



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.48 November/December 2015

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

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

We welcome comments or 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 donation to help with these expenses is received with gratitude.

Contents

- P.2,3** Editor's Comment
- P.4-13** Azusa Street - What Really Happened?
- P.14-20** Comments & Questions
- P.20** Praise/Prayer Points

Editor's Comment

In scripture there are consistent commands from God for his people to be separate from the world - from its philosophies, its thinking, its 'broad road'. It begins in the Old Testament with Israel and Egypt. Israel was to come 'out of' Egypt (the 'Exodus'). The Lord put '*a difference between the Egyptians and Israel*' (Ex.11:7). God's people were then to be '*severed from other people, that you should be mine*' (Lev.20:26).

There were some who broke this command and paid the price. Achan, against God's command, took something out of Jericho and it became sin in the camp of God for which Israel lost a battle, until Achan, his family and animals were destroyed (Josh.7). Similarly, Gideon in battle took gold spoils from the heathen and made an Ephod out of it to use in worship, which became a '*snare*' unto Israel (Judges 8).

The New Testament never puts the world system in a good light, but as '*this present evil world*' (Gal.1:4), '*the whole world lies in wickedness*' (1Jn.5:19) and '*friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God*' (James 4:4).

If the world is in such darkness and reserved for future judgement then why is the modern church thinking so much like the world? Why do we take so much postmodern thought out of the world? Why do we agree so much with the worlds 'new tolerance'? Why is the world coming into the church to take the church into the world?

Just how much does the modern church think as the world thinks?...

The world is full of injustices. The injustice of paedophilia has been in the news a lot lately. Yet much of this is being exposed *within* the modern churches! Indeed *it is in the church as much as it is in the world*.

The world is crying for an Ecumenical unity across cultures and beliefs. So is the church. The Ecumenical church is here in every town. 'Ministers Fraternal' come together to pray and hold hands with those with often fundamentally different beliefs and different gospels. *The world loves and applauds this*. To refuse to be a part of this hypocrisy will often bring the disdain of both the world and the local church leaders.

The Pope is now a much loved and respected world leader preaching a message of giving to the poor, do good to one another, and an Ecumenical unity with Rome. World leaders rush to meet and bow before him. *Christian leaders do the same*. Gone are the days when 'Protestants' were 'protesting' Rome's different gospel.

The world pumps out self esteem, felt needs and prosperity. *The modern church preaches the same*, even some introducing a new 'prosperity' gospel in the late 20th century.

The world's gospel of self worth and human potential is echoed and aped by the modern church. Just listen to Joel Osteen's sermons and one will

understand why he has the largest church in America with world celebrities taking in every word he utters.

The world seemingly says everyone goes to Heaven. The modern church in many funeral messages and pulpits are sympathetic to this deceptive comfort of a blissful afterlife. The world does not have a 'Hell'. *Likewise, many churches today no longer teach of a Hell.*

The world is being coerced into accepting same sex relationships. This would have been anathema to most churches even just a few decades ago. What does the church increasingly do about this issue considering the clear scriptural commands against this? Answer: it sits on the fence of compromise or runs with the same arguments that the world has on 'equality', 'tolerance' and 'discrimination'. Are we not fast approaching the '*days of Noah*' and the '*days of Lot*' when same sex agendas were rampant (Matt.24:37; Lk.17:26-28)?

Even the music in churches today is *hardly different or distinct from that of the world*. Many non christians openly admit to attending mega churches (such as 'Hillsong') for the 'entertainment', as well as the feel good motivational messages. Even the secular media does not know the difference in the music when they openly describe these events as similar to 'rock concerts'.

But what of the effect of all this on the Gospel? The world system will never want the Gospel. '*For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness...*' (1Cor.1:18). So, what does the modern church do about this?...Sadly, preach what the world wants to hear! Preach the goodness of man, the potential of one's worth, self esteem, success, a message of a tolerant Christ as helper, friend and healer. Don't mention sin and the resultant wrath of God upon the sinner (Jn.3:36; Rom.1:18; Eph.2:3; 5:6). Don't mention repentance towards God and faith in the risen Christ (Acts 20:21) as the only Saviour, Lord. Don't mention that God required a satisfaction, a turning away (propitiation) of the anger He has upon sin and that Christ was that bloody sacrifice to appease an offended God (Rom.3:25; 1Jn.4:10). Don't mention dying to self is necessary to enter the kingdom of Heaven (Lk.14:26). Turn the message away from Christ and His work to one that uplifts man and what he can do even by a simple 'decision'. The world might just accept that.

The real church is fast becoming a remnant. But that's exactly what is forecast in scripture. How close are we to the Lord's coming? The thought of another generation and further apostasy from the Gospel is difficult to bear.

One of the saddest thoughts concerning the modern church is that most Christians today are simply unaware there even is this apostasy! Yet the scriptures are replete with end time warnings (1Tim.4:1-5; 2Thess.2:3,9,10; 2Tim.3:13; Matt.24:11,12,24).

However, the most serious casualty of this falling away is in the true Gospel. As the church thinks more like the world, so the Gospel is minimised to suit.

But the true Gospel must not be lost to a dying generation!

Terry Arnold

Azusa Street - What Really Happened?

The Contradiction

Pentecostals cite the famous *Azusa St. Revival* as the restoration of the Apostolic gifts of the Holy Spirit. This event is widely recognised by many church groups, (such as the *Assembly of God* churches), as the roots of the Pentecostal movement. It was here in Los Angeles, 1906, that many are said to have received the '*Baptism in the Holy Spirit*' with the 'evidence' of this experience being the gift of speaking in 'tongues'.

The Azusa St. phenomena cannot be properly studied unless previous events of 1901 in Topeka, Kansas, are also studied. Indeed, most Pentecostals cite Charles Parham as the movement's founder. *It was at Topeka in 1901 that the modern unknown tongues movement was founded at the direction of Charles Parham.*

The following truth might surprise most who hold to today's *unknown tongues*!: Parham always believed that the experience of 'tongues' he encouraged at Topeka and subsequently was evident at Azusa St, was *known languages as in Acts 2*. Parham believed the last days revival would be for 'missionary' work and they would have supernatural missionary gifts such as *Zenoglossalia* - (*Zeno* - foreign; *glossa* - known language). He believed the *known* language only had to be deciphered as to the country it was from. However, what occurred and is historically documented in Topeka and Azusa St. was not *known* tongues (languages) but *unknown* tongues. The Pentecostal groups that came out of this did not, and do not, practise *known* languages but rather *unknown* tongues!

Parham eventually rejected the unknown tongues at Azusa St. when he realised it was a counterfeit! This fact is documented clearly in his writings yet ignored by many today. *Most Pentecostal leaders and pastors are simply unaware of the historical events of Azusa St.* It is sometimes re-written, leaving out vital details clearly documented in eye witness accounts of the day.

The Seed Bed

The 'seedbed' for the new 20th Century Pentecostal movement and its doctrine, was the Holiness movement in the late 1800's. Various Holiness sectors of the Methodist movement left the traditional orthodox view of Sanctification as a process ('progressive sanctification') and began to develop doctrines of *states* or *stages* of sanctification. This appears to be the result of individuals being genuinely dissatisfied with their sinfulness and yearning for a greater 'holiness'. Many sought more power over sin in their lives. Yet the teaching of Sanctification *as a process* had been well established in various Confessions of faith down through the centuries. Confessions such as the famous Westminster and London Baptist Confessions made it clear that the Holy Spirit and the Word of God *progressively* gave power over the dominion

of sin which although broken at salvation was yet ongoing - there being a war between the spirit and the flesh in the Sanctification process (Rom.7:23).

The Greek tenses in many Sanctification passages show clearly the positional and progressive aspects of this work of the Spirit (2Cor.7:1). (1) However, as the Holiness movement developed many were led to new views on Sanctification by influential figures such as Phoebe Palmer and Charles Finney. These leaders developed and taught further states of Sanctification which supposedly would give greater power over sin. Finney paved the way for 'Oberlin Perfectionism' - the name being derived from Oberlin College where Finney was president. This view incorporated a *second* consecration by the Holy Spirit.

Other contributing factors for the new views of Sanctification were the 'higher life' movement which stressed a series of experiences which would equip the believer for witnessing and power.

Towards the end of the 1800's some holiness enthusiasts began to use the term 'Baptism with the Spirit' as a *subsequent* experience to salvation. Many began to teach sanctification was a second work of grace instantaneous following conversion although preceding any 'baptism with the Spirit'. Extremes in this quickly developed with Benjamin Irwin's teaching on a 'fire baptism'. (Irwin went on to teach other 'baptisms' of 'dynamite', 'lyddite' and 'oxidite' before falling into immorality in his own church).

A study of the Holiness movement in the late 1800's shows a clear progression of *changes* in theology broadly summarised by the following:

- * In seeking holiness and in an attempt to eradicate sin, individuals sought a 'crisis point' of sanctification...

- * This led to second states or 'stages' of sanctification...

- * This then led to the doctrine of 'Entire Sanctification'...

- * This led to the 'Baptism with the Spirit' (as a subsequent receiving of the Spirit)

- * The lines between the various views eventually blurred until the Topeka and Azusa St. phenomena delivered a doctrinal position of a 'Baptism with the Spirit evidenced by 'speaking in tongues'.

These unorthodox views were the 'seed bed' for the new Pentecostal teaching on the '*Baptism with the Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues*'. The changes to produce this new doctrine can be traced over just a few decades before the Topeka experience of 1901, which became a catalyst for the Azusa St. phenomena and the foundation of the Pentecostal movement.

Topeka 1901

The 'Baptism with the Spirit' became widely accepted when Charles Parham

Continued next page >

(1) For articles on Sanctification see '*Justification/Sanctification/Glorification & Sanctification Systems; True & False*' in the Salvation Doctrines section of our website: www.taministries.net

in Topeka 1901 (and later a student, William Seymour in Azusa St. Los Angeles 1906), added the ‘evidence’ of speaking in tongues.

In 1900 Parham began a Bible school at Topeka, Kansas, with 34 students. Parham encouraged his students to seek the *same experience* as at Acts 2. In 1901 on New Years Day, after an all night prayer meeting, a student, Agnus Ozman, began to speak in what was thought to be the Chinese language. (It was reported she was unable to speak English for three days). Although the event divided the group, the experience later spread to some other students. Parham initially claimed some of the tongues were ‘Swedish’. They tried to *automatically* write the languages down but it became uncontrollable scribble, yet they still believed it to be ‘foreign languages’. (1) Copies of these show examples such as: ‘*Eurossa, Eurossause, rela sema calah mala kanah leulla saga nalan. Laigle logle lazle logle. Ene mine mo, sah rah el me sah rah me.*’ These sentences were ‘translated’ as meaning: ‘*Jesus is mighty to save*’, ‘*Jesus is ready to hear*’ and ‘*God is love*’. (2) Parham also exaggerated the spontaneousness of it all, as his later accounts prove. Ozman in fact had already received a ‘tongues’ experience *before* the ‘baptism’ experience at Topeka as diary accounts show. (3)

Who was Agnus Ozman?

Agnus Ozman was a 30 year old unmarried ‘holiness enthusiast’ from Nebraska. She had a reputation of wandering around the country seeking mystical things and the sensational. The ‘tongue’ of Ozman was *unknown* to herself or the hearers. No one but Ozman spoke in ‘tongues’ initially. The others received the experience *two days later*. Ozman’s tongue was initially mistaken for Chinese. But when a linguist was brought in by Parham it was quickly ascertained that it was ecstatic and not a real language. Later in her life Agnes admitted that she had been wrong to believe that all people would ‘speak in tongues’ when they were ‘baptized with the Holy Spirit’. Writing in *The Latter Rain Evangel* of January 1909, she wrote: ‘*Some time ago I tried but failed to have an article printed which I wrote calling attention to what I am sure God showed me was error. The article maintained tongues was not the only evidence of the Spirit’s Baptism...He had revealed it to me, and satisfied my heart in praying that He might reveal this truth to others who would spread it abroad. For a while after the baptism I got into spiritual darkness, because I did as I see so many others are doing these days, rested and reveled in tongues and other demonstrations instead of resting alone in God*’. (4)

Continued next page >

(1) Parham ‘*life*’, P.53,61 *The Topeka Mail* and ‘*Breeze*’, 22/2/01; other sources also.

(2) *Topeka State Journal*, 9/1/01

(3) *Apostolic Faith* & Parham ‘*life*’; other sources numerous

(4) ‘*When The Latter Rain First Fell: The First One to Speak in Tongues*’ - *Latter Rain Evangel*, Jan.1909, P.2.

Parham advertised the Topeka phenomenon, insisting it was a breakthrough in missionary strategy, even six months after numerous language experts had stated the ‘tongues’ and scribbles of Agnes Ozman were not Chinese.

Missionaries went out from Topeka expecting to use the miraculous languages of various countries. An article published in 1909 described the result: *‘Missionary S. C. Todd, of the Bible Missionary Society, has made investigations personally in three mission fields and among four groups of well-meaning but deluded people who have gone from this country to Japan, to China, and to India expecting to preach to the natives of those countries in their own tongue; but in no single instance have been able to do so. They have needed an interpreter in even the commonest affairs of life. Some of them are in absolute destitution and are dependent on their Christian brethren there for the necessaries of life and are as helpless as babes. In some cases they are in danger of losing all faith in the supernatural in religion and drifting into infidelity and sin’*. (1)

Parham and those who had received the experience mistook their experience for ‘Zenoglossalia’ (foreign languages). This mistake was supported at the time by a report and *rumour* that a Bohemian observer had understood the tongues. Parham often claimed validation for the languages from unnamed interpreters yet no documentation ever existed. All known interpreters eventually were to deny any such claims and linguists who attended the meetings were adamant that the tongues were *unknown* and ecstatic. In 1914 a Charles Shumway conducted research on Parham’s ‘languages’ but found none were known. (2) Linguists have since agreed that the ‘glossalia’ as practised by Pentecostals then and now is technically not a known language of any sort.

A Samuel Riggins who was part of the initial group with Parham at Topeka and who defected, wrote: *‘I believe the whole of them are crazy...They were racing about the room talking and gesticulating and using this strange and senseless language which they claim is the word from the Most High’*. (3)

It should also be noted that Parham was well known for his heretical teachings. He taught that tongues was the sealing of the Bride of Christ. He later rejected the seven day creation and believed that Adam and Eve were not a part of this creation and that others existed outside the garden. He taught that Adam and Eve had souls, but the others were flesh and blood. Parham received much of his teaching from extra-Biblical and ‘personal revelations’ from God.

From Topeka to Azusa St.

Parham had a black student, William Seymour, who on leaving Parham’s

Continued next page >

(1) A. E. Seddon ‘*Edward Irving and Unknown Tongues*’ The Homiletic Review (New York; Funk and Wagnalls, 1909)

(2) Shumway, P.168

(3) *Topeka Daily Capital*, 6/1/01

Topeka Bible school, was locked out of a Nazarene holiness church in Los Angeles after preaching a sermon considered to be heresy. He then held home meetings and spread the message of his experience of tongues. Seven people spoke in unknown 'tongues'. People outside were attracted by the noise and it caused some concern. (Some early Pentecostalist congregations were commonly ordered out of town by the police because of noise and 'misconduct'). (1) Seymour then began conducting meetings at 312 Azusa St. Most of this was every day and often three times per day. Both men and women preached. As time went on visions and manifestations became more extreme. Pastors went to Azusa St. to receive and take their experiences home to other churches.

There are testimonies from Christian and secular eyewitnesses alike as to the events which occurred at Azusa St. It is these which Pentecostal writers either ignore completely or play down...

What Really Happened?

At Azusa St. people had visions of Jesus and manifestations were common. *'A woman...stood shaking from head to foot...a man in front of her slid down out of his chair and became unconscious...the man...arose, staggered to them and began to shake his hand in front of their faces and wave his arms over their heads and moan...Then he put his hands on the heads of the women and began to shake their hair. Some of them lost control of themselves and went under an hypnotic spell. He rubbed a man's jaw until the victim tumbled over on the floor and lay for half an hour, then suddenly began to jabber. Those who had received their 'Pentecost' cried out, 'He has the baptism, he has the baptism!'*

A young coloured woman, doing her best to get the gibberish, went through all kinds of contortions...to get her tongue to work...A coloured woman had her arms around a white man's neck, praying for him. A man of maturer years leaped up out of his chair and began to stutter. He did not utter a distinct syllable... 'tut-tut-tut-tut-tut-tut'. This was evidence that he had his 'baptism'.

...[The first woman mentioned] this time singing a far-away tune that sounded very unnatural and repulsive...When the altar call was made, a woman walked up to the front and kissed a man...kissing between the sexes is a common occurrence in the tongues meetings ['kissing between the sexes' was considered shocking and immoral]...I found men and women lying on the floor in all shapes...(they were) jabbering all at one time in what they called unknown tongues. While I was praying, one of the workers took hold of me and said, 'Holy Ghost, we command Thee to go into this soul'. The workers were jabbering and shaking their hands over me, and a demonic power (as I now know) took possession of me, and I fell among the people on the floor and knew nothing for ten hours. When I came to my senses I was weak and my jaws were so tired they

Continued next page >

(1) 'A Critical History of Glossalalia' by C.W. Shumway PhD thesis, Boston Uni. 1919

ached. I believed then that this power was of God. They said I was wonderfully blessed, and the leader sent me from one place to another so that I could jabber in tongues...It would be impossible to publish the things that have occurred there. The familiarity between sexes in the public meetings has been shocking, to say the least. Hell has reaped an awful harvest and infidelity has become more strongly rooted...than ever before' . (1)

Another Christian eye-witness account states: *'Men and women...were talking excitedly 'in tongues'. A man (holding on to a post) seemed to be in possession of...the jerks. He was muttering and mumbling...but would (also) shriek. About sixty or seventy of the three hundred present were 'possessed of the spirit'...there was barking like dogs, hooting like owls, and the like...(2)*

Another eye witness wrote *in favour* of the proceedings: *'...such a divine 'weight of glory' was upon us we could only lie on our faces. For a long time we could hardly remain seated..the 'jerks' and 'treeing the devil' ['crawling and barking up a tree like a dog'] were in evidence in the [Azusa] mission' . (3)*

The Witness of Bible Teachers of the Day

If the reader judges the eye witness accounts to be mostly biased, then what of the prominent and most highly respected and trained theologians of the day? Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, a Bible college president, pastor and commentator, described the Azusa Street activities as *'the last vomit of Satan'*. (4) R.A. Torrey, evangelist, pastor and writer, declared this new Pentecostal movement was *'emphatically not of God, and founded by a Sodomite'*. (5) H. A. Ironside stated in 1912 that both the holiness and Pentecostal movements were *'disgusting...delusions and insanities...pandemonium's where exhibitions worthy of a madhouse or a collection of howling dervishes [causing] a heavy toll of lunacy and infidelity'*. (6) Clarence Larkin, a famous commentator, who was known for avoiding criticism of others, wrote: *'The conduct of those possessed, in which they fall to the ground and writhe in contortions, causing disarrangement's of the clothing and disgraceful scenes, is more a characteristic of demon possession, than a work of the Holy Spirit...we see that we are living in 'perilous times' and that all about us are 'seducing spirits' and that they will become more active as the dispensation draws to its close, and that we must exert the greatest care lest we be led astray' . (7)*

Continued next page >

(1) Eyewitness account in *'Demons and Tongues'* (P.82 and various) by Alma White, 1949

(2) *'A Critical History of Glossalalia'* by C.W. Shumway PhD Dissertation, Boston University, 1919

(3) *'Another Wave Rolls In'* by Bartleman. Voice Publications, 1962

(4) *'From Holy Laughter to Holy Fire'* by Michael L. Brown, P.197,198

(5) *Ibid* P.197,198

(6) *'The Holiness Pentecostal Movement'* by Synan, P.144

(7) *'Dispensational Truths'* by Clarence Larkin

The reader who has experienced, or has knowledge of the ‘*Toronto Blessing*’ phenomena in 1994-96 might see the striking similarity between Azusa St. and the Toronto phenomena. (1) But here is also an interesting contradiction brought out by Larken. In many Pentecostal assemblies the same activities have been described as ‘demonic’ and people ‘delivered’ of ‘demons’. Yet in Azusa St, the ‘Toronto Blessing’ and in many Pentecostal assemblies today such phenomenon is touted as of the Holy Spirit. Which is it?

The End of Azusa St.

By 1906 Azusa St. had up to one thousand people in attendance. Seymour was concerned about some of the manifestations and lack of order in the assembly. He wrote to Parham, strongly urging him to come to Los Angeles to help curb the problems with the ‘*spiritualistic manifestations, hypnotic forces and fleshly contortions*’. (2) Indeed ‘*Spiritualists and mediums from the numerous occult societies of Los Angeles began to attend and to contribute their seances and trances to the services*’. (3) Seymour was alarmed by the difficulty of discerning ‘what was of God’.

When Parham eventually came to Azusa St. at the request of Seymour, he was shocked at what he saw. (4) Parham strongly denounced the various phenomena as hypnotic and not of the Holy Spirit and he was eventually asked to leave. To Parham, the lack of evidence of ‘zenoglossalia’ (known foreign languages) was an embarrassment and he renounced Azusa St. for their ‘*babbling*’ and their coercing of such sounds. (5) Parham found ‘*hypnotic influences, familiar spirit influences, spiritualistic influences, mesmeric influences and all kinds of spells and spasms, falling in trances, etc. All of these things are foreign to and unknown [to the Apostolic Faith movement] outside of Los Angeles, except in the places visited by the workers sent out from this city.*’ (6) Parham considered to be the *founder* of Pentecostalism, later denounced the movement as a case of ‘*awful fits and spasms*’ and of ‘*holy rollers and hypnotists*’ (7) ‘*a freak imitation of Pentecost. Horrible awful shame!*’ (8)

This account by Parham is backed up by the newspaper reports at that time. The *Los Angeles Times*, (April 18th., 1906, P.1) wrote: ‘*Meetings are held in a tumbled down shack on Azusa St...the devotees of the weird doctrines practice the most fanatical rites, preach the wildest theories, and work themselves into a state of wild excitement...Coloured people and a sprinkling of whites compose*

Continued next page >

(1) See ‘*The Toronto Blessing - A Critique*’ by the author

(2) ‘*The Birth of a Lie*’ by K. B. Napier (www.christiandocctrine.net)

(3) ‘*The Holiness Pentecostal Movement in the United States*’ by Vinson Synan. 1971

(4) See *Diakrisis* article 4/98 by the author.

(5) ‘*Life*’, Parham, P.169

(6) ‘*The Life of Charles Parham*’ by Sarah Parham, P.168.

(7) ‘*The Holiness Pentecostal Movement in the United States*’ by Vinson Synan, P.112

(8) ‘*Apostolic Faith*’ by Charles Parham, Baster Springs, Kansas, 1912

the congregation. And the night is made hideous in the neighbourhood by the howlings of the worshippers who spend hours swaying forth and back in a nerve-racking attitude of prayer and supplication. They claim to have the gift of tongues and to be able to comprehend the babble.'

The Azusa St. 'revival' was closed down in 1911.

The *Assembly of God* was begun in 1912.

Had Parham succeeded in gaining control of Azusa St. he could have changed the course of the entire Pentecostal/tongues movement, as he would have attempted to address his conviction of Zenoglossalia against the counterfeit unknown tongues! To this day in Pentecostal/Charismatic circles, the 'glossalia' as *unknown* tongues continues. Amazingly, today most neo-Pentecostal groups see Parham as a champion and pioneer of Pentecostalism. Yet to his death Parham insisted that all authentic speech was 'zenoglossalia', (known foreign languages), and that the Pentecostals of his day had a counterfeit experience!

The End of Parham

The story could easily end here because few people have cared to research the life of Parham. Earlier in life Parham was rejected for ordination by the Methodist Church. He denied the doctrine of eternal punishment, opposed medical treatment and believed serious diseases to be demonic. He was also influenced by a cult-like centre called '*Shiloh*' run by a Frank Sandford near Durham, Maine. Parham was documented as having mental, emotional, psychological and sociological disorders.

In 1907 he was arrested for homosexual acts with a 22 year old man in San Antonio, Texas. (1) The case was not prosecuted for lack of evidence and the scandal remained a mystery. From then unto his death in 1929 he was considered a fallen prophet by many church leaders. He continued his religious endeavours up to the end, including raising funds for a trip to the Holy Land to search for the Ark of the Covenant. This trip never materialised as Parham claimed to have been 'mugged' in New York and had all his money 'stolen'. (2)

A New Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?

Seymour, the leader of the Azusa St. movement '*ultimately repudiated the initial evidence teaching (speaking in tongues)*' - the very foundational doctrine of most Pentecostal churches today! (3)

The '*initial evidence*' doctrine, (that tongues is *the* initial evidence of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit), came later and was initially only accepted by Ozman and later Parham. This doctrine was *new* and not taught before this, yet

Continued next page >

(1) '*Fields White Unto Harvest*' by James Goff, P.106,136.

(2) Ibid P.145,146

(3) '*Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*'.

is now included in the ‘statement of faith’ of many Pentecostal Churches such as *Assembly of God (AoG)*. However, in private conversations with many AoG pastors and superintendents in Australia, I have found many were not (in private) fully convinced of this doctrine. (1)

In the mid 20th century the new Charismatic movement labelled the Pentecostal ‘glossalia’ as a ‘*heavenly language*’. In truth it was not known on earth and did not match the historic cases of *known* tongues in the New Testament (Acts 2,10,19). Pentecostal/Charismatics altered the definition of ‘tongues’ to allow for *unknown* tongues rather than *known* languages! But the ‘*faith once delivered to the saints*’ (Jude 3) did not include such new teaching.

Conclusion

The above information on Parham and Semour and the Topeka and Azusa St. foundations is almost unknown to most Pentecostals today. No doubt there was a genuine seeking of God by the persons involved in the Azusa St. ‘revival’. However, when the roots, the fruit and the lives of the leaders involved are examined, there remains serious questions as to the same teachings and the experiences that *continue* and *remain* to this day.

The Pentecostal system might well collapse if the average Pentecostal knew the history. History is very often a discerner of the roots and fruit of any movement. Some have escaped the obvious conclusion by claiming to be ‘classical Pentecostals’. However, no matter how one might label themselves - whether ‘Classic’ or ‘Neo’, Pentecostalism is based on the *one distinctive teaching* of a *subsequent baptism with the evidence being speaking in tongues*. This was, and still is, based on the *experience* in 1901 which travelled to the Azusa St. ‘revival’ upon which Pentecostalism is founded!

One ex-Pentecostal summarises: ‘*There are many Pentecostal people who stand apart from the nonsense that is going on today...against the hypnotism with Christian terminology as performed by Benny Hinn and others...But the sad thing is that the same rule which they measure these things, they fail to apply to the roots of Pentecostalism itself, indeed to it’s founder. They fail to apply this same rod of measuring to Azusa St...They would look at someone like Benny Hinn today and say, ‘...here’s a man who said there’s nine persons in the Trinity...who said that God originally made women to give birth out of their sides...that Adam was superman and could fly to the moon...who travels around the world telling people they’re healed and then they die’...They would look at what comes out of his mouth, and it is right to do so. The Bible says ‘by their fruits you shall know them’...and so we measure them by that standard...*

So let’s look at Mr. Parham’s theology. Mr Parham was a faith healer. He

Continued next page >

(1) For further teaching on the ‘*Baptism with the Spirit*’ and the ‘*Filling by the Spirit*’, etc., by the author, DVD’s or audio CD’s are available.

taught that he could only effect a cure in the person if they had faith to be healed...he believed in British Israelism...he supported the Klu Klux Klan until he died...This was the man who was the founder of Pentecostalism...a man who was supposedly chosen by God to bring new revelation, new gifts and a new move of God into the world...In 1907 he was arrested for Sodomy, later acquitted. There was an enormous amount of scandal and controversy that followed this man, and is it not the same with the false prophets today?...Their lies are...a trail of horror stories and incredible theology that is unbelievable.

The same measuring rod that is used to measure the false prophets today...the Pentecostals who stand against these do not apply that same standard of testing to the roots of Pentecostalism itself...’ (1)

Whatever strain of Charismatic/Pentecostalism people adhere to - *the roots are the same.*

Some ‘Classical Pentecostals’ also distinguish themselves from modern Pentecostals by stating their ‘tongues’ are *known* languages, (as Parham sought for and expected). Parham admittedly accepted that the tongues at Azusa St. were not known languages. But this author has personally challenged some of these ‘Classical Pentecostals’ to have their ‘tongues’ tested. All efforts to have this done have been ignored or rebuked. There are numerous cases of ‘tongues’ being tested by linguists and found to be ecstatic unknown babble. The author has also demonstrated *unknown ecstatic* tongues in the presence of unsuspecting Pentecostals who believed this was a ‘gift’ of tongues. The author has also demonstrated a foreign language and again had some people thinking this was a ‘gift of tongues’. There are also those who have entered into Pentecostal services and spoken in foreign languages only to have it interpreted as something else. *The deception is obvious and wide spread.* One could also be blaspheming Jesus in a ‘tongue’ and it not be known what is being said. Today’s ‘tongues’ are simply not known languages *as at Acts 2* where the word for ‘tongues’ is translated from the Greek ‘*dialektos*’ - known dialects! (Acts 2:6,8).

The spirit of this movement is not the same spirit as with the ‘faith once delivered’. The roots of Topeka and Azusa St show a *new and different* spirit, ‘another Jesus’. The language might be similar but *the tree is known by its fruit.*

In these last days there is the need for God’s people to ‘*test the spirits*’ (1Jn.4:1). How can we do that if we do not check the roots?

Terry Arnold (a former Pentecostal)

(1) Mark Haville, former Pentecostal; author of ‘*Signs and Wonders-Exposed*’ - DVD’s

Recommended Reading: ‘*Fields White Unto Harvest - Charles Parham & the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*’ by James R. Goff Jr. (This is an unbiased, accurate and well documented historical account by one who was a descendant of a co-worker of Parham). A follow up book with further history of early Pentecostals is: ‘*Portraits of a Generation*’ by Goff & Wacker.

Your Comments and Questions

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

A 'More Hair Than Brains' Reply

In your Doctrines of Grace Studies you wrote: 'In our regeneration did we choose God or did He choose us?...You quote 'You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that you should go and bring forth fruit...' (Jn.15:16). Was Judas regenerated too? Jesus said 'Have I not chosen you, the Twelve? Yet one of you is a devil!' (Jn.6:70)...Are Calvinists saying that God unconditionally elected a devil to salvation? Of course not. But if Calvinists use this passage to prove unconditional election to salvation, and Judas is included, then how is that point avoided?

...Calvinists take a passage on election to servanthood, and intentionally misapply it to an election to salvation, even though they know full well that Judas is included. By Calvinist reasoning, Judas would be part of an unconditional election to salvation...Reading Unconditional Election into these verses give a sovereignly elected, irresistibly called, ordained devil (Jn.6:70)...when Jesus came to His Own (Elect) not all His Own received him...

You ought to...not read Calvin, James White and others...You guys are so dodgy and sneaky...Be a true Christian...stop dodging and weaving...is it true that you got more hair than brains?...you pharisee...hypocrite...

(K.H., TAS)

Editor's reply: We keep getting labelled 'Calvinists' which we do not claim for ourselves.

In some much earlier studies I incorrectly cited Jn.15:16 for regeneration when it has nothing to do with salvation but to Christ choosing apostles. For this I humbly apologise and seek forgiveness. I do not quote this verse for unconditional election. I do quote John 6:37-44 and other texts.

You say '*By Calvinist reasoning, Judas would be part of an unconditional election to salvation*'. But who is 'inferring' Judas was 'elected' or '*reading unconditional election into these verses*'? John 15:16 does not state that Judas was elected. Judas was not saved or repentant. Nowhere does it say Judas was '*drawn*' or '*given*' by the Father as in John 6:44,65.

The scripture you refer to '*when Jesus came to His Own (Elect) not all His Own received him*'...is John 1:11 and is NOT referring to 'elect' believers. The context is to 'his own' Jewish people who '*received him not as Messiah!*' You added the word 'elect' which is not in the text.

In regard to Jn.6:37-44 - Is there any doubt in Jesus words when He says those called and 'drawn' '*shall come*' (vs.37), they will '*not be cast out*' (vs.37) and will be '*raised up on the last day*' (vs.39,40)? In this Effectual Calling the text has man passive and God the active one. One cannot escape

Continued next page >

the sovereign work of God here. *Jn.6:39-44* says ‘no man can come to the father unless drawn’ and those same ones are ‘raised up’. I don’t call this ‘Calvinism’, I call it ‘Biblical’!

Are we really ‘*dodgy, sneaky...and weaving*’ and maybe not a ‘*true christian*’? Our beliefs are revealed in a book ‘*Calvinism & Arminianism - Out of the Maze*’ and in debates which can be read *publicly* (see transcripts of ‘*Debates on The Doctrines of Grace*’ - free or donation for postage).

I have written to you (several times now) yet you repeat the charge - I have *not read Calvin* and only one book by James White. I came to believing sovereign election, predestination and the Effectual Calling decades before *through scripture and study*. I don’t claim to understand it logically but I marvel in the sovereign choosing and work of God in my salvation. I ask ‘*why me, a sinner ‘DEAD in sin*’ (Eph.2:1,5; Col.2:13)? It is the pride of man that tries to understand sovereign election with human logic and twist scriptures to make them say otherwise. Decades ago I got past questioning ‘*no man can come to the Father unless drawn*’ (Jn.6:44). I must believe it and trust in the power of the Gospel and the sovereign wind of the Spirit which ‘blows where it will’ (Jn.3:8).

God forbid I am ‘*dodgy, sneaky and weaving*’, although I may have ‘*more hair than brains*’? I encourage you to attack the doctrine, not the person?

Predestination or Postdestination?

Terry, appreciate your newsletter and bold speech for our Lord. Re: Nov/Dec ‘Anger or Truth’ (P.14-16) - I believe in sovereign election, predestination ‘before the foundation of the world’ and accept God chooses man (Eph.1:4). Am I in error that predestination is ‘according to’ whether we ‘first trusted Christ’ (Eph.1:11,12). This would be reliant on God’s omniscient foreknowledge. Does our sovereign God give us the choice (without violating his omnipotent, providential control) to receive or reject his offer of grace? (leaving us without excuse on judgement day...after ‘drawing’ us with his word? (Jn.6:44).

Editor’s reply: The purpose of us ‘*trusting Christ*’ here is that we would give God ‘*glory*’ (vs.12). The verse does NOT say this caused any predestination. A predestination which is ‘*according to whether we first trusted Christ*’ is not a *predestination*, but a *postdestination*. The passage does not say He predestinated us *according to our choosing*. It actually has God choosing us *before* any choosing by us. Absolutely nothing is stated in this passage about God ‘*foreknowing*’ us and then predestinating us on that basis. *That notion is ‘read’ into the scripture* by many today...

God cannot foreknow without foreordaining, or else he is not sovereign. Nowhere does God ‘*offer*’ grace at the will of man. Rather, he *saves* by

Continued next page >

grace unmerited by anything ‘*of ourselves*’ (Eph.2:8,9), and ‘*not of the will of man*’ (Jn.1:13). Nowhere in scripture does God ‘*give us a choice...to receive or reject*’. Rather he ‘*draws*’ and ‘*raises up*’ (Jn.6:40-44).

People will not only be judged for ‘*not receiving Christ*’ but also for not ‘*knowing*’ him at all (2Thess.1:8). According to your extra logic for Eph.1, what will you believe for the Amazonian Indians who for thousands of years never heard of Christ or the Gospel? They were not given any ‘*offer*’ to ‘*choose*’. Such people are not in Heaven (Jn.4:12; 14:6) and were ‘*condemned already*’ (Jn.3:18,19).

One cannot apply human logic to a predestination and election ‘*before the foundation of the world*’. Ephesians ch.1 says nothing about any person choosing and that being the cause of predestination. Ephesians 1 says *God chose us, before the foundation of the world* (vs.4) and ‘*predestinated us according to his will...the counsel of his will*’ (vs.5,11). We must not read a ‘*foreknowledge*’ of man’s ‘*choice*’ into a passage that is all about *God’s action and His foreordaining*.

Sabbath Keeping - a Principle or a Command?

[Editor’s reply in **bold** and brackets]

Terry...in response to your article ‘More Sabbath Confusion’ (Sept/Oct P.15,16), we believe God would desire us to keep his day of rest...not as a legalistic ritual. [There is not one NT scripture commanding Christians to keep the Sabbath as given to Israel. At best it is a principle in creation and good to have a Sabbath - one rest day in seven. But it is error to teach this is as a command in the NT]

*Jesus gave two commandments (Matt.22:37-40)...He said on these hang all ‘the law and the prophets’. This is a quote from Dt.6:5; 30:6; Lev.19:18. This included the 4th commandment - ‘remember the sabbath’. [If you quote Matt.22 as including the ‘4th commandment’ to be kept, then you must also include everything commanded under the ‘law’ in the Old Testament (‘the law and the prophets’ includes *all the OT*). The idea of the law being ‘fulfilled’ is that Jesus Christ fulfils it in two commandments here. He does this in substitution, paying the price for breaking the law]*

...The law was never for salvation but to prolong their days in the land Dt.5:33... [Who is the ‘their’ here - it is specifically Israel! The Scriptures clearly teach the Sabbath was a ‘sign’ between God and Israel: ‘Speak you also unto the children of Israel...my sabbaths you shall keep: it is a sign between me and you...that you may know I am the Lord that does sanctify you...the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath...It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever...And he gave unto Moses...’ (Ex.31:13-18); ‘...I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they

might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them' (Ezek.20:12).

*The pharisees were living the law legalistically and Jesus told them they were going to Hell (Matt.23:13-15; 33) [How can you keep it anything but legalistically? If you use OT scriptures, then you must keep the Sabbath as the Jews do. Jesus did not tell the Pharisees they were 'going to Hell' for 'keeping the law legalistically' as you say. They were going to Hell because they did not have the 'righteousness' needed to go into Heaven - a substitute alien righteousness *outside of the law* and themselves]*

*In Genesis 2 God...rested on the seventh day. He blessed, sanctified it...2,600 years before 'moses law' was given to Israel. The sabbath at creation was for the whole world...not just Israel...In Genesis 20:10 even the stranger (Gentile) kept the Sabbath...[The Sabbath at creation was not commanded for man and was *not* given 'for the whole world'. God rested, not man. The command did not come till the Mosaic covenant. Genesis 20:10 does not mention any Sabbath - you mean Ex.20:10 and that was given to Israel, *not the Gentiles*]*

At the time of Noah God judged the whole world because they had turned away from God and his ways...[No Sabbath mentioned here. The people were not judged here for not keeping the Sabbath]...The sacrificial laws were a shadow of the coming Christ...[this included the Sabbaths! - see Col.2:16,17]

*You quote Rom.14:5 as choosing your own day. Vs.1 refers to the weak in the faith; vs.5 says one man (esteems (regards, not chooses) one day above another. [Whether one is 'weak' or not, Romans 14 teaches 'one person will judge one day above another or 'every day alike'. The word 'esteem' ('krino') is to judge with the idea of voluntarily choosing a day. It is impossible to get from this passage any command to keep the Sabbath. Rather the opposite - a *freedom* to esteem one day above another!]*

*...We need to search God's word, not historic writings. [I use historic writings from the 1st C. only to counter the SDA lie that the 'Sabbath was changed' in the 3rd C. The early church was *already keeping Sunday* for worship. They saw that as their 'resurrection Sunday']*

1Cor.7:19 'keeping the commandments of God' [This is NOT the 10 commandments. It is the word of God]

*In the NT they kept the sabbath (Acts 13:4,27,42,44; 15:21; 16:13; 17:2; 18:4 [Not one of these scriptures has a command to keep any Sabbath! Acts 13:4 is evangelising in the synagogue where Paul, Barnabus and others did most of their teaching and evangelism. Similar for other verses. The apostles won the *unsaved Jews in the synagogues!*]*

There is only one recorded account in the NT of fellowshipping on the first day of the week...you cannot build a doctrine on this verse...The other reference is 1Cor.16:1,2 about collection for the saints on the first day of the week, not about changing the sabbath day to the first day of the week. [Acts 20:7 is irrefutably Sunday. 1Cor.16:1,2 - this collection of monies history attests was done on their day of worship. But even if you accept one scripture

(Acts 20:7) - why do you say I ‘use this for a doctrine’? I have no ‘doctrine’ for a Sabbath as a command. And why will you not take Acts 20:7 as truth instead of a contradiction?]

*In Hebrews 8-10 it talks of a...first covenant. The 10 commandments including the 4th is not mentioned here. Hebrews 3,4 talks about a spiritual rest from the sacrificial system...[The ‘first covenant’ referred to in Hebrews **WAS** the Mosaic covenant! And its sign was the Sabbath. It is being compared to the New covenant which is said to be ‘better’]*

*Rom.3:1,2 the oracles were given to the Jews for everyone. [Romans 3:1,2 does not say the oracles were given to the Jews ‘for everyone’. The context is **not about the Sabbath** but Jews being sinners ‘without excuse’ and judged]*

In the NT they all keep the sabbath...not legalistically...Other scriptures (Matt.5:17-20; 2Tim.3:16,17; Rom.15:4; 1Cor.10:11; Rom.10:13). [None of these scriptures deal with the sabbath or a command to keep it. There is gross misuse of scripture here. If you are to keep the Jewish Sabbath then you better keep it even ‘legalistically’. Failure brought a death penalty!]

*Jesus healed on the sabbath day (Lk.13:11-17). [This is Jesus **breaking the sabbath**]. There is a blessing if you obey God’s commands; a curse if you disobey (Dt.11:27,28) [Spoken to Israel. So, we are ‘cursed’ if we don’t keep the Sabbath? Christians are free to keep the Sabbath or any Jewish tradition, but it is not to be taught as a command. We are not Israel nor under the Mosaic covenant which had a *beginning and an end* (Dt.5:2,3; Gal.3:19). The Sabbaths were a ‘shadow’ of things to come (Col.2:17; Heb.10:1)*

‘Yes I am an Adventist!’

Hi Terry, recently I have found myself in the midst of several SDA friends. Something seemed strange about their ‘talk’. I found your article ‘Why I Am Not an SDA’. It really helped me get a larger view of this group...I have noticed this group of folks rarely talk about Jesus. Their language is reduced to an organization, i.e. SDA., schools, diet, especially the Sabbath...not Jesus or the miraculous gift of Grace. These people continually ask me ‘Are you an Adventist’. I wish I had a good answer to bring glory to the Lord Jesus. How would you respond to this question...rather than say ‘I am not an Adventist’?

(J.W., Vict)

Editor’s reply: My answer would be firstly ‘Yes, I believe in the imminent return of Jesus Christ!’ That is what the term ‘adventist’ literally means. Then I would wait for a response. If they try to tie you to an *organisation* that calls themselves ‘Adventists’, then I would say ‘I am a Christian who believes in the person of Jesus Christ and the finished work he did on the cross for me...’. Present the Gospel here clear and strong and that it is *not*

Continued next page >

by keeping the Law.

If they try to tie you to ‘Seventh Day Adventism’ then I would explain to them that you are now under ‘a new covenant’, not the Mosaic covenant which had a *beginning* and an *end* (Dt.5:2,3; Gal.3:19). The Mosaic covenant had a ‘sign to Israel’ (Ex.31:12-17; Dt.5:2,3) - the Sabbath. But that covenant ended. Tell them you do not live under any old covenant any more. Also tell them no one can be saved by the law or *the keeping of it* (Rom.3:20,28)...Give them the fact sheets found on our website.

Seventh Day Adventists are lost people *if they are attempting to keep the law for salvation* and arguably many do this. The organisation also lies about Saturday and Sunday keeping in the first few centuries. The early church kept Sunday as a day of gathering together, breaking of bread and worship. Scripture teaches this (Acts 20:7; 1Cor.16:1,2) and early history affirms it. (See our website article ‘*Saturday or Sunday*’).

SDA is a dangerous religion because it binds people under law and a different covenant. It was also founded by a false prophetess.

SDA and Luke 16

Terry, I have been doing Bible study...from [an SDA TV station]...With the course have come books by Ellen G. White of the SDA. One of the questions is: ‘Is the story of the rich man and Lazarus a parable?’...Also, do you have any information on ‘law and salvation’...

(R.M., Qld)

Editor’s Reply: If you are doing Bible study with an SDA group and with material by E.G. White then you are doing studies under a false gospel and a false prophetess. Scripture would command against this.

SDA groups struggle with the Rich man and Lazarus (Lk.16) because, whether it be a ‘parable’ or not, it clearly teaches a Hell which is eternal and against their ‘annihilation’ doctrine. The passage begins with a ‘certain rich man’. Jesus obviously had a person in mind and truth to tell about Hell being *eternal* and having *punishment*. Many scriptures match these truths (Matt.8:12; 22:13; 25:30,41,46; Mk.9:44,46,48; 2Thess.1:9).

...Information on ‘law and salvation’ is found on our website.

Cremation or Burial?

Terry, your thoughts on cremation...

Editor’s Reply: I think not to be dogmatic or doctrinal about this. I *prefer* burial. It has always been a Jewish and Christian custom to bury. Yet martyrs were often burned. The Bible has no sure command on this.

Your Comments and Questions

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

Hi Terry, in one section of your seminar on the Holy Spirit you say 'you may be baptized in the Spirit but not filled...'. That sounds like two baptisms?...

(M.H., Sth Aust)

Editor's reply: The Baptism with the Spirit occurred *historically* and *transitionally* at Acts 2 (to the Jews); Acts 8 (to the Samaritans) and Acts 10 (to the Gentiles). From then on we all receive the same 'promise' by faith at salvation (Acts 2:39; Gal.3:14,22). But the filling of the Spirit is a *control* by the Spirit from within (Eph.5:18). The Spirit can be 'grieved', quenched. The Corinthians were not always 'filled' ('*pleroo*' - controlled) with the Spirit in that they were fleshly, acting carnally, drunken and misusing gifts of the Spirit (eg. as in 'unknown tongues' in 1Cor.14). A Christian must be baptized (with the 'promise' of the Spirit by faith) but may not always be 'filled' - controlled by the Spirit within. The baptism with the Spirit is never a command, the filling is.

Praise/Prayer Points

- Pray for the many pastors, Bible teachers and readers who receive literature and resources each week from this ministry. Pray this material will be used to build God's people.
- Pray for, and thank the Lord for, the volunteers who tirelessly help the editor in the administration and resources for this ministry.

Subscription Form

I am interested in receiving the *free* monthly Send this form to:
TA Ministries newsletter '*Diakrisis*' by **TA Ministries**
hardcopy - by *e-mail* - (tick boxes) **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, BSB 084 705 Account No. 02737 1856