he was alone paying for our sins as only a man’. (4)... ‘Jesus said ‘it is finished’. ..The job he had to do was just getting started. He really did the job the three days and nights that he was in hell...he was pronounced guilty on the cross but he paid the price in hell...All the hosts of hell was upon him...They got him down in the floor and got on him...laughing and mocking...Sunday morning, God gets himself together. Ho, hoooo. Justice has been met...And ol’ God gets his voice together and he hollers out three words and they go roaring through the universe and entering the gates of hell. He said, ‘It is enough! It is enough!’(5)

Anything that adds to, or detracts from, the atonement and the deity of Jesus Christ is cultic and dangerously heretical. Jesus did not atone for our sins and take our place *in hell*, but *only* on the cross of Calvary! He was never tormented by demon powers and was never resurrected from the dead in Hell! Jesus did not have to be ‘born again’!

Meyers shows clearly where she obtains her ‘revelations’: *‘The Bible can’t even find any way to explain this. Not really. That’s why you’ve got to get it by revelation. There are no words to explain what I’m telling you. I’ve got to just trust God that He’s putting it into your spirit like he put it into mine...I don’t know what hell looks like but God gave me a few ideas. Its hot, fire hot, but at the same time its cold and clammy. That’s kind of different, isn’t it. Fire hot, but cold and clammy.’ (5)*

The above is only a sample of what Meyers has taught.

(1) *‘What Should You Believe’*, Ch.4, P.35, Aug/91 (2) P.36 (3) P.38. In a new edition of this book some changes were made but the bulk of this teaching remained. Deletions included *‘Jesus took your place in hell.’* (4) *Ibid*, P.38 (5) Sermon - *‘From the Cross to the Throne’*.

Terry, Thankyou for the great work you do with the newsletter. A friend forwards it on to me. The latest May/June issue was very timely as the article on spiritual warfare helped confirm to me the errors many Christians follow. ie. believing Rebecca Brown’s book ‘He Came To Set The Captives Free’, which I read in the 80’s as a former Charismatic Christian.

(K.G., e-mail)

Editor’s Comment: The Rebecca Brown books were a deceptive fabrication. She engaged in lies and deceit. Yet the books fooled a lot of people if they allowed for extra-biblical stories concerning demons. (We have a pdf file with further details).

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

KJV 'Errors'?

Dear Terry, Can you please check this for any errors: A number of Greek words in the NT of the KJV Bible have either been poorly translated or I suspect deliberately translated incorrectly...Rev.6:8 'And I looked and behold a pale horse'. The word 'pale' translated from 'chloros' means green. Chloros has been translated to 'green' in Rev.8:7; 9:4 and Mk.6:39, yet 'pale' in Rev.6:8. My guess for this error is 'who has seen a green horse'?

In Rev.1:1 'shortly come to pass' should read 'things which must occur quickly' or 'occur with speed'. One infers that these things will happen near in the future, while the latter gives the clear impression that when these things occur, they will occur in rapid succession.

In Acts 21:9 'And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy'. The four daughters were not all prophetesses. It was the dad who was the prophet.

In Ephesians 4:11 'And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers'. The Greek 'poimen' has been translated in this verse to 'pastor'. The Greek 'poimen' means 'flock'. The word 'poimen' should be translated to 'carer of the flock'. In the NT this should be the same meaning as the overseer of the flock. (Note Acts 20:28). Pope Gregory the Great first popularised the term 'pastor' in about 550AD...gradually the term 'pastor' emerged into Protestant vocabulary...there is only one reference to pastor in the NT...my challenge to 'pastors'...is to resign his title as 'pastor' and 'shepherd the flock of God among you...' (1Pet.5:2,3)...

(Name withheld at editor's discretion)

Editor's reply:

Rev.6:8 - Greek words must never be taken literal without checking the *context* first. The word 'pale' has been used because the *context* is *death* and it is in contrast with a *red* horse previously (Rev.6:4). Context is important when translating. The Greek word does mean 'green' in a literal sense and used of young (green) grass in other instances. But 'pale' is used because of the 'death'. To use 'green' here would not have made as much sense to the word 'death'. This is not the only case where context overrides the literal meaning of a Greek word. The word 'ekklesia' (church, assembly) if used literally is 'called/out' but that literal meaning would not make sense in many cases in English translation. The translators wanted to show a 'pale' as in a deathly horse. Most other versions have gone by the contextual meaning, even the most literal ones. But this is one instance where the KJV, is not 'formal equivalent' as many wrongly assume it always is. I don't see 'pale' as an inaccurate translation to the context here.

Continued next page >

Rev.1:1- In Rev.22:7 Jesus said He Himself was coming ‘*quickly*’. The same Greek word is used. This verse should be understood to mean that the events in the book will occur ‘soon’ *in God’s view of time*. The human mind is only able to relate to those things which it can see and understand. Hence, the proper way to interpret this verse is to realize that when these events do happen (though the specific time is unknown to believers), they will occur suddenly and quickly. This is similar to the expression ‘latter times’ which should not be taken as only later in the church age. Again, I don’t see any translation problems here.

Acts 21:9 - I don’t know where you got these ‘Greek’ comments from but here is the Greek transliterated word for word: ‘*Now to this one [man] there were daughters virgins four [who] prophesied*’. It is clearly saying that the daughters prophesied. The verb ‘*prophesied*’ is connected to the daughters, not the man.

Eph.4:11 - The Greek word ‘*poimen*’ here is a noun and literally is a shepherd, feeder or one who cares for the flock. It is translated in a variety of ways depending on whether it is a verb or a noun. As a person it is only mentioned once in Eph.4:11.

The word ‘*overseers*’ in Acts 20:28 is NOT ‘*poimen*’ but ‘*episkopos*’ - literally ‘*epi*’ - ‘*upon*’; ‘*skopos*’ - ‘*to see*’ (or watch). It is used for a ‘*bishop*’ or ‘*elder*’ elsewhere and is the *function* of an elder. The *office* is an elder, the *function* is an overseer and the *gifting* is a pastor. All these words are used in 1Pet.5:1-4 ‘*The elders [presbuteros] which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: 2 Feed [‘pastor’ - poimaino] the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight [‘bishop’ - episkopos] thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not greedy for money, but of a ready mind; 3 Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being examples to the flock. 4 And when the chief Shepherd [‘pastor’ - poimaino] shall appear, you shall receive a crown of glory that fades not away*’.

Eph.4:11 does mention a *person* as a *gift* to the church. He is called ‘*pastor*’ in that scripture. I prefer the term ‘*pastoring elder*’ rather than a ‘*pastor*’, but I would not be legalistic about this or force such definitions...

Your history is somewhat lacking I feel...The Roman Catholic religion did not have ‘*pastors*’ in the sense of a noun. Their claimed office was that of a ‘*priest*’. They may have used the word as a verb in that the priest were to ‘*pastor*’. The Reformers used the word ‘*pastor*’ to replace the idea of ‘*priest*’ which is nowhere a New Testament title for any Christian minister. The word ‘*pastor*’ is biblical (as a gift to the church - Eph.4:11), even if abused or misunderstood today. It is used once as a person (a personal pronoun) and many times as a verb referring to the work that elders do.

Terry's Itinerary

July 14 (Sat) 2-5pm Corinda Brethren, Brisbane: Seminar - 'Unity, Union and Ecumenism - At What Price?': The Ecumenical Movement; History; 'unity', 'union', True 'unity'; Justification/Imputation; The 'Philosophy' of the Gospel; Separation/Holiness ('ekklesia' or 'oikoumenikos') Ph.(07)37256458

July 15th (Sun) 9.30am Corinda Brethren Assembly, Brisbane Ph.(07)37256458

Mail on Dave Hunt Article

Terry, [Re: 'Dave Hunt's 'Calvinism' May/June] Dave Hunt is on about 'Calvinism' again! If only he would learn what it is then he might be able to hit the target...His misquoting of 2Pet.3:9 is similar to his work on 1Tim.2:4. He disregards the mention of praying for 'all men' in vs.1 and its explanation in vs.2 about being for 'kings and those in authority' (their persecutors or enemies)... That is what is meant by 'all men' in that passage i.e. all types of men, the good, the bad and the ugly. God can and does save all types of men, but definitely not ALL men as that would contradict many other passages in scripture. To say that He wants to save everybody, but fails, means that man has authority over God in regard to salvation and so man is also responsible to keep himself saved...or give away their salvation as they choose. This removes God's omnipotence and gives man the glory for his own salvation...Jesus said, 'with man these things are impossible, but with God all things are possible', so it must be God's work that makes the difference in the way people who are spiritually dead in their sins and in rebellion against God respond to the gospel unto salvation. Jesus also raised Lazarus from the dead and I wouldn't credit it to Lazarus' 'decision' to come back to life. Rather we are looking at the Creator of all things who brings about life from the dead...a new creation in the elect. I give God the glory for every sinner saved by grace, but all the responsibility for sin with the sinner.

(P.G. E-mail)

Editor's Comment: This is a breath of fresh air to have the above *balanced* 'Calvinism' in comparison to Hunt's misrepresentations. We have received many comments on our exposure of Dave Hunt. One person has charged us with '*attacking Hunt's character*'. Yet I fail to see where we have done this. (See our article '*The Art of Misquoting*' in this edition)

Dear Terry, Thankyou for your latest magazine read with real interest. Unusual for me to read it all at one sitting. You have answered well re 'Calvinism' ...

(G.J., Qld)

Your Comments and Questions

(Views expressed here are not necessarily those of the editor)

Hi Bro Terry, Greetings in the Lord... I've finished reading your Editor's Comment (May/June 2012). The fear you've got is the same I've got. I also see in the arising generation...what I used to think of as born again believers, compromising the truths of the Bible and uniting with apostate churches. Many are bringing worldly methods and using them to get more people into 'church'. Many are adding numbers and not true born again believers to their groups. The preached truths of the Scriptures are no longer accepted. Church goers, having itching ears, want preachers who tickle them, smoothly...Isaiah 30:8-10 'Now go, write it before them on a tablet, And note it on a scroll, That it may be for time to come, Forever and ever: That this is a rebellious people, Lying children, Children who will not hear the law of the LORD; Who say to the seers, 'Do not see', And to the prophets, 'Do not prophesy to us right things; Speak to us smooth things, prophesy deceits. Get out of the way, Turn aside from the path, Cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us'.

I pray the Lord hastens His second coming and 'may we have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming'. (1Jn.2:28) Maranatha

(Ps. A.H., Sydney)

Prayer/Praise Points

- Please pray as we look to the Lord for funds to print a new book on 'Calvinism/Arminianism'. This is a compilation of over 10 years of research and writing on this subject. Pray for God's timing and provision.

Subscription Form

I am interested in receiving the *free* monthly
TA Ministries newsletter 'Diakrisis' by Send this form to:
hardcopy - by *e-mail* - (tick boxes) **TA Ministries**
PO Box 1499,
Hervey Bay, Qld, 4655, Australia

Name-----Address-----

E-mail-----Phone-----

Signed-----Date-----

I enclose \$----- as a donation for costs and postage.

For transfer deposits: National Bank, Hervey Bay 084 705 02737 1856