

Liberalism: Its Cause And Cure –

Chapter Four: Charismatics Are

Liberals

This is the continuation of [Liberalism: Its Cause And Cure – Chapter Three: The Mainline Churches And Evolution](#)

One can claim a direct relationship between Luther's Reformation and the charismatic movement. The Reformed, first under the influence of Huldreich Zwingli (1484-1531) and later John Calvin (1509-1564), broke with Luther on the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. Zwingli and Calvin taught that sacraments were only symbols, ordinances to be obeyed by man, not involving the work of God. The Church of England continued this doctrine, which John Wesley (1703-1791) adopted. Wesley's efforts resulted in the birth of Methodism, often called "the American religion" because of its growth and influence in the United States.

At the end of the 19th century, the followers of Wesley, who thought the Methodists were becoming too liberal, formed their own denominations, known for their emphasis on holiness or perfectionism. From these Wesleyan Holiness churches came the first Pentecostals. The best known today is the Assemblies of God, formerly the home of Rev. Jim Bakker and Rev. Jimmie Swaggart.

Charismatics are mainline members who have adopted the chief doctrine of the Pentecostals, tongues-speaking, while remaining in their liberal denominations. Pat Robertson, the founder of the Christian Broadcasting Network, is a charismatic Southern Baptist. Although the Pentecostals and charismatics make up two distinct groups within the American religious scene, charismatics continue to see such Pentecostal leaders as Oral Roberts as their spokesmen.

The American religious scene has long labored under the myth that charismatics are conservatives. One reason may be that some of them have publicly identified with conservative political causes. This should not be confused with a conservative or strict approach to the Scriptures. Many charismatics reject the inerrancy of Scripture and use the historical-critical method to justify their compromise. The characteristics of liberal theology match almost exactly the dominant themes of charismatics and Pentecostals. These parallels will be explored in the main body of this chapter.

Some may take offense at this chapter, since they think they let liberalism behind when they joined the tongues-speakers. A number of faithful, orthodox Lutheran pastors were once involved with the charismatic movement, before discovering the true nature of scriptural Christianity. At some point, someone knocked them on the head and said, "You are full of beans if you think the charismatic movement is the answer to the crisis in American Christianity." These Lutherans probably growled and fumed before they

realized they mistook froth for reality.

Today there are many charismatic ministers in the two largest Lutheran bodies in America, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. Several para-church groups exist to support the work of charismatic congregations within the mainline denominations. People are being deceived and seduced by the charismatics, who traverse the whole world to net a single convert and may only make him twice more fit for hell (Matthew 23:15). Some view the growth of Pentecostalism and the charismatic movement as signs of God's blessing. A more realistic view is that the apostasy of the mainline denominations has become so obvious to members that they are driven from their congregations to those organizations which offer an alternative. Mainline ministers, too, have found comfort and support in their charismatic affiliations. The mainline churches teach against the Bible, while the Pentecostals and charismatics seem to view the Scriptures as authoritative.

The National Council of Churches could slow the growth of this phenomenon simply by going out of business. Of course, more is involved than just the crafts and assaults of the NCC. The entire mainline seminary system produces ministers who cannot preach the gospel because their faith has been undermined by the historical-critical method and a new religion of social and political activism has been substituted for the gospel. The Roman Catholic Church has joined this self-destructive crusade and found ways to outdo the liberal Protestants. Results:

1. Some Assemblies of God churches report half of their members to be former Catholics. A large proportion are former Lutherans.
2. Many mainline charismatics stay in their home congregations while floating over to the Assemblies of God for "spiritual enrichment."

Charismatics have properly diagnosed the ills of corpse-cold liberalism: lifeless worship, political harangues disguised as sermons, unbelieving ministers and officials, attacks on the Bible in the name of scholarship, and a lack of genuine Christian nurture. Unfortunately, their prescription for the ills of the church is killing the patient, slowly and painfully, just as liberalism did, while stimulating him to the appearance of life before his last gasp.

The fatal weakness of Pentecostalism and the charismatic movement is a trust in the operation of the Holy Spirit apart from the means of grace—their heritage of Reformed teaching. For them, God can and does speak directly to individuals, giving authoritative pronouncements on every possible subject. The dream they had last night is as authoritative as the Gospel of John, perhaps more so, since these visions can overturn the clear statements of Scripture. This is contrary to Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions, which declare that God comes to us only through the means of grace. Anything else is of the devil. Luther made this very clear in the Smalcald Articles:

All this is the old devil and old serpent, who also converted Adam and Eve

into enthusiasts, and led them from the outward Word of God to spiritualizing and self-conceit and nevertheless he accomplished this through other outward words. Just as also our enthusiasts [at the present day] condemn the outward Word, and nevertheless they themselves are not silent, but they fill the world with their pratings and writings, as though, indeed, the Spirit could not come through the writings and spoken Word of the apostles, but [first] through their writings and words He must come.¹

A LITTLE HISTORY

Revivalism

The Pentecostal movement is old rather than new. Montanus (ca. 170), an early Christian heretic and current charismatic idol, said, "We will only take communion from Spirit-filled bishops." He and his two female assistants, who deserted their husbands to join Montanus, had many visions, including one of Christ in the form of a female.²

The Wesleyan revivals of the early 19th century were Pentecostal in nature, with people fainting and dancing and jerking their limbs around. Then too, much of the work was in reclaiming inactive Christians who had fallen away from the church. The Wesleys were outcasts in the Episcopalian Church in England, shunned and persecuted by the approved clergy for being too earnest about scriptural principles, so the preaching was often done in open fields to the lower classes.

As Methodism (as it was called) became more respectable and academic, liberalism drove away elements loyal to the Wesleyan spirit, making Methodism even more liberal. Since the trend in all mainline churches was toward liberalism, from 1900 on, the growth of Pentecostalism owes some debt of gratitude to liberals for making the choice so obvious for people.

The Lutherans of the General Synod (now part of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America) were also caught up with revivalism, which they felt would make the gospel more appealing. William Passavant (1821-1894), later a leader in the more conservative General Council, was a dedicated follower of the movement in his first pastorate. He studied Wesley instead of Luther and held "protracted meetings" until after midnight, where emotional excesses were common:

Among the mourners or seekers and exhorters there was a confused mingling of tears, groans, cries and occasional loud shoutings. Praying, singing and exhorting often went on at the same time. The journal [of Passavant] records cases of persons falling to the floor and becoming as stiff as if dead.³

Lutheran advocates of the New Measures were so enchanted with Reformed doctrine they proposed a new version of the Augsburg Confession in 1855 which omitted the doctrines offensive to the non-Lutheran Protestants—baptismal regeneration and the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in Holy Communion. The historic liturgy was also neglected by revivalistic Lutherans during this first era of marketing the gospel.

Pentecostalism

Revivalism took a new turn at Stone's Folly, a weird old house in Topeka, Kansas, where students of Charles F. Parham (a Wesleyan Holiness preacher) began speaking in tongues in 1901. They had decided, at his roughshod Bible institute, that the true mark of the Christian was baptism in the Holy Spirit, and that proof of this baptism was the ability to speak in tongues. Their study of the Acts of the Apostles, urged by Parham, had convinced them that true Christians are filled with the Holy Spirit and that proof of the Spirit is in glossolalia, or tongues-speaking. (All Pentecostal and charismatic theology hinges on this narrow understanding of Scripture.) The students' first efforts to speak in tongues did not pan out until they discovered the requirement to pray for the gift. After much struggle, the group obtained the desired proof. Some suspect that Parham already spoke in tongues and used this Bible study to manipulate his students into adopting his new style.

Pentecostalism flared up in earnest at the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles in 1906, with wildly emotional services, under the leadership of black preacher William J. Seymour, a student of Parham. Things got too wild for Seymour, so he had Parham come to Azusa Street to exert a calming influence. The two had a falling out and parted company.

The Pentecostals and charismatics owe much to Wesley, who described his Christian faith as a growth in stages. He was a humdrum and timid Christian until his experience at Aldersgate Church, where he felt his heart strangely warmed at hearing Luther's preface to Romans read. Lutherans would not call this a conversion or born-again experience, but illumination, an experience of deeper understanding or new insight.⁴

Wesley helped establish the notion that one could be a churchgoer all his life and not really be a Christian until this born-again experience happened. Many Lutheran missionaries, like Lars P. Esbjorn of the Augustana Synod, had a commitment to accept only "born-again" Christians to Holy Communion. This two stage description of the Christian life made a perfect foundation for the claims of Pentecostals and charismatics, who often talk about being mere churchgoers until their baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Charismatic Renewal

Charismatic renewal, which is really Pentecostalism in the mainline groups, began in the Episcopal Church in California. In 1959, John and Joan Baker considered themselves baptized by the Holy Spirit, through the help of Pentecostal friends. This corrupt notion of a separate baptism will be considered later, but it is worth noting that charismatic flare-ups have been strongest in the most liberal denominations, those which had long abandoned the authority of Scripture. In many cases, the clergy trained in destructive criticism of the Bible, the historical-critical method, find joy and meaning in their ministry for the first time in decades through Pentecostalism. No one should be surprised that a minister or layman feels exhilarated after hearing that the miracles really happened, that Jesus is the Son of God, that prayer is something more than relaxation therapy.

After John and Joan Baker began speaking in tongues, they started working on friends and clergy. Dennis Bennett, an Episcopalian priest in a neighboring parish in Van Nuys, was drawn into the new phenomenon and found himself fired. Taking a poor parish in Seattle, he succeeded in spreading the practice even more, experiencing considerable church growth.⁵

Larry Christenson, an American Lutheran Church pastor in California, was distressed already in seminary with the demythologizing methods of the infidel Rudolph Bultmann. A member of the Foursquare Gospel Church in San Pedro, California, invited Christenson to a revival where a woman preached about the gifts of the Spirit. Later that night he began tongues-speaking and started influencing others. This happened about 1963. Christenson has remained a leader among Lutheran charismatics.⁶ His opposition to the inerrancy of Scripture was echoed by other Lutheran charismatic leaders during the formation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and gave great comfort to opponents of inerrancy. Christenson wrote in *Welcome Holy Spirit*:

Charismatics would insist on the classic understanding and use of the historical-critical method of biblical interpretation, that is, the attempt to interpret Scripture according to the way it was meant by those who wrote it, and the way it was understood by those to whom it was addressed. . .⁷

Erwin Prange was educated in the Missouri Synod, graduating in 1954 from Concordia, St. Louis, before serving in St. Louis County and later in New York City. Like Christenson, he had found little spiritual nurture in seminary. On December 7, 1963, after being involved with a Lutheran charismatic group and after requesting prayer for the ability to speak in tongues, he began tongues-speaking. Prange attended a pastoral conference where Harald Bredesen, the pastor of First Reformed in Mt. Vernon, New York, spoke about his charismatic experience. Prange also gave his testimony. Rev. Richard Neuhaus, in the Missouri Synod at that time, afterward with the ELCA, and now a Roman Catholic priest, spoke up and said:

We can't walk away from this. These men have just made some of the most amazing statements ever heard in a Lutheran pastoral conference. Either they are liars, or they are crazy, or they are right. Either this is of God or of Satan. I don't think we can leave until we find out.⁸

The district president later warned Prange to keep this business quiet. When Prange spoke at the Lutheran Women's Missionary League meeting, he gave his charismatic testimony, to the chagrin of the district president. The husband of one of the women in attendance later "started a charismatic cell at [Concordia Seminary] Springfield that now numbers [in 1973] about thirty-five students."⁹ Recently, Missouri Synod pastors have started "Renewal In Missouri," a charismatic caucus within the LCMS.

Roman Catholic charismatics trace their origin to a 1966 group at Duquesne University, a Catholic institution. From there it spread to Notre Dame and Ann Arbor. Charismatic communes were established in South Bend, Indiana (where Notre Dame is located), and Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Tongues-speaking reached Yale through the InterVarsity Christian Fellowship in 1962, after two visits by Harald Bredesen (see the Prange experience above). The Ivy League enthusiasts were called "glosso-Yalies."¹⁰ Tongues-speaking spread to Princeton and other academic centers where the Christian faith had been served up as thin, cold gruel. Mainline groups fought against charismatic ministers and congregations but finally accepted them in principle without taking them to heart. It may seem odd that two types of liberalism are at war with each other, but the main reason is their degree of liberalism. A truly dedicated liberal rejects most of the Bible, while a charismatic simply ignores significant sections.

Many institutions funded by Pentecostals led to the spread of the charismatic movement. The Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship spread the word. David Wilkerson's *The Cross and the Switchblade* achieved almost canonical status among charismatics in the 1960s. (It was made into a film with Pat Boone as the minister and CHIPS star Eric Estrada as the hoodlum, later earning the Golden Turkey award as one of the worst religious movies ever made.)

Retreats (such as Cursillo and Kairos) and prayer groups too numerous to mention were used to lure unsuspecting people into the charismatic experience, with the claim that it was real Christianity, a higher form of the faith, or the only genuine manifestation of the church. People were not introduced to tongues-speaking at first, but desensitized about charismatic songs, charismatic worship, and charismatic doctrine. Mainline Christians were too puzzled or naive to say, "Phooey!" When compared to Bultmann's demythologizing of Christmas and Easter, tongues-speaking looked pretty good, for the minister as well as the layman.

DOCTRINAL ERRORS OF THE CHARISMATICS

Although the liberal tendencies of the tongues speakers have already been mentioned, certain fundamental errors need to be discussed. When all of these matters have been carefully examined on the basis of the Scriptures, no one can claim that Pentecostalism is a conservative form of the Christian faith. Instead, tongues-speaking is an ecstatic religion which has attached itself, leechlike, to Christianity by selectively adopting its terminology.

Confusion about the Two Natures in Christ

Historic Christianity has always been the object of attack from false teachers, often concerning the two natures, human and divine, of Christ.¹¹ Liberals, laboring in the guise of Christians, cannot accept the divine nature of Christ: his pre-existence, his virgin birth, his miracles, his atoning death, and his resurrection. Pentecostals, in a similar fashion, assert that Jesus' "baptism" in the Holy Spirit enabled him to perform miracles.

Some corrections need to be noted at once. First of all, the Bible reveals Jesus' baptism in the Jordan as water baptism, with the Spirit descending upon him. There is no "baptism of the Holy Spirit" as a separate manifestation in the New Testament. Secondly, Jesus did not launch into a signs-and-wonders tongues speaking ministry immediately afterwards, but

rejected Satan's pleas for such in his temptation in the desert. One despairs of finding any place in the Bible where Jesus spoke in tongues. More importantly, his divine nature was not installed when the Spirit descended, contra this notion:

Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost... Why then must He be anointed? Because His human nature needed to be empowered by the Spirit, before even He could do successful service in this world. Jesus waited for thirty years until He was anointed... never forget that our Lord's ministry was not in the power of the second person of the blessed Trinity... but... the third.¹²

Pentecostals and charismatics draw this parallel—that we, like Jesus, can do nothing miraculous until baptized by the Holy Spirit. Until we experience that baptism, which is proven by tongues-speaking, we are not complete Christians. This concept of “anointing” by the Holy Spirit has also led to the charismatic tendency to call every charismatic book, CD, tape, DVD, TV program, and choir anthem “very anointed.”

Pentecostals have displayed an unfortunate tendency to draw false and misleading parallels between themselves and Christ, claiming the authority of the Bible but showing no respect for the complete witness of Scripture.

Two Baptisms

Wesley's unfortunate misunderstanding about the Christian life led him to set the stage for his followers to teach two baptisms, water and Spirit. Much of Wesley's terminology was taken over by the Pentecostals, since he taught there was something beyond justification by faith, a deeper experience, which he called entire sanctification. Since he taught a waiting and a wrestling for this higher, deeper experience, Pentecostals converted the same into tarrying, yielding, and struggling for the “gift of tongues.”

The distortions of Scripture are bad enough, but no one can calculate the damage these egregious errors cause to the spiritual well-being of believers. Although they deny it at first, Pentecostals believe they are the only true Christians. They cast doubt on genuine scriptural doctrine and steal from people the assurance of their salvation.

Since the Bible is the unified, unique revelation of God's will, no passage of Scripture contradicts another. Those who find contradictions realize later that the problems were introduced by translators or a misunderstanding of the text. Thus, when Ephesians 4:5 states clearly that there is one baptism, we should not be able to find two baptisms anywhere else in Scripture. Pentecostals and charismatics find a second baptism precisely because they deny baptismal regeneration and need a validating substitute.

The move away from the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, started by Zwingli and continued by Calvin during the Reformation, took away from people this visible reality of God's Word. Since both men taught that the sacraments were only symbolic, man's witness to his faith, they undermined the certainty of salvation and created a craving for outward, visible proof. Thus, Pentecostals deny that Baptism and Holy Communion are sacraments while

insisting upon tongues-speaking. Many seem angry that infants would be baptized, though entire households were baptized in Acts.

Pentecostals do not merely reject the sacraments; they are filled with wrath at the mention of them. The author was invited several years ago to a discussion of infant baptism, precipitated by an Assembly of God member who had raged against it. Since the group was mixed, the position of believer's baptism (opposed to infant baptism) was presented fairly, followed by an explanation of why the Scriptures clearly supported infant baptism. Though some claim that infants cannot believe, Psalm 22:9 speaks of a nursing infant believing, and Jesus said the kingdom of God belongs to little children (Mark 10:14). Though some argue that a baby cannot have faith, Christ himself taught that whoever did not receive the kingdom as a child would not receive it at all (Mark 10:15). During the entire discussion, the Assembly of God member folded her arms (a well-known body language expression of rejection) and glared.

Paul Crouch, Pentecostal owner of Trinity Broadcasting Network, offered "communion" on TV. He suggested that people get juice and crackers and follow along with him during the consecration, more properly the desecration. He picked up the bread, saying, "And Jesus said, ha-ha-ha, this is my body." (Crouch was indulging in what Pentecostals call holy laughter, another form of ecstatic speech.) On the same show they dedicated a baby named Destiny, Rev. Oral Roberts officiating. Oral pointed out that they did not believe in baptismal regeneration, in case any listener suspected them of Pentecostal unorthodoxy.

For charismatics and Pentecostals, tongues-speaking is the sacrament. At Jim Bakker's PTL Heritage Water Slide, people were known for stopping in the middle of the street for impromptu tongues-speaking sessions. Tongues-speaking is simply the repetition of meaningless sounds or syllables. In every case tongues-speaking is a learned behavior preceded by instruction and peer pressure to "come up higher and be with us." It has never been proven to be a foreign language. Like laughing and crying, it is easier to do in a group than alone, especially at first.

Jesus spoke of one baptism, water and Spirit, in John 3:5, in the discussion with Nicodemus. The Greek text could not be clearer, since water and Spirit are linked without the article, making it impossible to put asunder what God has joined together. "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. " (KJV).

Pentecostals find separate baptisms in the Book of Acts. Acts 8:4-24 is a favorite passage to prove that a Spirit baptism can arrive later than water baptism. The intent of the two-baptism fallacy is to support the contention that one can be a baptized church member without really being a Christian. What Acts 8:15-16 states, according to R. C. H. Lenski, is that the Samaritans had received the supreme gifts of the Holy Spirit at their baptism, but the miraculous gifts of Pentecost later through the apostles.¹³ The laying on of hands conferred the charismata of the Spirit, something Simon Magus wanted to buy, but the text does not tell us that the Samaritans

spoke in tongues nor that they were “baptized by the Holy Spirit.”

Pentecostals teach that the Holy Spirit is a reward bestowed by God upon those who earn it, through sacrifice, yielding, tarrying, and praying. That is the rabbinical understanding of the Holy Spirit, not the teaching of the Bible, which tells us that the Spirit is received as a gift through the sacrament of baptism.¹⁴ Teaching tongues-speaking as a reward from God only serves to widen the gulf between Pentecostals and historic Christianity.

In Acts 10, Luke gave a lengthy account of the conversion of Cornelius and other Gentiles. The Holy Spirit fell on them during Peter’s sermon. Jewish believers heard the Gentiles speak in tongues. Since God had bestowed the miracle of Pentecost upon the Gentiles, Peter exclaimed that they should be baptized. Here the work of the Spirit and baptism are too closely related to provide Pentecostals a foothold.

However, in Acts 19, Paul found some Ephesians who had been baptized into John’s baptism but had not even heard of the Holy Spirit. Paul baptized them and laid hands on them. The Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied (19:6). There is no way to make this into a two-baptism passage, since the only valid Christian baptism is in the name of Jesus or the Trinity. These people were not even aware of the Holy Spirit. One likely explanation is that the “disciples” were baptized earlier by a follower of John the Baptist. They failed the doctrinal test, since they had not been instructed. They failed the sacramental test, since they had not been baptized into Jesus but “into John.”

Unscriptural Practices concerning Tongues

Nothing here is intended to imply that current tongues-speaking practices are the same as the day of Pentecost or anything genuine from the apostolic age. Paul’s extensive discussion of tongues in 2 Corinthians 12-14, tell us much of what was going wrong in Corinth. Most forget that Corinth was a divided congregation and that the love chapter, 1 Corinthians 13, was aimed specifically at the charismatics. “If I speak with the tongues of angels and of men, but have not love...” Paul hammered the tongue-speakers for their childishness. Some of the problems he noted among them were envy, showboating, pride, rudeness, selfishness, touchiness, evil thoughts, and rejoicing in iniquity. Tongues and prophecy, Paul warned, would all pass away.

Oral Roberts himself does not obey the injunction of Scripture to have one person speak in tongues and another prophesy. Tongue-speaking is the last gift listed in 1 Corinthians 12:28 and the only one requiring another gift. Oral teaches that one can speak in tongues and do one’s own interpreting, getting a direct revelation from God without intermediaries, a revelation which actually suggests that the Bible is insufficient and unclear. Oral rejects baptismal regeneration. On one television show, Oral and his son Richard climbed into a swimming pool in their business suits and poured water on each other. Wouldn’t it be better to believe God’s Word than to mock baptism? ” “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the

Holy Ghost.” (Titus 3:5; KJV).

Interpreting tongues is a serious problem for charismatics. First of all, despite all anecdotal claims, no contemporary Pentecostal has ever shown a magical ability to speak in a foreign language without studying the language first. The tongues-speaking stories are so similar they take on a liturgical form. The following is the tongues-speaking anecdote which the author has heard or read in many different versions:

I was speaking in [name of foreign country]. Someone came up to me and said, “Where did you learn to speak perfect [name of foreign language]?” I replied, “Why, I have never spoken a word of [name of language] in my life!” Then the stranger said to me, “I have a master’s degree in [name of language] and I can tell you that your speech was perfect in grammar and pronunciation.”¹⁵

Some of us have heard or read the same claim in many forms, with such languages as ecclesiastical Latin and Japanese in the appropriate blanks. Enthusiasts smile smugly while the story is being told, without names, dates, places, with less evidence than a judge would demand for a parking ticket. Despite the hundreds of examples of flawless and instantaneous speeches in another language, charismatic and Pentecostal schools continue to pay people to teach foreign languages to their tongues-speaking students.

In fact, modern tongue-speaking is nothing more than ecstatic speech, easy to learn with peer pressure and some experience. Many people fall into it and fall out of it in a period of time. Each one has his own style, though there is a lot of imitation. One woman said, “Sh-sh-sh- sh-ba-ba-ba-ta-ta-ta.” Others affect a biblical “Shonda kabul togandaatol.” The same nonsense can be heard at football games: “Bulldogs, bulldogs, bow-wow-wow. Eli Yale.” An honest charismatic said he kept up tongues-speaking because of his childish addiction to emotionalism. Many of his friends, he said, acted like they opened a plug and let their brains run out.

How can one interpret gibberish? One can listen to “interpretation” on the record included in *The Charismatic Movement*, edited by Michael Hamilton.¹⁶ After some “Na-ga-ka-bom” a woman spoke up (in defiance of 1 Corinthians 14:34) and said, “Listen to what the Spirit of God says. Don’t be shallow in reading the Scriptures. Look deeply into them.” If the Holy Spirit chose to speak to that congregation, surely he would have said something a little more profound. At one Pentecostal service a woman stood up and said, “The Holy Spirit has led me into a lot of congregations and out of a lot of congregations. Here they really teach the Word of God.” This seems to be a case of the Holy Spirit being used to validate a woman’s feelings.

Women in Leadership Roles

Women pastors are absolutely forbidden in Scriptures (1 Timothy 2:12), an undebatable datum until Pentecostalism and liberalism converged in the charismatic movement. The Pentecostals beat the liberals in establishing female ministers in their churches. The mainline churches barely got started with the ordination of women ministers after World War II, some waiting until 1970. The Pentecostals were active much earlier. Even in mainline churches,

women normally did not even seek to lead in worship until the ferment of the 1960s worked its way through the churches. Now there are several TV Pentecostal ministers who let their wives preach for them. One allowed that she was dedicated to being "brassy for the Lord." In fact, no woman minister can be legitimately called a pastor, for her claim to ordination is at war with the word of God.

God intended that men would be leaders in the church, not to oppress and suppress women, but to let men develop their normally stunted spiritual lives. Women in liberal denominations often confess they do not want a woman minister and that they prefer having their husbands take leadership roles. They have seen the male leadership of their congregations evaporate in the face of feminist demands. In traditional Christian denominations, like the Wisconsin Synod and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, women have more influence (in the proper sense) rather than less. Everyone wins. In liberal groups and Pentecostal/charismatic gatherings, aggressive women gain at the expense of those who learn quietly, the majority of women. Everyone loses.

Theology of the Cross

Charismatic and Pentecostal ministers have sought to validate their teaching by the display of "signs and wonders," and by their success stories, measured in terms of money and members. Until the disasters which befell certain television ministers, they seemed to be unusually blessed, and they never seemed to tire of letting people know how successful they were.

The only criterion for measuring the success of a pastor, according to Luther, is whether he teaches pure doctrine according to Scripture.¹⁷ Therefore, the faithful Christian should expect the cross, not glory. Luther explains:

Secondly, God permits His saints to suffer these trials as an example for others, both to alarm the carnally secure and to comfort the timid and alarmed. . . But when we see and hear that God has in like manner dealt with His saints and did not spare even His own mother, we have the knowledge and comfort that we need not despair in our trials, but remain quiet and wait until He helps us, even as He has helped all His saints.¹⁸

But, some would counter, does not God bless those churches which are faithful to His Word? Rather than seek an easy equation, which would give anti-Christian cults the greatest honor for the fastest church growth, we should listen to Luther, who saw great calamities and poverty come with the Reformation:

Not only is Christ hidden from the world, but a still harder thing is it that in such trials Christ conceals himself even from His church, and acts as if He had forgotten, aye, had entirely forsaken and rejected it, since He permits it to be oppressed under the cross and subjected to all the cruelty of the world, while its enemies boast, glory and rejoice over it, as we shall hear in the next Gospel.¹⁹

Thus we should be very careful not to imitate the doctrinal errors of the

charismatics.

CHARACTERISTICS SHARED BY LIBERALS AND CHARISMATICS

Subjectivity

The founder of modern theology was Friedrich Schleiermacher (the last name means "one who makes a veil, screen or haze"), who established in the early 19th century that one could be an accepted theologian without believing in the basic doctrines of the faith. In this sense he is truly the founder of modern theology. He has exerted a considerable influence on such modern theologians as Karl Barth and Paul Tillich. Schleiermacher defined the Christian faith as "a feeling of absolute dependence." From his time forward it has been acceptable to talk about Christianity subjectively, as a feeling rather than a certainty derived from God's objective Word. C. F. W. Walther understood the danger of subjectivity:

But the required feeling may rest on a false foundation. It may not be the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the heart, but a physical effect, produced by the lively presentations of the preacher. That explains why sincere persons who have become believers not infrequently feel one moment that they have found the Lord Jesus, and in the next, that they have lost Him again.²⁰

Schleiermacher paved the way for using theological terms while changing their meanings. Charismatics and Pentecostals use the same approach today, deluding many uninformed people. Proof can be found in the number of people who justify what they believe or where they worship by how they feel.

Schleiermacher and the growth of rationalism opened the way for Pentecostals and charismatics to offer themselves as a positive alternative to liberalism. However, the tongues-speaking movement is itself a liberal phenomenon and only makes matters worse by appearing to be a conservative approach to the Bible. Liberalism is the rejection of any biblical doctrine, not just rejection of certain modern elements, such as the rationalistic interpretation of miracles. Whenever the Bible is used selectively, serious errors will follow in time, even if the initial problems seem slight and harmless.

Luther was not against reason, but he distinguished between the magisterial and the ministerial use of reason.²¹ The liberals know only the magisterial use of reason, judging which Scripture passages they consider true or authoritative. (Magister is Latin for master.) When a charismatic was reminded of Paul's injunction against false teachers, Romans 16:17,18, she quickly replied, "That's why I prefer Jesus to Paul." As if Jesus tolerated false doctrine! Our Lord said, "Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew 5:19 KJV).

One example of the ministerial use of reason is studying the geography of the Holy Land to help in understanding the content of God's Word. Anyone who wants to know the actual content of the Word of God is employing the

ministerial use of reason. (Minister means servant in Latin.) Luther opposed placing human reason or feelings above the Word of God:

To this I reply: I have often said before that feeling and faith are two different things. It is the nature of faith not to feel, to lay aside reason and close the eyes, to submit absolutely to the Word, and to follow it in life and death.²²

Ecumenism, Unionism by Another Name

Tongues-speaking spread in liberal Protestant bodies because the members were sacrament-starved. Thomas Merton, the Trappist monk who grew up a liberal Protestant, wrote in *The Seven Storey Mountain* about the arid intellectuals who served as liberal Protestant ministers. One minister could speak glibly about the novels of D. H. Lawrence, but could not talk about Christ.

As mainline members, Protestant and Catholic, became distressed over the clergy's assault on the Bible and support of political activism, they found a common solution in this new movement. The new sacrament of tongues-speaking created by Pentecostals has united all church bodies, many of them already used to ecumenical services, whether sponsored by liberal groups associated with the National Council of Churches or more conservative leaders like Billy Graham. The confession of faith is usually not, "I am a Catholic (or Lutheran or Baptist) charismatic," but "I am a charismatic." There is instant identification and fellowship among all charismatics and Pentecostals, with certain key words used to signal a common identity: Spirit-filled, on fire, praise, prayer group, and healing service. If charismatics were genuinely conservative, they would have qualms about the varying doctrinal standards of other groups. However, the common saying among charismatics is: "Doctrine divides." Indeed. Doctrine divides the sheep from the goats.

While unionism has been popular in recent years, the church leaders of the past understood how joint worship without doctrinal agreement led to or sprang from doctrinal laxity. Martin Reu observed:

Doctrinal indifference is at once the root of unionism and its fruit. Whoever accepts, in theory as well as in practice, the absolute authority of the Scriptures and their unambiguousness with reference to all fundamental doctrines, must be opposed to every form of unionism.²³

New Revelations Transmitted through the Emotions

When the liberals tried to take away the Scriptures as the ruling norm for Christians, they had to find a substitute. Denatured Christianity went one of two ways, toward rationalism and ultimately Unitarianism, or toward emotionalism, ultimately Pentecostalism. They also needed new revelations to replace the true revelation of God, His Word. For the rationalists, the new religion, which they called the religion of Jesus, was social activism. For the emotionalists, the new religion was tongues-speaking.

Charismatics have a flexible view of the Bible. The ruling norm for them is the latest vision experienced by one of their leaders. Someone announces, "I

had a Word of knowledge. We should send Jim as a missionary to Bulgaria." If everyone agrees, it is judged a Word of knowledge. If the revelation is a dud, someone has a new insight. An observer described Pentecostals as operating like a school of fish, swimming in one direction and then suddenly moving as one in a new direction, for no apparent reason. The heart of the issue, however, is that the "Word of knowledge" displaces the Bible as the ruling norm. This implies that the Scriptures are incomplete, insufficient, and unclear.

After being clobbered in debates when trying to argue from Scripture, the Council of Trent used this line of argument against the Lutherans:

The method of debate on the part of the papalists is far different now than it was at the time of Eck, Emser, and others like them. These men did not refuse to fight with us with the weapons of the Scripture. Pighius, however, has perceived that this arrangement has done the papal kingdom more harm than good. Therefore he has shown a different and shorter way by which, provided they stuck to it, they could obtain practically anything without trouble. It consists in this that they bring together every oratorical device and then declaim loudly about the shortness, the incompleteness, the insufficiency, ambiguity, and obscurity of the Scripture and strenuously fight for the necessity, authority, perfection, certainty, and clarity of the unwritten traditions.²⁴

If we could publish a list of every revelation of God claimed by all the charismatics and Pentecostals, the world would groan from the weight. Besides implicitly denying the inspiration and authority of Scriptures, these special revelations manipulate people and place a terrible burden on the gullible, as many insiders have admitted. In fact, too many direct communications from the Holy Spirit sound like the vindictive side of the person speaking. Charismatics are quick to say that their critics are possessed by Satan, but the hallmarks of Pentecostal worship are well established in the worship of Satan: being "slain in the Spirit," phony tongue-speaking, ecstatic dancing and laughter, miraculous signs, and trances. Genuine tongues speaking is in the Bible, but its abuse is subjected to considerable criticism in 1 Corinthians 12-14. If the charismatics are keen about the Bible, they should memorize this particular passage, spoken by Jesus:

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. (Matthew 7:21-23 KJV)

Ordination of Women

If anything shows doctrinal agreement between liberals, charismatics, and Pentecostals, it is the ordination of women. 1 Timothy 3:2 is clear enough, saying the minister is to be the husband of one wife. Paul also said clearly that he did not allow a woman to be in authority over a man in spiritual matters (1 Timothy 2:12). A Pentecostal woman minister argued that the

Timothy passage did not mean what it seemed to say. She said, "We don't take the words, 'This is my body,' literally, so why should we take 1 Timothy 2:12 literally?" Recently, a Pentecostal minister said on TV, "Isn't it great that we ordain women now?"

One woman minister, a former bartender, spoke on TV about her change of vocation. She wanted to speak in tongues, so she put candles on each corner of her bathtub and baptized herself, repeatedly saying, "Yabba-dabba-doo." Her atavistic cry (from the cartoon show, "The Flintstones") got her warmed up for speaking in tongues. The interviewer and audience laughed heartily at this sacrilege.

She was simply continuing a long line of self-appointed women ministers and cult leaders: Aimee Semple McPherson (adulteress and founder of the Four Square Gospel Church); Katharine Kuhlman (home-wrecker, Pentecostal, an early media star); Mary Baker Eddy (founder of the Christian Scientists); and Ellen G. White, (plagiarist and founder of the Seventh Day Adventists). If another woman tried to outdo White, she simply fell over in a trance and popped up with a more glamorous vision. The potency of local charismatic cells within mainline churches comes largely from the leadership of women.

Ill-educated Clergy: Rote Memory of Dogma, Shallow Dogmatism

Liberalism thrives on ignorance of the Word. When the clergy know Hebrew and Greek, studying the Scriptures in humility, false doctrine is denied a healthy start, just as weeds have trouble growing in a healthy, well-fed lawn. Classical mainline Protestantism has made impressive gains in the formation of political activists by concentrating on theories about Scripture as opposed to the actual content of the Bible. Thus students of liberal seminaries graduate with little Latin and less Greek, but are imbued with a narrow and fierce dogmatism about the current fads. In fact, liberal seminary graduates do not even know the literature of their own denomination's past, because the professors scoff at it and seldom assign it. Take a tour of a mainline seminary bookstore and read the texts listed as required reading; then ask for the classical theological publications of the church body. One person asked for the books of a deceased seminary professor at one bookstore, at the school where the late professor taught for decades. The store manager said, "How do you spell his name?" Then she said, "Who publishes it?" Upstairs, a room in the library was named in honor of the man, R. C. H. Lenski.

Pentecostals graduate from the College of the Holy Spirit. One joke is that they attend a Bible college until the studying gets tough. Then God speaks, "Go to Fergus Falls and build me a church." Jim and Tammie Bakker left college after one year. Pentecostal denominations have light ordination requirements, and they also train people in a narrow dogmatism. A Pentecostal in Alaska will answer a doctrinal question exactly the same way as a tongues-speaker in Delaware.

In a similar fashion, charismatics are self-appointed ambassadors of the Holy Spirit. John Sherrill, the son of a theology professor at Union Theological School in New York City, wrote that he did not know, after ten years as an

editor of Guideposts, if Jesus was the Son of God.²⁵ Influenced by the charismatic Catherine Marshall, he attended tongues- speaking services, went to charismatic prayer groups, and eventually spoke in tongues. In his book, *They Speak with Other Tongues*, 1970, he announced that he was no longer a disciple after learning tongues- speaking, but suddenly an "apostle." Imagine the fate of any ordained critic of this self-appointed apostle! It would be like arguing with God! (At least God listens.)

Rote memory of doctrine and narrow dogmatism are the results of shallow training. A current standard of liberal, feminist exegesis makes much of Jesus as a mother hen. Likewise, a canon of all Pentecostal exegesis states: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever" (Hebrews 13:8). The verse is followed by tumultuous shouts at Pentecostal rallies, because they teach that Christ was unable to do miracles until he received the Holy Spirit. Therefore, they believe that they, like Christ, will do the same miracles because they possess the Holy Spirit. Liberal dogmatism is always changing, flitting from one destructive opiate to another. Charismatics have moved from mere tongues- speaking to occultist imaging and worse, always looking for the latest thrill. Mainline liberals and charismatics together are dabbling in the occult: spirit guides and imaging.

The Swaggart and Bakker cases serve to remind us that the Assemblies of God do not discipline ministers very well. One minister was so bad, in spite of his enormous success, that the Assemblies booted him out. His name? Paul Yonggi Cho. Cho revealed his depraved theology in *The Fourth Dimension*, 1979, found in many Christian bookstores today. In brief, Cho teaches that one must demand from God exactly what one wishes. This is occultist imaging, and it is found in various forms among the American televangelists. Some call it "faith" theology, since the results depend on one's faith rather than on God's powers. One example of demanding miracles is from Cho's own life, after he failed to receive the bike, desk, and chair he prayed for:

Then that still small voice welled up in my soul, and the Spirit said, "My son, I heard your prayer a long time ago." Right away I blurted out, "Then where are my desk, chair, and bicycle?" The Spirit then said, "Yes, that is the trouble with you, and with all my children. They beg me, demanding every kind of request, but they ask in such vague terms that I can't answer. Don't you know that there are dozens of kinds of desks, chairs and bicycles? But you've simply asked me for a desk, chair and bicycle. You never ordered a specific desk, chair or bicycle." That was a turning point in my life. No professor in the Bible college ever taught me along these lines.²⁶

A flattering introduction to *The Fourth Dimension* is provided by the noted mainline preacher, Robert Schuller (Reformed Church in America). Schuller declares, without blushing:

Don't try to understand it. Just start to enjoy it! It's true. It works. I tried it. Thank you—Paul Yonggai Cho—for allowing the Holy Spirit to give this message to us and to the world. God loves you and so do I.²⁷

The secular form of this teaching was first promoted by Napoleon Hill (1883-1970) in *Think and Grow Rich*, first published in 1937, still a

continuing best-seller in the secular market, published by Ballantine Books, 1983.

Cho continues to be greatly admired by Pentecostals and charismatics. In 1990 Pat Robertson, the founder of Christian Broadcasting Network and CBN University, invited Rev. Paul Y. Cho to be on his Christian talk show, "The 700 Club," and played a promotional tape about the growing Cho empire: a 600,000-member church in Seoul, Korea; a newspaper; broadcasting; and his International Church Growth Institute, where hundreds of American and foreign pastors are trained by Cho, C. Peter Wagner (Fuller Seminary), and Rev. Jack Hayford (Foursquare Gospel Church).

Pat Robertson has also promoted occultist ideas in his book on *The Secret Kingdom*.²⁸ Robertson has deliberately tried to Christianize the message of Napoleon Hill:

Unfortunately, such people as Napoleon Hill, who wrote *Think and Grow Rich*, have gleaned only a few of the truths of the kingdom of God. They try to gain the kingdom without submitting themselves to the King. Some of the metaphysical principles of the kingdom, taken by themselves, can produce fantastic temporal benefits. But without the lordship of Jesus, these benefits are both transitory and harmful. In fact, many of the advocates of mind over matter ultimately end in hellish spiritism (p. 69).

Despite Robertson's warnings, his own doctrine suffers from an awe of worldly success and power:

Once we perceive this secret, we realize anew that the Bible is not an impractical book of theology, but rather a practical book of life containing a system of thought and conduct that will guarantee success (p. 44). We must hear this before it is too late: Jesus has opened to us the truths of the secret world of God! He has given us entrance into a world of indescribable power (p. 51).

Contrast Robertson, Schuller, and Cho with the biblical understanding of Luther: "If only the preachers remain orthodox and the doctrine is preserved, God will grant grace that among the multitude there will always be some who will accept the Word; for where the Word is pure and unadulterated, it cannot be without fruit."²⁹

Needless to say, liberals looking for a thrill are thronging to the New Age Movement. They find no contradiction between taking Holy Communion and visiting a medium to speak with the dead. Like charismatics, they are looking for power but are not too careful about where it comes from. They are anxious to deny the occultist label.

Excommunication

More than one person has huffed that conservative denominations actually excommunicate people, an expression of doctrinal and moral discipline with considerable foundation in Scripture (Matthew 18). Liberals, charismatics, and Pentecostals all excommunicate with resolute firmness and single-minded

purpose. To fall from grace, one only needs to question a single doctrine. For a liberal, it might be the doctrine of abortion on demand. For a charismatic, it might be the value of prayer groups. The method used is shunning, a freeze-out. This is how liberals and Pentecostals have extended their influence everywhere, by making it clear what happens to dissenters. Yes, liberals and charismatics will love-bomb someone who indicates a willingness to become a convert, but they disown even the mildest critics.

Liberals and charismatics confuse the innocent by denying the very labels they use of themselves. A Left-wing nun engaged in a rhetorical smokescreen about her support of the Sandinistas in Central America, ending in her declaration that Fidel Castro was not a Marxist. She then equated Marxist revolution with the Fourth of July. Likewise, in a conversation with a faith-healer: "Are you charismatic?" Answer: "No." Several diagnostic questions followed. Then came the confession: "I'm Third Wave. We are no longer distinguishing ourselves from the Evangelicals. We are blending together." He was right. By failing to assert themselves, Evangelicals have seen their institutions taken over by charismatics. While Evangelical Protestants once firmly opposed Pentecostalism, now they refuse to identify false doctrine as such. Such blending is always a capitulation.

Work Righteousness

The article on which the church stands or falls is number four of the Augsburg Confession, justification by grace through faith, apart from the works of the law:

Also they teach, that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works, but are freely justified for Christ's sake through faith, when they believe that they are received into favor and that their sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, who, by His death, hath made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God imputes for righteousness in his sight. (Romans 4: 3, 4)

The liberal problem with this article, the foundation of Protestantism, is that liberals reject the atoning death of Christ. The standard, puerile line is worded thus: "There was no celestial equation made." John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, educated at Harvard and Yale, expressed themselves even more clearly: "This is his work of atonement (or 'at-one-ment'), not some external or 'magical' act whereby God is appeased and man made righteous." (The real work of atonement, according to Welch and Dillenberger, was the potency of his God-consciousness, which inspired men "to realize in their own lives that which Jesus embodied.")³⁰ Liberals can only make a moralistic, legalistic philosophy out of the Christian faith. They find salvation, therefore, in a crescendo of save-the-world campaigns, each one resulting in making matters worse for everyone, except people who run save-the-world campaigns.

The charismatic version of works-righteousness is displayed in the frantic need to prove the validity of the movement through miracles, numerical growth, and prosperity. Though all might justifiably pray that God's Kingdom grow, the emphasis upon outward proof rather than pure doctrine can only

result in a man-centered, even a me-centered religion, as Paul Y. Cho has proved.

Political Power

The thirst for political power among liberals is established beyond a doubt. The mainline churches have established a huge network of lobbying organizations across North America. The National Council of Churches is the official headquarters, but the work done by the NCC is multiplied by denominational counterparts and interlocking activist groups. So-called denominational hunger funds mostly feed hungry lobbyists while deluding faithful members about sending food to Africa. Women's groups pursue pro-abortion policies, lobby for quotas, and take carefully managed tours to Marxist counties, coming home all a-flutter about the charm and wit of Fidel Castro. Edmund and Julia Robb have documented all this in *The Betrayal of the Church, Apostasy and Renewal in the Mainline Denominations*.³¹ Carefully researched articles on the subject can be obtained from the Institute for Religion and Democracy, 729 15th Street NW, Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Pentecostals have completed their "Washington for Jesus" 1988 campaign, a similar approach to power on the Potomac. One liberal lobbyist for a mainline denomination angrily declared that the overt religious emphasis was a mask for a covert political effort. His jowls shook with rage, even though he regularly bragged about using his clout as a church official to influence legislation. Nevertheless, he was correct. The Pentecostals and charismatics hunger for secular power in D.C. Pat Robertson and others have made some impressive inroads in politics simply by organizing the Pentecostals and charismatics who have not participated actively in the political process. The problem, as Jerry Falwell seems to have learned, is that when the church (or a minister) seeks to have power in the world, spiritual power is lost.

The next few years will confirm the postulate that charismatics and their elder brothers in the faith, the Pentecostals, are liberal in doctrine and rushing headlong toward complete apostasy. As their preaching of the law becomes more and more muted, to match the 93temper of the time, the tongues-speaking groups will accommodate themselves ever more obligingly to today's morals, fads, and delusions.

NOTES

1. Smalcald Articles, Part III, Article VIII, 5-6, *Concordia Triglotta*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921, p. 495. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, III, p. 130.
2. Arthur J. Clement, *Pentecost or Pretense? An Examination of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1981, p. 19. Otto Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 2 vols., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965, 1, p. 8. W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals, The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972.

3. G. H. Gerberding, *Life and Letters of W. A. Passavant*, Greenville: The Young Lutheran, 1906, p. 83.
4. Heinrich Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, no date, pp. 450-458. Schmid is a classic compilation of orthodox Lutheran dogmatics, invaluable for pastors and theologians.
5. Richard Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics*, II, New York: Harper and Row, 1983, pp. 61ff. The Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship, organized in 1951 by Oral Roberts and Demos Shakarian, succeeded in mixing Pentecostalism with the mainlines.
6. Larry Christenson, *The Charismatic Renewal Among Lutherans*, Minneapolis: Lutheran Charismatic Renewal Services, 1976.
7. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1987, pp. 45-6, cited in Craig S. Stanford, *The Death of the Lutheran Reformation, A Practical Look at Modern Theology and Its Effects on the Church and in the Lives of its People*, Ft. Wayne: Stanford Publishing, 1988, p. 251.
8. Erwin Prange, *The Gift Is Already Yours*, Plainfield: Logos International, 1973, p. 57.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 77. Apparently this cell operated in 1973. The seminary has since moved to Ft. Wayne and become known for curing students of charismatic doctrine.
10. Quebedeaux, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
11. Martin Chemnitz, *The Two Natures in Christ*, translated by J. A. O. Preus, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971.
12. F. B. Meyer, *A Castaway and Other Addresses*, Chicago: Revell, 1897, p. 86. Cited in Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 221n. Bruner presents a devastating but fair portrayal of Pentecostal theology and biblical exegesis. Some may think the Meyer quote is dated, but the same explanation, of Jesus' inability to perform miracles until "baptized by the Holy Spirit" was broadcast on religious TV, while this chapter was being written.
13. *Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*, Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934, p. 319.
14. Bruner, *op. cit.*, pp. 173,183.
15. This story was told about a Pentecostal in Japan. The exact same wording is used for a story about someone speaking perfect Hebrew in *The Pentecostals, the Charismatic Movement in the Churches*, by W. J. Hollenweger, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972, p. 4.
16. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1975.

17. C. F. W. Walther, *The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1928, p. 423.
18. *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 8 vols., II, p. 40f.
19. *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 8 vols., III, p. 67, (John 10:11-16).
20. C. F. W. Walther, op. cit., p. 135.
21. Siegbert Becker, *The Foolishness of God*, Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1982.
22. *Sermons of Martin Luther*, 8 vols. II, p. 244.
23. *In the Interest of Lutheran Unity, Two Lectures*, Columbus: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, p. 20.
24. Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, 4 vols., translated by Fred Kramer, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971, I, p. 71.
25. *They Spoke in Other Tongues*.
26. *The fourth Dimension, The Key to Putting Your Faith to Work for a Successful Life*, South Plainfield: Bridge Publishing, 1979, p. 12.
27. Ibid., unpaginated foreword.
28. Pat Robertson, *The Secret of the Kingdom*.
29. *What Luther Says. An Anthology*, 3 vols., ed. Ewald Plass, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959, III, p. 1125.
30. *Protestant Christianity*, New York: Charles Scribner, 1958, p. 222.
31. Westchester, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1986.

Continued in [Chapter Five: Defending Morality](#)

All chapters of Liberalism: Its Cause And Cure

- [Introduction and Chapter One – Chapter One: Decline Of The Mainline Churches](#)
- [Chapter Two Merger Mania](#)
- [Chapter Three: The Mainline Churches And Evolution](#)
- [Chapter Four: Charismatics Are Liberals](#)
- [Chapter Five: Defending Morality](#)
- [Chapter Six: The Cure](#)