

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications

**Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications, on: 2009/5/16 1:35**

The emergent Church is upon us! We must be vigilant, and let the body of Christ know that this is happening all over America! PRAY, PRAY, PRAY!!!

(<http://www.lighthouse trailsresearch.com/blog/>) Calvary Chapel Termination

Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications

Category: \* Emerging (Merging) Church

Source: Editors at Lighthouse Trails

**Lighthouse Trails regrets to report that on May 5th, Paul Smith, brother of Chuck Smith (the founder of the Calvary Chapel movement), was fired from his position in the Calvary Chapel (CCOF) organization during an unscheduled meeting that day. The motion to fire Paul Smith was made by board member Roger Wing and seconded by Chuck Smith's son-in-law, Brian Broderson. Other board members affirmed the motion, and Paul Smith was dismissed.**

**For some time now Paul Smith, who has been in full-time ministry since 1951, has been putting forth tireless efforts to help keep contemplative and emerging spirituality out of the Calvary Chapel movement. At times, this caused conflict with other Calvary Chapel figures who did not resonate with these efforts. This Lighthouse Trails report is being presented because of recent statements such as the following that give a biased view of Paul Smith's role at Calvary Chapel:**

**Smith's desire to codify and enforce not only the "Distinctives," but positions on such matters as "The Shack" and secondary doctrinal issues was at odds with other people in leadership and that eventually cost him his job. Smith was working out of a deep desire to see his brother's legacy remain intact and define what was and wasn't "Calvary Chapel." While I think his motives were pure they also brought a sense of restriction and censorship to many in the movement. (from a Reformed Calvinist pastor, formerly a Calvary Chapel pastor, who runs a blog called Phoenix Preacher)**

**Comments made on that site suggesting that Paul Smith's firing was warranted have prompted this Lighthouse Trails report. This is the story behind the story.**

On May 2nd of 2006, Lighthouse Trails was contacted by someone who wishes to remain anonymous who explained that a book written by Chuck Smith Senior contained quotes by and references to contemplative and emerging figures. In our efforts to expose the contemplative/emerging movement, Lighthouse Trails reviewed the book then issued an article titled, "What Happened to the Calvary Chapel Book, When Storms Come?." The article stated that Chuck Smith's book When Storms Come contained quotes by and references to contemplative Catholic mystic Anthony DeMello, for one. DeMello is discussed in Ray Yungen's book, A Time of Departing. DeMello wrote the contemplative classic called Sadhana: A Way to God and in that book he says:

To silence the mind is an extremely difficult task. How hard it is to keep the mind from thinking, thinking, thinking, forever thinking, forever producing thoughts in a never-ending stream. Our Hindu masters in India have a saying: one thorn is removed by another. By this they mean that you will be wise to use one thought to rid yourself of all the other thoughts that crowd into your mind. One thought, one image, one phrase or sentence or word that your mind can be made to fasten on. (A Time of Departing, p. 75).

**Prior to this first article, Lighthouse Trails had begun a working relationship with Roger Oakland who had been involved with the Calvary Chapel movement (teaching and evangelizing) for about twenty five years. We were in the early stages of contracting with Roger Oakland for a book on the emerging church.**

On May 18th, Chuck Smith emailed Lighthouse Trails and stated:

prepared a position paper to be distributed to the Calvary Chapel pastors on the subject of the Emergent Church and its many divergent and unscriptural theological positions that trouble me greatly.

Chuck Smith also thanked Lighthouse Trails for sending him a copy of *A Time of Departing*, which he said he "read with interest," then added "resonates with the concerns that I personally have concerning the direction that many ministries seem to be taking in their endeavor to unify all faiths. I do believe that straight is the gate and narrow the way that leads to life, and as Jesus said, He is that way, He is the truth, and the life, and no man can come to the Father but by Him."

Three days later, we reported that Calvary Chapel released a Position Paper, denouncing mystical practices (i.e., contemplative prayer) and the emerging church. A second Lighthouse Trails article discussed this move initiated by Chuck Smith Sr:

This weekend, a position paper addressed to pastors was posted on the Calvary Chapel website. The paper indicates that Calvary Chapel is taking a stand against contemplative spirituality and the emerging church and decrees that the title Calvary Chapel not be attached to such movements.

In the Position Paper, Calvary Chapel pastors were told not to use the Calvary Chapel title on their church name if they were going to go in the contemplative/emerging direction. On May 25, 2006, Lighthouse Trails released a follow-up article titled, "Calvary Chapel May Face Challenge in Upholding Position Paper". In the article, we quoted Roger Oakland regarding the Position Paper:

Calvary Chapel is at a critical point in the history of the movement. If clear correction is made, then the movement will go on and become a lighthouse in these last days. If nothing more happens than a written statement, and pastors and churches are permitted to carry the name Calvary Chapel but embrace contemplative, purpose driven, seeker friendly market driven ideas, the movement will break into various segments. There are many Calvary Chapel pastors who are asking for this kind of clear cut direction and want Calvary Chapel to remain what it once was.

On June 3, 2006, in our article titled, "Calvary Chapel May Set Precedent at This Week's Pastors Conference", we reported that Chuck Smith Jr, then pastor of Calvary Chapel Capo Beach, was officially no longer part of the Calvary Chapel movement because of his contemplative/emerging affinities. It appeared that Calvary Chapel was going to stand strong on their commitment to maintain biblical integrity, even though this was a very painful situation for family members. At that time, Paul Smith expressed his deep sadness at his nephew's decision to embrace contemplative/emerging spirituality. Our article also stated:

Calvary Chapel may be the first large ministry that has been directly influenced to actually denounce the false teachings of these movements. If Calvary Chapel stands firm on defending the gospel message and rejecting these heretical doctrines, it may be setting a precedent for other Christian ministries to do likewise. With organizations such as Purpose Driven, Zondervan, NavPress publishers, Willow Creek and Renovare all promoting contemplative spirituality and with many other ministries appearing to head that way, it is becoming less and less popular to do what Calvary Chapel has done. But it is a time in history when compromising the integrity of the gospel could actually help to unfold the greatest spiritual deception Christianity has ever seen.

Then on June 16, 2006, we issued a short notice titled "Calvary Chapel Rejects Purpose Driven and Emerging Spirituality". In an unexpected move, Calvary Chapel came out publicly against the Purpose Driven movement. Our posting stated:

This week a notice was placed on the Calvary Chapel Distribution website recalling Chuck Smith Sr's book, *When Storms Come* (which had been tampered with). The notice (no longer online) also stated: "The teaching and positions of Rick Warren have come into conflict with us at Calvary Chapel. Pastor Chuck has directed us to discontinue this product effective immediately."

Shortly thereafter, Calvary Distribution (the resource arm of Calvary Chapel) removed all Purpose Driven materials from their resource database. In the meantime, Roger Oakland was beginning to receive increased criticism for his stand against Purpose Driven and the emerging church. In a July 2006 article, he explained some of his concerns in an article titled, "Calvary Chapel and Purpose Driven". He told what he believed to be the main reasons why Calvary Chapel and Purpose Driven do not resonate with each other:

Why did Calvary Distribution remove Rick Warren's Purpose Driven books and related materials from their distribution? I believe these four reasons I have discussed are reasonable and a valid answer to that question:

Differences in Eschatology

Differences with regard to the Emerging Church

Differences with regard to contemplative prayer and mysticism

Differences with regard to church growth principles and beliefs.

Christianity has always been made up of strong leaders who take different positions. In this case, we see two well-known contemporary leaders going in two different directions. I also know that many Calvary Chapel pastors approved the decision and applauded Calvary Distribution when the Rick Warren materials were no longer being distributed.

Because there are some Calvary pastors who strongly disagree with this decision, it is very possible that in the future there will be a split of the Calvary Chapel movement. The pressures on young pastors today to conform to the current trends for the sake of having a successful big church are ever increasing.

Over the next several months, Roger Oakland wrote *Faith Undone: the emerging church--a new reformation or an end-time deception*. The book was released in the summer of 2007 and documents many irrefutable connections between some of today's most popular and influential proclaiming-Christian leaders: Rick Warren, Brian McLaren, Bob Buford, Peter Drucker, Richard Foster, Bill Hybels, Leith Anderson, and others. It also reveals the financial backing that was behind the birth of the current emerging church movement, showing that the movement wasn't just the "discontent grumblings of young people looking for answers" (back cover) but entailed a far more structured effort to bring about a new mystical spirituality that would ultimately reject the very core of the Bible's main tenets. Because the book connected dots between the emerging church and highly regarded leaders, needless to say it rocked the boat.

Over the next few months after *Faith Undone* was released, Roger Oakland spoke in different locations around the world, warning believers about the new spirituality that had entered the Christian church. Then two days after he posted an article called *Icabod*, Roger was promptly removed from Calvary Chapel's radio network/station, KWVE. In our article "Roger Oakland Removed from Calvary Chapel Radio", we stated:

Lighthouse Trails contacted KWVE on November 19th to confirm the removal and to find out the reason this took place. Richard McIntosh, KWVE station manager, confirmed the removal and told Lighthouse Trails that while he knew the reason, he would not comment.

During this time period, Roger Oakland and Lighthouse Trails were receiving angry and threatening phone calls and emails by unidentified persons. Nevertheless, we knew we must stay the course.

While the long-time relationship between Roger Oakland and Calvary Chapel became highly strained, in a meeting between Roger Oakland and Chuck Smith, Pastor Smith affirmed his support of Roger Oakland and his ministry. It should be noted too that on a number of occasions, Chuck Smith has expressed his support for the work at Lighthouse Trails. And to our knowledge, he has never reneged on his original statements to keep contemplative/emerging/Purpose Driven out of the Calvary Chapel movement. In fact, Chuck Smith invited former New Age follower-turned-Christian Warren Smith to speak at the 2008 Calvary Chapel Senior Pastors Conference in Murrieta, California. Warren Smith delivered a powerful exhortation to pastors on June 5th, 2008, encouraging Calvary Chapel pastors to stand during these times of great spiritual deception that the Bible warns will take place in the last days.<sup>1</sup> A large number of the 800 pastors in attendance gave Warren Smith a standing ovation, indicating that many Calvary Chapel pastors resonate with Warren Smith's message, which is the same message as Roger Oakland, Ray Yungen, and Lighthouse Trails.

**But as with most denominations and Christian organizations, there are indications that contemplative/emergent/Purpose Driven is continuing to influence the Calvary Chapel movement contrary to the efforts and statements of Chuck Smith in 2006. For instance, Calvary Chapel speaker Gayle Erwin has come out strong in support of the New Age sympathizing book, *The Shack*. Erwin's endorsement for William Paul Young's New York Times best-seller sits on *The Shack* website, and says:**

**Riveting, with twists that defy your expectations while teaching powerful theological lessons without patronizin**

**g. I was crying by page 100. You cannot read it without your heart becoming involved.**

**Even though a statement was issued by Calvary Chapel denouncing The Shack, which is reported in our article "New Age Similarities, Popularity Continues, and Calvary Chapel Gives Official Statement" , Gayle Erwin continues speaking at Calvary Chapel churches today.**

**In the summer of 2008, Lighthouse Trails issued a controversial article titled, "Greg Laurie Connects Purpose Driven to a Move of God - Gives Financial Support". Laurie, one of the most popular Calvary Chapel pastors had given financial support to Rick Warren's New York crusade, and at the same time, called the Purpose Driven movement a move of God. This was disheartening for those who hoped that Calvary Chapel was truly going to stand strong against the heretical teachings of the day. Later, Greg Laurie's ministry issued a statement denying that they had financially supported the crusade, but Lighthouse Trails spoke with crusade organizers who had not only placed the information on their website but confirmed it to us over the phone. In September 2008, we issued a follow-up report: Warren, Blanchard, Hybels, Laurie, Buford - Launching New York Leadership Center.**

Concerns over the direction that the Calvary Chapel movement may go after Chuck Smith is no longer heading the organization have continued to grow. And now with Paul Smith, who strongly advocated and supported his brother's hopes of having a NON-contemplative/emerging/Purpose Driven movement, those concerns are mounting. Just two weeks ago, Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa (home church of Chuck Smith Sr.) hosted a Pure Worship Conference, which included worship leaders from the nearby Rock Harbor church. Rock Harbor has shown signs that it is being significantly influenced by the emerging church, including having had their youth group study New Age sympathizer Rob Bell's book, Velvet Elvis , for three weeks. A few months ago, Rock Harbor held a meeting due to concerns by congregants as to whether they were going emergent or not. Approximately 700 people showed up!

A second event is scheduled between Rock Harbor and Calvary Chapel at the end of May, Movement 2009. The conference will take place at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa and will feature Rock Harbor's teaching pastor Mike Erre and worship team. Mike Erre is the author of a new book, Death by Church: Rescuing Jesus from His Followers; Recapturing God's Hope for His People. The book is filled with kingdom-now theology and numerous favorable references to and quotes by people like Brian McLaren, Dallas Willard, and other contemplative, emerging figures. Based on this book alone, it is accurate to say that Erre has all the earmarks of an emerging church pastor. In Erre's 2008 book, Why Guys Need God, where he quotes and references a number of contemplative mystic-proponents: Richard Rohr, Larry Crabb, Pete Scanzero, Rob Bell, and others. It is very clear by Erre's remarks about Richard Rohr (whom he references over a half a dozen times in the book) that he esteems him highly. And yet Rohr's spirituality would be in the same camp as someone like Matthew Fox (author of The Coming of the Cosmic Christ) who believes in pantheism and panentheism. Rohr wrote the foreword to a 2007 book called How Big is Your God? by Jesuit priest (from India) Paul Coutinho. In Coutinho's book, he describes an interspiritual community where people of all religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity) worship the same God. How ironic that Paul Smith's firing is sandwiched between two Rock Harbor events at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa. Members at that church should be very, very concerned.

Recently we reported on Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa's high school in which a teacher there asked his class to read, review, and study How to Stay Christian in College written by Protestant-turned-Catholic J. Budziszewski . The book has references in the back of some editions to mystic emergent Tony Jones, and Budziszewski himself is a proponent of contemplative prayer practices. Our article "Concerned Family Asks Legitimate Questions of Christian Leaders" illustrates what many families are going through in trying to protect their children and teens from spiritual deception. Christian parents must realize that the souls of their youth are at stake.

Paul Smith came on board to Calvary Chapel about four years ago to help with what could possibly be a sinking ship. Paul believed that the only answer for the movement was to hold to the basic tenets of biblical Christianity. As he learned of the various emerging/contemplative/Purpose Driven influences pouring into Calvary Chapel, he often spoke up but was also often received with resistance--until last Tuesday, when an impromptu meeting in the middle of the day brought his efforts to a halt.

When we spoke with Paul Smith this week, he was packing his things, preparing to leave Calvary Chapel. At approximately 80 years old, his mind sharp and his focus straightforward, Paul isn't sure where he will go from here. He isn't sure of the future of Calvary Chapel anymore either. But he is sure of this - the One whom He seeks to serve is faithful and will in these last days draw a line in the sand and ask every true believer to step on the side of biblical truth. Paul sent us an email a few days after his dismissal. We asked him if we could post part of it, and he agreed:

I have enjoyed serving our Calvary Chapel pastors through Calvary Chapel Outreach Fellowship. Calvary Chapel is a w

onderful and surprising work of God. It has been used by God to hold fast to simply teaching the Word of God, book-by-book and verse-by-verse, the whole counsel of God.... It is my prayer that we hold fast to the sufficiency of the Word of God and the sufficiency of the Holy Spirit to guide this blessed ministry of God. My heart's desire is to follow the way of my Lord Jesus Christ. I like what the prophet Isaiah and David have to say about the true Judge who would come and dwell among us and His method and His heart in righteous judgment.

Isa 11:1-5: And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD ; And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD : and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.

This situation with Calvary Chapel is not isolated. Nearly every evangelical denomination and organization of any size in North America is going in this same direction to one degree or another. One key factor in why this is happening so rapidly is that Christian colleges, universities, and seminaries are heavily saturated with contemplative/emerging spirituality. Biola University, for instance, where many Calvary Chapel pastors have attended and graduated, is deeply involved in this "new spirituality."

The spirituality of the desert fathers has gotten a grip on the current theological thought and practice like no one could have predicted just a few years ago, thanks largely in part to the emerging church and the work of Rick Warren and Bill Hybels. Remember, mysticism is what gives the emerging church its momentum. Holistic doctor and author Dr. Rick Levy revealed that in 2008 17 million Americans were practicing meditation (eastern-style). That number is up from 10 million in 2003. At that rate, in another five years it will probably be somewhere between 20 and 25 million. There is no doubt that this surge of mysticism will have a profound effect on virtually every North American family. This statistic is sobering when you consider what Richard Kirby observed:

The meditation of advanced occultists is identical with the prayer of advanced mystics; it is no accident that both traditions use the same word for the highest reaches of their respective activities: contemplation. (Mission of Mysticism, p. 7)

Our prayer at Lighthouse Trails is that everyone involved in this issue would take that statement seriously. Mysticism (i.e., the occult) is overtaking all segments of society, and this means that the world is falling under the spell of sorceries (magical arts) that according to the book of Revelation will deceive all nations (Revelation 18:23).

We close with this: In Alan Jones' book, Reimagining Christianity, he talks about a mystical spirituality in which not only all the world's religions will be united but all humanity will be united whether religious or not. On the back cover of Jones' book, Brian McLaren claims that this view "stimulates" and "encourages" him "deeply" and that Christianity is moving away from "dogma" (doctrine) toward "authentic spirituality" (mysticism).

With the termination of Paul Smith and the embracing of and teaming up with an emerging church, is this "authentic spirituality" the direction that Calvary Chapel is going to go? The answer to that question is becoming clearer all the time.

Related:

"Brian McLaren's Hope for the Future - The Minds of Your Grandchildren"

This article or excerpt was posted on May 15, 2009@ 11:09 am.

Sincerely,

Walter

**Re: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications, on: 2009/5/16 1:46**

Quote:

*"When we spoke with Paul Smith this week, he was packing his things, preparing to leave Calvary Chapel. At approximately 80 years old, his mind sharp and his focus straightforward, Paul isn't sure where he will go from here. He isn't sure of the future of Calvary Chapel anymore either. But he is sure of this - the One whom he seeks to serve is faithful and will in these last days draw a line in the sand and ask every true believer to step on the side of biblical truth. Paul sent us an email a few days after his dismissal. We asked him if we could post part of it, and he agreed:"*

Was thinking about the life of Paul the Apostle.

How easy life would have been for him if there were never heresies trying to enter the Church.

Poor man.

Our prayers are With this Dear Brother in The LORD.

When the Victory's won - when we See Him - it Will Be Worth It All - Amen!

**Re: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications, on: 2009/5/16 8:37**

Thanks for posting this up. It is something I have seen coming for quite a few years and a further sign that time is short. Things are moving in this direction exponentially fast and when the salt has lost its savor, what good is it any longer except to be trodden under foot. This will be just another reason why, in God's economy, this nation won't be worth saving and in "one hour it will all be over". (Rev 18)

**Re: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications - posted by repentcanada, on: 2009/5/16 11:05**

Denominations are not biblical and ALL should be terminated today

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/5/16 11:46**

repentcanada,

Denominations are somewhat of a necessary evil. Would I love all professing to Christians to be united in the truth? Absolutely!

However, because there are fundamental differences in what we believe about God, salvation, worship, church leadership, etc. It is difficult for many to worship together with a clear conscience, therefore, groups of believers agree to walk together agreeing over a certain body of truth and Biblical doctrine.

For those who are not Reformed, it is hard for them to go to Calvinistic church. Likewise, for those who are Calvinistic, they cannot attend non-Calvinistic churches. The doctrines and implications of those doctrines are huge. To try and ignore these differences and have some kind of false unity is dangerous, for we would have no body of faith to pass on to the coming generations and the faith would disintegrate into nothing but shallow mysticism.

Just my thoughts, hold on to what is good and let go of what is not.

With care in Christ,

Taylor

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 11:53**

Quote:

-----  
TaylorOtwell wrote:  
repentcanada,

Denominations are somewhat of a necessary evil. Would I love all professing to Christians to be united in the truth? Absolutely!

However, because there are fundamental differences in what we believe about God, salvation, worship, church leadership, etc. It is difficult for many to worship together with a clear conscience, therefore, groups of believers agree to walk together agreeing over a certain body of truth and Biblical doctrine.

For those who are not Reformed, it is hard for them to go to Calvinistic church. Likewise, for those are Calvinistic, they cannot attend non-Calvinistic churches. The doctrines and implications of those doctrines are huge. To try and ignore these differences and have some kind of false unity is dangerous, for we would have no body of faith to pass on to the coming generations and the faith would disintegrate into nothing but shallow mysticism.

Just my thoughts, hold on to what is good and let go of what is not.

With care in Christ,  
Taylor  
-----

True however, not for those reasons do I not attend a Calvinistic church. I don't attend because of lack of fellowship. Most all don't speak of Jesus after the service . . and of course they can't during the service.

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/5/16 11:56**

Quote:  
-----True however, not for those reasons do I not attend a Calvinistic church. I don't attend because of lack of fellowship. Most all don't speak of Jesus after the service . . and of course they can't during the service.  
-----

I have noticed the same situation in many churches, friend.

Well then, may we pray those churches will embrace true, edifying fellowship.

With care in Christ,  
Taylor

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 12:02**

Quote:  
-----  
TaylorOtwell wrote:

Quote:  
-----True however, not for those reasons do I not attend a Calvinistic church. I don't attend because of lack of fellowship. Most all don't speak of Jesus after the service . . and of course they can't during the service.  
-----

I have noticed the same situation in many churches, friend.

Well then, may we pray those churches will embrace true, edifying fellowship.

With care in Christ,  
Taylor

-----  
We can always pray, friend. I too, have attended other "modern traditional" churches with like results. May I suggest this to be the reason for the ease with which the "Emergent church" is taking over, i.e., Christianity doesn't work?

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/5/16 12:04**

Intense,

You are probably right. False teachings and philosophies are more easily received when the faith is not preserved and passed on by godly, edifying discussion and teaching, along with true fellowship and relationships.

Good thoughts.

With care in Christ,  
Taylor

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 12:10**

Quote:

-----  
TaylorOtwell wrote:  
Intense,

You are probably right. False teachings and philosophies are more easily received when the faith is not preserved and passed on by godly, edifying discussion and teaching, along with true fellowship and relationships.

Good thoughts.

With care in Christ,  
Taylor

-----  
Thats right and when you are as Jesus said we should be, You will find yourself to be a reproach in whatever church you find yourself today. I believe the church is in desperate need of being evangelized. Unfortunately leadership must be first. Until that happens, you can kiss it off.

**Just Once, on: 2009/5/16 12:49**

I would love to see a church building, with a sign, either painted on the windows of a simple storefront, or a shuttered industrial building with a sign, and all that sign would read is "JESUS". and the creed of that church would be John 17, the High Priestly Prayer of Jesus.

From that Well, all of the "what we believe's" would flow.

I am positively tired, and weary of all the divisiveness and devouring and backbiting among imperfect souls, lips of clay, that spend inordinate hours in denunciation of this ministry or that ministry, positively tired of "discernment" ministries, and SELF proclaimed "watchmen", filled with fleshly self pride on how they are going to help the "babes in Christ" avoid the "apostates" that abound today, as if such apostates are anything new.

As if Messiah, as if God needed your help,.....pride, religious pride just soaked thru and thru. We blame the condition of the Church in North America solely on the corporate sins of the nation?

wake up! the "church--es" are the worst enemy of the Church, that is the Body of Christ. Is the Body of Christ a hundred headed monster?!? God forbid. But man in his lack of Jesus love, and his lack of unity IN the Spirit has made it so.

Who cares about the Smith's and their "Calvary Chapel" tear the whole thing down, tear down Warrens "megachurch", Osteen's megachurch, all of them, the follower's of Jesus in America are hiding up in a multitude of "Herod's Temple", monstrosities all of them.



was Jesus born in a palace? no. He was born in a humble manger, how far we have all backslid, with this incessant devouring of one another, what a shameful hypocritical example we send to those who are lost, helpless harassed sheep.

In what do have to offer them in the way we walk? Do we walk in the Way of Jesus, who said, "come to me all you who labour, and are heavily laden and I will give you rest."? Jesus Himself, describes Himself as "gentle and lowly in heart".

In the light of honesty and authenticity, do we walk as Jesus does in these matters?

"gentle"? "lowly in heart"?

Do we?...or are we more intent on "being right"?...in these God awful incessant threads arguing this point or that point of Scripture, to absolutely NO PROFIT in the Economy of God.

I pray this, that this human nation we live in, totally persecutes the Body of Christ in this nation, makes it illegal to have a ekklesia, a congregation, makes it illegal to possess a Bible, on the pain of death and/or imprisonment.

watch. that day is coming, and the sheep will rejoice at being counted worthy to suffer for the Name, while the goats will fade away, recede into the woodwork.

that day is coming, so have fun now with these needless little ditties that do nothing to Glorify the Risen Lord Jesus.

**Re: Just Once, on: 2009/5/16 13:06**

Quote:

-----

Natan4Jesus wrote:

I would love to see a church building, with a sign, either painted on the windows of a simple storefront, or a shuttered industrial building with a sign, and all that sign would read is "JESUS". and the creed of that church would be John 17, the High Priestly Prayer of Jesus.

From that Well, all of the "what we believe's" would flow.

. . . . .

that day is coming, so have fun now with these needless little ditties that do nothing to Glorify the Risen Lord Jesus.

-----

Who are you talking to? What are you talking about that suggests we, who have heard the clarion call, should now walk with them who can't hear it, as they walk to the edge of the cliff with the love of Jesus and a hope in our heart they will turn around?

**Re: Just Once, on: 2009/5/16 13:16**

Brother Neil, the bulk of your post was a perfect three point Emerging-Church sermon.

Brother - what do you think of the total of Paul's writings? - the majority of which are on this line -

Act 20:26-31 Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.

Or, for 'what cause' did The WORD of GOD come to earth in flesh?

Joh 18:37b To this end was I born,  
and for this cause came I into the world,  
that I should bear witness unto the truth.  
Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

Or the purpose of HIM sending the Comforter -

John 14:17 Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.

John 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

Love without Truth is not His Love and vice versa.

Thanking GOD for almost 2000 years of apologists who have held back this apostasy from Truth as long as they have - starting with His Apostles.

Only your last three lines, the Emergent Do Not Agree with you - but I do. ;-)

P.S. from Paul -

1Ti 4:13 Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.  
1Ti 4:16 Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 14:21**

Quote:

-----

Jesus-is-GOD wrote:

Brother Neil, the bulk of your post was a perfect three point Emerging-Church sermon.

Brother - what do you think of the total of Paul's writings? - the majority of which are on this line -

Act 20:26-31 Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.

Or, for 'what cause' did The WORD of GOD come to earth in flesh?

Joh 18:37b To this end was I born,  
and for this cause came I into the world,  
that I should bear witness unto the truth.  
Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

Or the purpose of HIM sending the Comforter -

John 14:17 Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.

John 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear

, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

Love without Truth is not His Love and vice versa.

Thanking GOD for almost 2000 years of apologists who have held back this apostasy from Truth as long as they have - starting with His Apostles.

Only your last three lines, the Emergent Do Not Agree with you - but I do. ;-)

P.S. from Paul -

1Ti 4:13 Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.

1Ti 4:16 Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.

-----

Can the rest of us take for granted you and Neil are of the emergent church crowd?

**Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2009/5/16 14:43**

Quote:

-----

Intense wrote:

Thats right and when you are as Jesus said we should be, You will find yourself to be a reproach in whatever church you find ourself today. I believe the church is in desperate need of being evangelized. Unfortunately leadership must be first. Until that happens, you can kiss it off.

-----

Frank Bartleman, chronicler of the Azusa Street revival, said that when revival comes, pastors are always on the front line of the resistance. "They are always the last to break; they have so much religious flesh to die to."

I have been involved in two ministries in which revival was in the air and the fruits of the Spirit were abounding. Both sprang up spontaneously outside of "the church." Both were opposed and squashed by the professional clergy, even though both met on Friday night, took up no offering and posed no threat to their commercial interests. We were told, "You can't just set up on your own. You have to submit to church authority!" One clergyman told us, "If you are not a part of the local church, you are cut off from God's work on earth." In other words, "If you do not submit to the professional clergy, you are cut off from God's purpose. You need us. You can only be connected with God through us." Sounds like a grift to me, since there are offering plates and salaries involved. From the days of the pharisees and sadducees till now, the professional clergy has always been a fraud. There may be an occasional Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea, but organized religion is nothing more than a commercial racket and "church authority" is nothing more than priestcraft.

Calvary Chapel began when Chuck Smith left the Foursquare church and vowed to never again submit his ministry to human authority. Imagine that! He rebelled against church authority and God blessed his efforts. Clearly there is some miscommunication between the Almighty and the priesthood. He's not supposed to be blessing people who don't submit to the salaried clergy. He's a threat to the profit margin and must be stopped!

Calvary Chapel began as a spontaneous move of God, and remains soundly biblical, but within a generation or so a movement will stop moving and ossify into a denomination (or "not-a-denomination" as most evangelical denominations prefer to be called) with corporate interests to protect.

What do we care? The Emerging Church is on the rise in the same way that the stern of a sinking ship is on the rise a few moments prior to submergence. The sinking ship in this case is the American Gospel Enterprise. Let it sink!

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 14:46

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id28759&forum48&0](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id28759&forum48&0)) Intense!

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 15:40

Intense, but accurate?

So what is your persuasion? You haven't said yet except to imply, "emergent".

Re: - posted by JCGarc55, on: 2009/5/16 15:44

Thank you for posting this article. It was sad but helpful to know what is happening in the church. I agree it's common. I have a feeling, many of us here have been impacted by this type of thing in the professing church. I became a member in a popular church organization(denomination) because much of the org's statement of faith was similar to my own convictions. Unfortunately at the local level, it was not practiced.

May each of us be faithful to the True Shepherd.

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 15:45

To Wayneman:

You posted:

"Calvary Chapel began as a spontaneous move of God, **and remains soundly biblical**, but within a generation or so a movement will stop moving and ossify into a denomination (or "not-a-denomination" as most evangelical denominations prefer to be called) with corporate interests to protect.

My response:

Remains soundly Biblical?

Calvary Chapel of Costa Mesa is on the verge of becoming emergent. The man that has made it his business to keep it non-emergent (Paul Smith—Pastor Chuck Smith's 80 year old brother) was fired on May 5th, 2009 in the presence of his own brother, who he has supported his entire life.

Previously, in 2007 Calvary Chapel disassociated itself from Roger Oakland and his ministry Understand the Times. Why? Because he posted an article called **Ichabod** on the internet. Two days after posting this article, Roger was evicted from his office at Calvary Chapel, and his belongings placed in the hall.

What was the article all about? **It was about Calvary Chapel, Costa Mesa!:**

(<http://www.understandthetimes.org/commentary/c71.shtml>) ICHABOD, by Roger Oakland

ICHABOD

Commentary by Roger Oakland  
[www.understandthetimes.org](http://www.understandthetimes.org)

The Bible calls Satan the great deceiver. To be deceived means to be led away from the truth without knowing it. If the person being deceived knew they were being deceived, then deception would not have occurred. One must believe that one is not deceived in order to be deceived. It is just that simple.

I believe that understanding deception has a lot to do with having a proper perspective. Instead of having God's perspective, the person being deceived has his own perspective. A human desire for power and the potential to be proud are two of the greatest barriers that prevent us from seeing God's perspective. Satan's plan is to deceive mankind by wor

king on human weaknesses. He knows what he is doing.

In Proverbs we read: “There is a way that seemeth right unto man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.” Think about this for a moment. The Bible states “the wages of sin is death.” So what may seem right, can lead to death because the consequence of sin is death. Do you see how deception works?

Sometimes it is beneficial to take time to do a reality check on our lives. For example, a Christian can be confident that he or she is serving the Lord when he is actually deceived. This is because what we do “seems to be right” in our eyes.

Not long ago a situation occurred which helped me to see how easily one can be deceived by not having the proper perspective. I was looking over a series of slides on my digital camera. I had taken these photos while traveling around England. Without knowing what I had done I had somehow expanded the view on one particular slide from the normal view to a view that was 10 times enlarged. As I was flipping through the slides, I could not figure out what the scene was that I had photographed.

Moving the picture around on the screen from left to right and top to bottom did not help. It was the most frustrating experience. Nothing that I could see in the photo seemed to give me a clue where I had taken this photo. Suddenly, I remembered how to view the slide in the normal unexpanded view. In a second I could see what the picture was and recalled exactly where I had taken it. I just needed the proper perspective.

Perhaps this illustration will be useful to help you see what can happen to human beings, ministries, pastors and even denominations. It is very easy to go about our lives thinking we are God’s chosen vessel, doing His will, when we are deceived and doing the work of Satan. This is why it is important that we read the Word and give ourselves a reality check from time to time.

### **When the Glory Has Departed**

I know Christian leaders and denominations that started out right but have ended up wrong. This downfall can be predicted in light of church history. God has raised up individuals from time to time to be leaders. As long as these leaders are led by the Holy Spirit and continue in His Word, God’s blessings will be abundant.

Sometimes, a pastor will become a leader and a model for many other pastors. Eventually, a fellowship of churches with like-minded pastors may be the result.

This fellowship of pastors teaches the Word of God and the sheep are enlightened and fed. The sheep, because they are learning, love God with all their heart. This love spreads to the horizontal plane and love is overflowing. The sheep want to tell others about Jesus. It is even possible to have a Jesus movement.

However, the passing of time has a way of helping us forget. Perhaps another way of saying this is that Satan hates what God is doing. It doesn’t take long before the fellowship of pastors takes on a different perspective. Some pastors forget from where they came. They were once shepherds with small flocks. As they taught the Word and fed the sheep, the small flocks grew to become mega-churches.

These mega-churches grew to the point that there was no longer a flock, there was a herd. There were so many sheep in the flock that the shepherd had no choice but to manage the flock by turning the church into a corporation.

As everyone knows, churches, when they become corporations have to operate like a corporation not a church. In the world, people in corporations are always looking for position.

The only way one can be successful in climbing the corporate ladder is to be loyal to the corporation and the corporate president.

Here lies a problem—when a Christian becomes more loyal to a man than to the Son of Man, spirituality can soon turn into carnality. Carnality that is further driven by the obsession for power, position and possession often is the perfect recipe for disaster. What once was a wonderful Spirit-filled church now becomes a machine that simply goes through the motions. Everything looks like it is working. However, the machine is broken.

### **When the Spirit Departs**

In the Old Testament, the Holy Spirit inspired the writer of I Samuel to give us an example of what happened to the children of Israel in days past.

Israel, as a nation, knew the glory of God's presence among them. The children of Israel prospered and became strong as they followed the Lord. However, Israel turned from God by making wrong choices. Eventually, they came to the place where the presence of God was no longer among them. The glory of God had departed.

In a desperate attempt to win a battle with the Philistine army, Israel devised a plan. The leaders actually believed that if they took the ark of the covenant with them to battle that God was obligated to lead them to victory.

Such was not the case. God did not fight for Israel. Israel was defeated and the Philistines triumphed and even took the ark. When a messenger returned from the battlefield with the sad news that the army was defeated, the ark captured, and the two sons of Eli were dead, Eli fell backward off his chair, broke his neck and died.

Eli's daughter-in-law, the wife of one of the sons killed in battle was pregnant. When she heard the news that her husband, brother-in-law and father-in-law were dead she went into labor. She gave birth to a son, but she died during the delivery. The Bible states that the woman who was acting as the midwife named the son—Ichabod. **“Ichabod” means the glory has departed.**

There are other examples in Scripture of what happens when the Spirit of God departs from a man. For example in 1 Samuel 16: 14 we read, “But the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the LORD troubled him.” Or, remember the story of Samson. Once empowered by the Spirit there came a time when the LORD departed from him and Samson was not even aware that it happened.

### **A Biblical Solution**

The Bible paints a grim scenario with regard to what happens when the Spirit of God departs, doesn't it? Well, I have some good news. There is a solution.

**I believe that such a scenario could be turned around. God wants His servants to finish the race. He does not take joy in seeing them defeated. Do you recall the words of Jesus when He spoke to the church at Ephesus as recorded in Revelation 2? While the members of the church were noted for saying what was right, in their zeal to be right, they were wrong. In fact it almost seems as if the Spirit of God had departed from their midst.**

This can be deduced by reading what Jesus said. He was warning that He would depart from their midst. Jesus said that the church at Ephesus had “left their first love” and that they needed to “repent” and “return to the place” where they had once been. That means they had departed and did not know it.

Jesus said He would remove the “candlestick” if they did not repent. Clearly Scripture interprets this to mean that Jesus would remove His presence from the church of Ephesus. Did that mean He was about to write “Ichabod” above the door of the church?

**The Spirit of God points us to the Word. The Word, Jesus said, is the truth. What we do with the truth is entirely up to us. We can choose to obey or to disobey.**

**I would pray that every Christian would sincerely ask God for His perspective of where we are and what we are doing. Don't rely upon the praises of man or the fear of man as a spiritual barometer.**

**When we stand before the throne all the things we did in the flesh will burn like wood and hay. Only those things that were done when we were led by the Spirit will count.**

**It is all about getting the right perspective, now.**

**Before it is too late.**

Now, today, Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa is in the process of aligning itself with Rock Harbor Church at the end of this month. Rock Harbor is an emergent Church.

**A second event is scheduled between Rock Harbor and Calvary Chapel at the end of May, Movement 2009. The conference will take place at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa and will feature Rock Harbor's teaching pastor Mike Erre and worship team. Mike Erre is the author of a new book, Death by Church: Rescuing Jesus from His Followers; Recapturing God's Hope for His People. The book is filled with kingdom-now theology and numerous favorable references to and quotes by people like Brian McLaren, Dallas Willard, and other contemplative, emerging figures. Based on this book alone, it is accurate to say that Erre has all the earmarks of an emerging church past**

or. In Erre's 2008 book, *Why Guys Need God*, there he quotes and references a number of contemplative mystic-proponents: Richard Rohr, Larry Crabb, Pete Scazzero, Rob Bell, and others. It is very clear by Erre's remarks about Richard Rohr (whom he references over a half a dozen times in the book) that he esteems him highly. And yet Rohr's spirituality would be in the same camp as someone like Matthew Fox (author of *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ*) who believes in pantheism and panentheism. Rohr wrote the foreword to a 2007 book called *How Big is Your God?* by Jesuit priest (from India) Paul Coutinho. In Coutinho's book, he describes an interspiritual community where people of all religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity) worship the same God. How ironic that Paul Smith's firing is sandwiched between two Rock Harbor events at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa. Members at that church should be very, very concerned.

Calvary Chapel has been a wonderful place to be over the years. Pastor Chuck has led us through every Book of the Bible. The problem is, there has been one thing missing. What has that been? The Application of that Word in the believers life.

Application of the Word has been missing, and that is why Calvary Chapel finds itself slipping into apostasy.

Sincerley,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
wayneman wrote:

Quote:

-----  
Intense wrote:

Thats right and when you are as Jesus said we should be, You will find yourself to be a reproach in whatever church you find ourself today. I believe the church is in desperate need of being evangelized. Unfortunately leadership must be first. Until that happens, you can kiss it off.

-----  
Frank Bartleman, chronicler of the Azusa Street revival, said that when revival comes, pastors are always on the front line of the resistance. "They are always the last to break; they have so much religious flesh to die to."

I have been involved in two ministries in which revival was in the air and the fruits of the Spirit were abounding. Both sprang up spontaneously outside of "the church." Both were opposed and squashed by the professional clergy, even though both met on Friday night, took up no offering and posed no threat to their commercial interests. We were told, "You can't just set up on your own. You have to submit to church authority!" One clergyman told us, "If you are not a part of the local church, you are cut off from God's work on earth." In other words, "If you do not submit to the professional clergy, you are cut off from God's purpose. You need us. You can only be connected with God through us." Sounds like a grift to me, since there are offering plates and salaries involved. From the days of the pharisees and sadducees till now, the professional clergy has always been a fraud. There may be an occasional Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea, but organized religion is nothing more than a commercial racket and "church authority" is nothing more than priestcraft.

Calvary Chapel began when Chuck Smith left the Foursquare church and vowed to never again submit his ministry to human authority. Imagine that! He rebelled against church authority and God blessed his efforts. Clearly there is some miscommunication between the Almighty and the priesthood. He's not supposed to be blessing people who don't submit to the salaried clergy. He's a threat to the profit margin and must be stopped!

Calvary Chapel began as a spontaneous move of God, and remains soundly biblical, but within a generation or so a movement will stop moving and ossify into a denomination (or "not-a-denomination" as most evangelical denominations prefer to be called) with corporate interests to protect.

What do we care? The Emerging Church is on the rise in the same way that the stern of a sinking ship is on the rise a few moments prior to submergence. The sinking ship in this case is the American Gospel Enterprise. Let it sink!

"Jesus-is-God" , on: 2009/5/16 15:47

Quote:

-----Brother Neil, the bulk of your post was a perfect three point Emerging-Church sermon.  
-----

I trust that is not an encouragement, feels like slander, and slander is what? SIN. The Lord will reveal this to you, I have trust in that.

Furthermore, I have heard the term "three point sermon", and since I don't find it in the Bible, I disregard it as just another "religious tradition" designed to have a "by the numbers" lazy witness, rather than speaking what the Holy Spirit has laid on my heart.

in addition, I have heard of the "emerging church" or "emergent", whatever it deigns to call itself, and I know nothing of it, and to attribute such values to me, and what is on my heart, by you, is just wrong.

I am positively tired of watching other believers misuse and abuse the Word, Church, that is the Body of Christ. When we gather together, we gather together in "assembly", "congregation"---ekklesia.

what do I think of Paul's writings? I love them, as I do the entire Word of God. In fact, led by the Lord, I have reading and re-reading the Epistle to the Philippians for the past two weeks in prayerful repose, as far the wonderful passage you quoted in Acts 20, it makes me cry, because I can see in my hearts eye, dear dear Paul kneeling in prayer, with everyone around, weeping on his neck....in Jesus love...and I ask you this, **Who are the "wolves"?**

they are closer than you think, and you Thank God for 2,000 years of "apologists"?

How many of these "apologists", with stake and piles of wood at hand, pitch oil at the ready burned saints ALIVE, they declared "hereticks"? HOW MANY of the people of my kinsmen of the flesh, the Jews were killed by such "apologists", when they wouldn't relent to forced conversions at the hands of the murderous satanic priests of the roman institution, or even others after Martin Luther broke with that scarlet whore rome, and look at Martin Luther himself...look at the last poisonous writings to flow out of his heart and into his pen.

Shame, sin and slander!

finally, you wrote:

Quote:

-----Love without Truth is not His Love and vice versa.  
-----

In due and loving respect, you are missing part of what we need so desperately in the Body of Christ.

Love without Tears without Truth is not His Love. The Body of Christ, the various congregations need more tears, just as Jesus wept many many times in the Gospel Accounts, and as He still weeps today, that's what the Holy Ghost the Ruach HaKodesh has laid on my heart.

If you wish to label me "emerging", "emergent", "apostate", join the crowd, for as a Jew who follows Jesus, I am labeled an "apostate" by the kinsmen of my flesh, do you I really care what you or any other human being "labels" me?

I only care for what my Father, my God, my Saviour feels or says to me, not man.



**Re: Just Once - posted by JCGarc55, on: 2009/5/16 15:54**

hi nathan,

I'm confused. So you think it's wrong to have this topic up? I do care about these churches and I'm sure many do here. I know people that go there. I pray for them. And not that I'm any better than anyone else. Far from it. I'm just thankful to be a saved. Thankful for HIS mercy to redeem a sinner like me...

well.. maybe I'm just not understanding your point.

Because if anyone is tired of these kinds of topics, he or she can simply avoid reading them.

**Shame on you "Intense" Ormly, on: 2009/5/16 15:56**

for this bit of nasty vile assumption:

Quote:

-----Can the rest of us take for granted you and Neil are of the emergent church crowd?  
-----

no, you may not take it "for granted", but what you should do is cease from your slander....your accusations, and who is the father of all accusations?

you know who.

**Re: Intense Ormly 2, on: 2009/5/16 16:01**

Quote:

-----Who are you talking to?  
-----

That's between me and the Lord. If you feel I'm addressing you, (which believe me, I've tried HARD to avoid) all I can say is, if the shoe fits.....

**Re: Intense Ormly 2, on: 2009/5/16 16:09**

Brother Neil, my (https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\_id28773&forum48&4) last post to you on 5/13 still stands.

Love you Brother!

**Brother Wayneman , on: 2009/5/16 16:35**

Thank you for such a "God" touch, in that Frank Bartleman's book, "Azusa Street" was the first non-canonical book I read after I read thru the Bible when I started to follow Jesus. That book speaks to my heart, so completely, how I love dear brother Frank, (my only disappointment was when Frank fell in with the "Oneness" crowd) the testimonies, and his exhortations, just filled me with joy, in fact, I'm re-reading now.

The second non-canonical book I ever read was the "Life of Brainerd", which also had an impact on my heart, so tenderly and completely. Dear David Brainerd, what a Godly role model, mighty in prayer, weak of flesh.

Thank you in the Lord for lifting my grieving heart, neil

**Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2009/5/16 16:37**

Walter,

So Roger Oakland wrote an essay against Calvary Chapel and then (Surprise!) a few days later he gets kicked off Calvary Chapel's radio station. What kind of reaction was he expecting?

I talked to Roger Oakland once. I sent him a copy of a research paper I wrote on the "holy laughter" revival. He wanted to use some of the material and called to verify my sources. (I also got an irate call from Todd Hunter, Director of Vineyard Ministries International, who also wanted to know about my sources--as in, "Where did you get this stuff?" But I was able to reference everything. He was surprised to learn of some of the lunacy going on in his own movement.)

I stand by my statement that CC remains soundly biblical, as well as my inference that it is in the transitional phase between movement and denomination. If the Emerging thing gains acceptance among CC leaders, there is bound to be a schism, like the Vineyard schism 20 years ago. Most Chapelites share your opinion of the Emerging Church.

**Re: Brother Wayneman - posted by wayneman (), on: 2009/5/16 16:43**

Neil,

"Azusa Street" is one of the most inspiring books I've read. Bartleman took up the Oneness position, then abandoned it when its proponents became divisive. He did the same with Durham's "finished work" position. Theology had no hold on his mind; he was always looking for spiritual fruit.

**Jesus-is-God , on: 2009/5/16 17:00**

ah yes, the torture post....my heart is cut to the quick, for I feel I wrote a harsh post directed to you in this thread, bereft of love in Christ, rest assured, I repent if it was directed to you in such a manner. It was not my intention, my heart is so full of grief that the direction the Way is going in.

something's wrong, and in my own weakness, I can't discern it, but in His wisdom, I can discern what the Way is not to be, we are called to Love, winsome, not wimpy Love. IN Him, Jesus.

I have such a God hunger building in my heart, I can't even put it into words, that's no boast, it's just where Jesus is leading me, hungry and desperate. I ask God, "Lord, please give me a ministry of weeping, give me a ministry of sold out, all-encompassing private prayer, in travail, build my foundations so that I can glorify You, in the ministry that You lead me in to.

Praying to God to burn me out of self, vain ambition, pride, or religious pride, whatever is of flesh, BURN IT OUT! I'm hungry for more of You Lord!

That's where I'm at dear one.

In regards to the "torture" thread, I was just giving a snapshot of how they do it, I would never be involved in such, a "Balm in Gilead" ministry in Christ is more my calling, as I am getting to loathe the world, and everything that stinks of it.

I was just grief stricken when I wrote those series of posts, forgive me.

So I love you in my love, and in His love, Neil

**Re: Jesus-is-God - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/5/16 17:20**

Calvary Chapel is better off than most of the main-line denominations in America. But thank God Calvary Chapel is not becoming a dry fault-finding discernment ministry denomination. That will not further the work of Christ.

We must put our energies towards preaching the bible and the gospel and not looking at every wrong thing. For we could do that until Christ comes back and the world will not know the testimony of Christ in the Church. But it will God is raising a remnant!

**Re: Jesus-is-God , on: 2009/5/16 17:27**

Quote:

-----  
Natan4Jesus wrote:

ah yes, the torture post....my heart is cut to the quick, fore I feel I wrote a harsh post directed to you in this thread, bereft of love in Christ, rest assured, I repent if it was directed to you in such a manner. It was not my intention, my heart is so full of grief that the direction the Way is going in.

some things wrong, and in my own weakness, I can't discern it, but in His wisdom, I can discern what the Way is not to be, we are called to Love, win some, not wimpy Love. IN Him, Jesus.

I have such a God hunger building in my heart, I can't even put it into words, that's no boast, it's just where Jesus is leading me, hungry and desperate. I ask God, "Lord, please give me a ministry of weeping, give me a ministry of sold out, all-encompassing private prayer, in travail, build my foundations so that I can glorify You, in the ministry that You lead me into.

Praying to God to burn me out of self, vain ambition, pride, or religious pride, whatever is of flesh, BURN IT OUT! I'm hungry for more of You Lord!

That's where I'm at dear one.

In regards to the "torture" thread, I was just giving a snapshot of how they do it, I would never be involved in such, a "Balm in Gilead" ministry in Christ is more my calling, as I am getting to loathe the world, and everything that stinks of it.

I was just grief stricken when I wrote those series of posts, forgive me.

So I love you in my love, and in His love, neil  
-----

God never does for a becoming son what a becoming son should do for His Father. You want purity of heart? Then be pure. You have a problem with youthful lust? Flee it. Consider these times of testing your opportunities to reveal your allegiance. . . Just like Jesus did. As for the rest of your untoward remarks directed toward me, I forgive you.

**Greg, on: 2009/5/16 17:46**

Quote:

-----Calvary Chapel is better off than most of the main-line denominations in America. But thank God Calvary Chapel is not becoming a dry fault-finding discernment ministry denomination. That will not further the work of Christ.

We must put our energies towards preaching the bible and the gospel and not looking at every wrong thing. For we could do that until Christ comes back and the world will not know the testimony of Christ in the Church. But it will God is raising a remnant!  
-----

Amen brother, you said that better than I could ever hope to.

**Thank you Wayne!! , on: 2009/5/16 17:49**

Quote:

-----Bartleman took up the Oneness position, then abandoned it when its proponents became divisive. He did the same with Durham's "finished work" position.  
-----

I never knew this! I thought he kept in the "oneness" camp till his passing. Praise God!!!

and here is why I always loved reading Brother Bartleman:

Quote:

-----Theology had no hold on his mind; he was always looking for spiritual fruit.  
-----

that makes me very very joyous.

neil

**Re: Just Once - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/5/16 19:24**

Hi Taylor...

Quote:

Denominations are somewhat of a necessary evil. Would I love all professing to Christians to be united in the truth? Absolutely!

However, because there are fundamental differences in what we believe about God, salvation, worship, church leadership, etc. It is difficult for many to worship together with a clear conscience, therefore, groups of believers agree to walk together agreeing over a certain body of truth and Biblical doctrine.

For those who are not Reformed, it is hard for them to go to Calvinistic church. Likewise, for those are Calvinistic, they cannot attend non-Calvinistic churches. The doctrines and implications of those doctrines are huge. To try and ignore these differences and have some kind of false unity is dangerous, for we would have no body of faith to pass on to the coming generations and the faith would disintegrate into nothing but shallow mysticism.

Yet is this the mission of a Church? To instruct in sectarian doctrines that are highly discordant?

Sadly, most denominations (and churches for that matter) have become organizations where involvement or membership is restricted to forced adherence to a particular set of doctrinal views. If you walk into any number of churches in America today (including the "holiness" churches), you will find that they hold to a particular set of doctrinal views upon which the local congregation is united (which, ironically, divides them from the rest of the Body of Christ). For the most part, Pentecostals attend Pentecostal fellowships. Calvinists attend Calvinist-teaching fellowships. Prosperity guys attend prosperity preaching congregations. It is rare to find someone who embraces a particular set of views attending a congregation that teaches otherwise. It is also rare to find believers who differ on doctrinal peculiarities remain in close fellowship.

Since there is so much disagreement in the Body of Christ over such things, why should a pastor (or congregation, denomination, etc...) teach such issues as truth?

I actually don't have a problem with people teaching their positions in regard to such issues - as long as they clarify that it is a personal persuasion or inclination (rather than a spiritual absolute). Yet this isn't what happens in most churches today. Denominations are created regarding the doctrines that divide rather than the truths that unite believers.

Should a person stand up and proclaim to a congregation that a particular doctrine is true or false when there is so much discussion in the Body of Christ? I am not speaking of truths that are undeniable to the true Body of Christ. I am speaking about divisive issues. Does a person have a right to present their view as a "truth" that must be adhered to by any one who wants to join a local fellowship? This is what happens.

Can we not simply present a view as just that - a view? Such views serve to divide the Body of Christ by these sorts of peculiarities presented as indisputable truths. Wouldn't it be better, in such matters, to present our view as an alternative...and do what we can to love the Body without resorting to any sort of separation or forced adherence? Can't we have the brethren just prayerfully consider such matters without resorting to drawing a similar conclusion or reciting a similar creed?

I have my own particular set of doctrinal views and inclinations. I actually feel very strongly about many of them. However, should I proclaim them here (or behind a pulpit) as a set of "rules" for involvement in a congregation or as a set of tenets by which I can cognitively judge a person's "spirituality" or "maturity"? Or, should a pastor focus on things that really matter - those undeniable truths of the faith? Too often, I think that pastors use their position to propagate the doctrinal persuasions that they (or their denomination/local fellowship) hold.

My brother-in-law, Jerry, periodically visits this website. Last year, he began attending a church that was located just a few blocks from his home. That church held a very particular set of standards in dress, as well as a very particular set of doctrinal views. The church was an "oneness" congregation who also held to a belief that a person is not saved if they didn't begin speaking in tongues at the moment of their salvation. Jerry and his wife do not embrace these views, but he began attending because the congregation was very welcoming and located close to his home. They embraced Jerry and his family, even inviting him to teach Sunday school after less than two months. Even though Jerry and his wife disagreed with these views, he didn't think "less" of those believers who embraced them. He simply disagreed with them...but loved them as brethren.

Jerry asked me what I thought about these things. I explained to him that I have a problem with congregations that teach this particular set of beliefs as though they were undeniable truths. Jerry explained that the pastor was fully aware that he didn't hold to those same ideas, and didn't seem to mind him teaching Sunday school or becoming highly involved with the congregation. I told him that I felt that they were allowing him to become involved because he was the type of member that they like (involved...and willing to help out in any way). However, I warned him that this warm embrace might not last for long...especially if the rest of the congregation realizes that they haven't "seen the light" regarding the church's peculiar doctrinal views. I warned him that his "liberty" in the congregation might slowly disappear once they are aware that his mind has not changed regarding those doctrinal views.

Sure enough, this is exactly what happened. They quietly found "another" person who was "more equipped" to teach Sunday school. The invitations for helping out became fewer and farther between. Eventually, he was told that he and his wife were "in rebellion" because of their views. In fact, the congregation began to view him as a "rebel" and they were eventually warned to stay away from him.

This is the story of many people. Many denominations accept members – not on the basis of whether or not they truly came to Christ – but whether or not they will adhere to doctrinal peculiarities.

Before moving to California, my wife and I attended a small congregation. One of the things that I liked about it was the fact that the pastor did not preach peculiarities as undeniable doctrines. He did share his views, but he was quick to point out that these were his views. The local congregation belongs to a fellowship of congregations throughout the state (and several other states). The basic beliefs are considered undeniable truth – but those are truths that are widely embraced by believers from many different denominations. The pastor (and the leadership) did not make it their responsibility to teach those specific sectarian beliefs that tend to divide the Body of Christ. They presented their views (some of which differed from one another) and allowed the Holy Spirit to nudge the believer as needed.

It was a Pentecostal fellowship – but not one that taught specifics about the Pentecostal experience (like, whether or not a person will speak with tongues if they are filled). In fact, the congregation did discuss the peculiarities of the faith, but often in a broad brush of diversity of opinion. They didn't preach whether a person could "lose their salvation" or not; however, they discussed the different views without requiring adherence toward one in particular. They didn't preach about a prescribed set of outcomes from a baptism of the Holy Spirit; although, they discussed this often. In other words, they left it up to the believer to make up their own mind through prayer and study.

I truly miss that fellowship. There were people from a diverse background of doctrinal views, but they allowed the unity of Christ to supersede any sort of particular doctrinal differences. There were people who believed that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. There were people who believed that speaking in tongues was a single gift that might come from a Baptism of the Holy Spirit. There were even people who didn't believe that speaking in tongues was available to believers today. Yet no one felt pressured by the pastors or leadership to adhere to a particular set of doctrinal views. They were pressured only to seek Christ. They were admonished to take the faith seriously...because we live in serious times.

I have attended some congregations where the only unity that was present was regarding a distinctive set of doctrinal requirements. Is this what God intended?

The early church was filled with diversity of thought. How do I know? For one, Paul's letters to the Corinthians differed in content from the Thessalonians. While they are undeniable Scriptures that everyone should embrace, it does reflect that the congregations differed from one another. Also, Paul was instructed by the Apostles on just how to present the Gospel. He was not given a particular set of doctrinal views by which he must cause his converts to adhere to. Rather, he was simply given the task of preaching simple, basic truths (Acts 15:4-21).

This doesn't mean that we should ignore doctrinal differences. However, denominations have a way of separating believers according to those peculiarities. I believe that we should be able to break bread with brethren from a plethora of doctrinal views. I also think that it is unwise to use such times to "challenge" the brethren in regard to such differences—especially if those differences are non-essential to faith in Christ. And you know what? Most of these issues are petty. Most of the divergences of opinion are just that—divergences of OPINION. If we learned to season our words and fellowship with the awareness of our own limitations (in terms of knowledge, maturity and feeble understanding), I think that the Body of Christ (as a whole) would be much better off.

Quote:

-----  
Natan4Jesus wrote:

I would love to see a church building, with a sign, either painted on the windows of a simple storefront, or a shuttered industrial building with a sign, and all that sign would read is "JESUS".

-----  
Amen, brother! Our entrance into the Kingdom of God is not dependent upon our doctrinal peculiarities. Rather, it is dependent upon what we did with our knowledge of Jesus. Did we give our all to the One who created us?

: - )

**Re: Greg, on: 2009/5/16 20:22**

We must take our stand now on Biblical Purity and Truth while we still have freedom if we expect to 'stand' when it will mean our lives.

Either we believe this Featured Sermon and others like it or we don't.

Paul and the other Apostles all died horrific deaths and all were Apologists.

If we throw out the Apologists NOW -

I can't even finish that sentence.

Edit to add: This reply is in reply to the topic of this thread - the Emerging Church or Emergent mind.

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/5/16 20:49**

Chris,

Thank you for your response - I read it in its entirety.

Some thoughts that come to mind are: who would establish these "basic" truths? I try to maintain a sense of continuity with church history, so I typically view the Apostles, Nicene, Athanasian, and Chalcedonian creeds as the basic foundational summary of the Christian faith. However, others may not. Of course, many simply claim "I just believe the Bible!" But, the question is, what do you believe the Bible teaches? Who is going to determine which doctrines are too mysterious and should be held as secondary matters?

While I love the idea of all brothers and sisters in Christ rejoice in unity over the truth, I'm not sure if the suggestions you offered could be carried out without losing the entirety of the Christian faith.

For instance, the deity of Christ was a seriously debated issue in the first centuries of the church. The church could have said, "you know what, this is such a divisive issue, let's just agree to disagree and have good fellowship". However, the question remains, fellowship over what? I often tell people that fellowship is not an abstract concept, it is grounded on some objective facts that those in fellowship hold in common. Sure, we could all unite in our "love for Jesus", however, the question is "which Jesus?". Is it a Jesus that preserves his followers and keeps them to the end, or is it not? To me, that presents two radically different persons, and, in fact, two very different messages. Can we really be said to be worshipping the same person if our idea of the person we claim to be worshipping is vastly different from the person next to me?

However, perhaps you consider the deity of Christ a basic truth, so let's consider an example you used: preservation of the saints or "losing your salvation". I don't know about everyone else, but I want to know for sure if this doctrine is true or

not. This is not ivory tower theology to me. Should every member of the church be required to hold to the same view? Maybe not. But, should those in teaching positions have a definite conclusion on this doctrine and preach it. I definitely think so. This doctrine is precious manna that should not be withholden from Christ's flock. Part of the great commission was to teach "all things that I have commanded you". Even though there is disagreement in the church over this issue, I must stand firm on what I sincerely believe our Lord taught, and I believe church elders should as well.

We have to remember that all bad practice stems from bad doctrine. Orthodoxy and orthopraxy are inseparably connected. I believe Paul saw this, as his letters move from the doctrinal to the practical.

Do I believe many congregations reject genuine believers for not holding to certain obscure convictions? Yes, I do. However, I think it is much more often the case that the local churches accept and bless anyone regardless of how un-Biblical their theology is.

On a personal level, if the Lord blesses me with a family and children, I want to be in a church that holds firmly and rejoices in certain specific doctrinal teachings that are non-negotiable. I am obligated to teach my children the Scriptures. And, I'm not going to teach them things are "mysteries" that I'm convicted to the core are plainly revealed in the Scripture.

As a side note, I believe the ability to discern what is a primary issue and a secondary issue takes vast amounts of wisdom, as all the implications of the doctrines must be thought through entirely.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/5/16 21:09**

Hi Jesus\_is\_God,

Quote:

-----Paul and the other Apostles all died horrific deaths **and all were Apologists.**

-----

Are you sure about that?

Were they *apologists* or *apostles*?

They didn't go around dissecting what was written. They were WRITING what God gave them...and speaking this to the Churches.

The apostles' defense of the Gospel, at least from what is written, was by injecting pure truth rather than a particular interpretation. Their defense was also to unbelievers -- and not as a means of debate amongst believers.

The problem with standing for "Biblical Purity and Truth" is that your definition might differ with the rest of believers over peculiarities. In fact, there is someone somewhere who names the Name of Jesus but is prepared to pass you off as a heretic simply because you don't adhere to their own doctrinal peculiarities that they call "truth." They are "taking a stand" -- but this is the stand that divides the true Body of Christ.

There is something very wrong with many of the "emerging church" teachings. Its perspective is skewed by an "all roads" opinion of Scripture. Yet, at the same time, there is something wrong with the "dividing church" teachings -- where believers pass off other believers because they are so "certain" that they are right (and everyone else, therefore, must be wrong).

Why can't pastors and teachers concentrate on what is undeniable truth? We build up walls of separation. Churches become "institutions" with a peculiar "creed" that is almost demanded of its adherents.

Is this what God had in mind when the Church began? I think that there is something wrong with the "Church" if we feel the need to line up behind such peculiarities that serve to separate us from fellowship and encouragement in the Body of Christ.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/5/16 21:15

Quote:  
-----Why can't pastors and teachers concentrate on what is undeniable truth?  
-----

Chris,

I addressed this in my longer post. However, I would think that all pastors who teach feel the vast majority (if not all) of the beliefs they teach on are undeniable truth. They sincerely believe the Apostles taught the things they teach.

With care in Christ,  
Taylor

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 21:30

Quote:  
-----  
ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:  
Hi Jesus\_is\_God,

Quote:  
-----Paul and the other Apostles all died horrific deaths **and all were Apologists**.

-----  
Are you sure about that?

Were they *apologists* or *apostles*?

They didn't go around dissecting what was written. They were WRITING what God gave them...and speaking this to the Churches.

The apostles' defense of the Gospel, at least from what is written, was by injecting pure truth rather than a particular interpretation. Their defense was also to unbelievers -- and not as a means of debate amongst believers.

The problem with standing for "Biblical Purity and Truth" is that your definition might differ with the rest of believers over peculiarities. In fact, there is someone somewhere who names the Name of Jesus but is prepared to pass you off as a heretic simply because you don't adhere to their own doctrinal peculiarities that they call "truth." They are "taking a stand" -- but this is the stand that divides the true Body of Christ.

There is something very wrong with many of the "emerging church" teachings. Its perspective is skewed by an "all roads" opinion of Scripture. Yet, at the same time, there is something wrong with the "dividing church" teachings -- where believers pass off other believers because they are so "certain" that they are right (and everyone else, therefore, must be wrong).

Why can't pastors and teachers concentrate on what is undeniable truth? We build up walls of separation. Churches become "institutions" with a peculiar "creed" that is almost demanded of its adherents.

Is this what God had in mind when the Church began? I think that there is something wrong with the "Church" if we feel the need to line up behind such peculiarities that serve to separate us from fellowship and encouragement in the Body of Christ.

-----  
This thread is about the Emerging Church.

And your question up top floored me Chris.

The simple definition of an apologist is "defender of belief: somebody who defends a doctrine or ideology."

Anyone reading anything written by Paul or John or Jude or Peter could never miss that they were apologists. Just the word "doctrine" alone is found 45 times in the N.T. - nonetheless the word "teaching" and contending for the faith and so forth. We are all to be apologists.

You surprised me with this one on *this* particular thread Chris - sincerely.



Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/5/16 21:48

Hi Taylor...

Thank you for your response. Here are a few thoughts that I have regarding some of the things you wrote.

Quote:  
-----For instance, the deity of Christ was a seriously debated issue in the first centuries of the church. The church could have said, "you know what, this is such a divisive issue, let's just agree to disagree and have good fellowship". However, the question remains, fellowship over what? I often tell people that fellowship is not an abstract concept, it is grounded on some objective facts that those in fellowship hold in common. Sure, we could all unite in our "love for Jesus", however, the question is "which Jesus?". Is it a Jesus that preserves his followers and keeps them to the end, or is it not? To me, that presents two radically different persons, and, in fact, two very different messages. Can we really be said to be worshiping the same person if our idea of the person we claim to be worshiping is vastly different from the person next to me?

-----  
Really? How do we KNOW that there was a debate in the first century about the deity of Christ? The Scriptures seem exceedingly clear about this matter. From everything written in the Word of God (as a whole...both Old and New Testaments), there isn't any room for debate of this matter. Now, I have read that there was *some* debate amongst *some* believers found in *some* writings (but not really from the first century). Yet the Word of God was not available then as it is now. The Word of God is truth...and it is the primer for any credible determination of truth.

The "Jesus" that we can unite behind is not a "Jesus" of doctrinal peculiarities (by which, I mean the issues that aren't certain in Scripture). The Jesus that we can unite behind is the REAL THING -- the One that is written about in the Word...and the One that we gave our life to...the One that we long to know in truth. It is true (as Dave Wilkerson so eloquently discusses in the CHRISTLESS PENTECOST message found on this website) that Christ is a "stranger" to many who meet in churches today. However, Christ is NOT a stranger to those of us who have truly met Him. This meeting was not set up by our understanding of "calvinism" or "predestination" or whether or not we must adhere to particular dress requirements. This meeting is unique to EVERY person who has had the authentic born again experience.

It is the experience where I, as a young teenager, desperately told God one night that I would trade everything that I was...and all that I would ever be...and give up anything and everything that the world would offer...if I could just know Him and be His friend. Regardless of what someone believes about petty doctrinal peculiarities, we have met the same Christ if we had such an experience. Our initial encounter with Christ might differ in circumstances, but it always contains that element of giving up ourselves to the One who made us...and hungering for fellowship with Him.

Quote:  
-----However, perhaps you consider the deity of Christ a basic truth, so let's consider an example you used: preservation of the saints or "losing your salvation". I don't know about everyone else, but I want to know for sure if this doctrine is true or not. This is not ivory tower theology to me. Should every member of the church be required to hold to the same view? Maybe not. But, should those in teaching positions have a definite conclusion on this doctrine and preach it. I definitely think so. This doctrine is precious manna that should not be withheld from Christ's flock. Part of the great commission was to teach "all things that I have commanded you". Even though there is disagreement in the church over this issue, I must stand firm on what I sincerely believe our Lord taught, and I believe church elders should as well.

-----  
Yet, are we called to teach one way OR the other? Can we simply teach the Word...and let believers make up their mind on such issues? I don't need to know some silly doctrine of predestination (and, yes, I think that most...on multiple sides of this issue...are petty and almost downright silly). We know the ROOT to every doctrine...and those roots are undeniable truth. Whether you think that a person can lose it (salvation) or not, the Scriptures are clear about the end of a person who is living for self...in sin...who has run ahead and departed from the faith. Whether or not they were ever part of some supposed "predestined" group is irrelevant (in my opinion). The bottom line is that we must love God and continue in the faith. I believe that this is a message that we all can (and should) preach.

We can nitpick through every particular doctrinal peculiarity that divides the Body of Christ. I have visited congregations where men were rejected on the basis of their FACIAL HAIR. Someone somewhere had a "revelation" about such a matter...and it became a matter of doctrine for that congregation. These peculiarities extend from specific matters of dress to the extent of salvation (can we lose it or not). Yet all of these things divide the Body.

Is this a good thing? Was this indicative of the early Church? Did they separate themselves according to such things? One thing is interesting: Persecution probably had a way of uniting believers. Who cares if you are a calvinist or not if BOTH the calvinist and the non-calvinist were in danger of being sawed in half? Who cares if you think that women must wear a head scarf if both the woman with it and the woman without it are about to be tortured for their relationship with Christ?

Quote:  
-----Do I believe many congregations reject genuine believers for not holding to certain obscure convictions? Yes, I do. However, I think it is much more often the case that the local churches accept and bless anyone regardless of how un-Biblical their theology is.  
-----

Actually, I have had the experience of seeing people rejected because they didn't adhere to a particular doctrinal view. I have seen believers kicked out of churches simply because they weren't sure that tithing is a New Testament requirement. I have seen believers kicked out of churches simply because they didn't believe that speaking in tongues was the initial sign of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. I have seen believers kicked out of churches simply because they embraced reading the NIV or NASB (instead of the KJV). I have been in churches that questioned the authenticity of a person's salvation because that woman continued to wear a little makeup. Is this what God has called the Church to do? A local church that impresses such doctrinal peculiarities as mandates for involvement are united -- until someone has a different opinion. At that point, the door of fellowship is often closed.

Quote:  
-----On a personal level, if the Lord blesses me with a family and children, I want to be in a church that holds firmly and rejoices in certain specific doctrinal teachings that are non-negotiable. I am obligated to teach my children the Scriptures. And, I'm not going to teach them things are "mysteries" that I'm convicted to the core are plainly revealed in the Scripture.  
-----

I have no trouble with teaching children what we are sure of. My problem, however, is that we are so "sure" of issues that are not eternally established in God's Word. Are we called to teach our children about Calvinism -- or something far more important? Even if we believe it as such, are we supposed to teach our children that the rapture is a certainty or a possibility? If we demand adherence to only what we think is true, the Church will continue to be divided by peculiarities. Yet I believe that we should reserve our teaching for what is undeniable truth...as well as noting anything else for what is -- doctrinal peculiarities.

Sadly, we cannot "see" or "hear" what Paul or Peter preached. We are left with accounts from the Book of Acts...and the letters of these men to particular congregations. However, I have a strong suspicion that Paul didn't concentrate on debating issues. He presented exactly what God showed him...and nothing more. I wonder how many of us do the same? Do we preach what we KNOW to be truth...or what we perceive to be truth from the vantage point of where we are and what we know at that time? I wonder if "the whole counsel of God" that Paul preached was void of divisive debate within the true Body of Christ?

Now, please understand that I do believe in teaching about divisive issues. I just don't believe that those issues and doctrinal peculiarities should be mandates for involvement in a local congregation. If we know that a person has sincerely come to Christ, can we fellowship with brethren who do not wear a head covering if we think that they should? Can we fellowship with a believer simply because they are a sincere believer? In many denominations and local churches, the answer is often a resounding no. You might be able to fellowship with such brethren outside of the walls of the congregation. However, many of those believers are not permitted to fellowship or become involved in many congregations.

Somehow, I think that this was different from what God intended for the Church.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/5/16 21:52**

Hi Jesus\_is\_God,

I'm sorry if this surprised you. However, I am using the term "apologist" in the purest sense of the word. However, my post is not so much about defending the faith to unbelievers -- but defending (through debate) doctrinal peculiarities amongst those who call themselves Christians.

If we could defend the faith to this fallen world with the same fervor that we defend doctrinal peculiarities, we might actually have more impact upon this dying world.

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 21:58

Quote:  
-----  
ccchhrrriiisss wrote:  
Hi Jesus\_is\_God,  
  
I'm sorry if this surprised you. However, I am using the term "apologist" in the purest sense of the word. However, my post is not so much about defending the faith to unbelievers -- but defending (through debate) doctrinal peculiarities amongst those who call themselves Christians.  
  
If we could defend the faith to this fallen world with the same fervor that we defend doctrinal peculiarities, we might actually have more impact upon this dying world.  
-----

I'm staying on Topic of this thread Chris.

IF we do not point out what this Emerging Church is doing and more importantly "becoming" - How is that Scriptural to you?  
I'm asking because there are countless N.T. passages coming to mind presently.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/5/16 22:02

Hi Taylor...  
Quote:  
-----However, I would think that all pastors who teach feel the vast majority (if not all) of their beliefs they teach on are undeniable truth. They sincerely believe the Apostles taught the things they teach.  
-----

I think that you have hit the "heart of the matter." Perhaps believers are far too easily convinced about a matter when they go about proclaiming it from the pulpit, forums, or when they demand adherence for continued fellowship?

Should we be teaching something from a peculiar perspective...or should we mingle our teachings with the knowledge of our own, limited understanding? I don't know about you, but I am not the person that I was just a few years ago. It would hurt if I proclaimed something as an indisputable "truth" only to find out later that I was wrong.

My wife and I have taught at the college level. One thing that is required of professors (but not often followed) is that they cannot teach something that is not true (according to the accreditation program). Professors at the university where I taught are permitted to DISCUSS divisive or controversial issues where there is a divergence of opinion. However, they are not permitted to present a view as fact. "Black and white teaching" is reserved only for what is beyond dispute in accordance with the governing body. OF course, this changes if you have "tenure." :P

Is our "governing body" the Word of God...or a peculiar doctrine or view? Too often, I think that we are basing "truth" on something other than what is clear from God's Word. We might claim that it is clear...but even a little doubt is still doubt.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/5/16 22:04

Hi Jesus\_is\_God,  
  
Quote:  
-----I'm staying on Topic of this thread Chris.  
-----  
As far as I can tell, so am I.  
Quote:  
-----IF we do not point out what this Emerging Church is doing and more importantly "becoming" - How is that Scriptural to you?  
I'm asking because there are countless N.T. passages coming to mind presently.  
-----

I don't understand your question. I am not an adherent to the "Emerging Church" or its philosophies. In fact, I have never read anything about the "Emerging Church" save what I have read here at SermonIndex.

I am merely responding to some of the posts on this thread.

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 22:07

Dialoging to consensus is not what we are to do.

There are countless sermons on this website devoted to defending sound doctrine in The Church.

I posted this earlier -

Act 20:28-31 "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.

Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears."

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 22:13

Quote:

-----  
ccchhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi Jesus\_is\_God,

Quote:

-----Paul and the other Apostles all died horrific deaths **and all were Apologists.**

-----  
Are you sure about that?

Were they *apologists* or *apostles*?

They didn't go around dissecting what was written. They were WRITING what God gave them...and speaking this to the Churches.

The apostles' defense of the Gospel, at least from what is written, was by injecting pure truth rather than a particular interpretation. Their defense was also to unbelievers -- and not as a means of debate amongst believers.

The problem with standing for "Biblical Purity and Truth" is that your definition might differ with the rest of believers over peculiarities. In fact, there is someone somewhere who names the Name of Jesus but is prepared to pass you off as a heretic simply because you don't adhere to their own doctrinal peculiarities that they call "truth." They are "taking a stand" -- but this is the stand that divides the true Body of Christ.

**There is something very wrong with many of the "emerging church" teachings. Its perspective is skewed by an "all roads" opinion of Scripture. Yet, at the same time, there is something wrong with the "dividing church" teachings -- where believers pass off other believers because they are so "certain" that they are right (and everyone else, therefore, must be wrong).**

*Why can't pastors and teachers concentrate on what is undeniable truth? We build up walls of separation. Churches become "institutions" with a peculiar "creed" that is almost demanded of its adherents.*

*Is this what God had in mind when the Church began? I think that there is something wrong with the "Church" if we feel the need to line up behind such peculiarities that serve to separate us from fellowship and encouragement in the Body of Christ.*

-----  
Emphasis mine.

Chris, I am merely replying to this.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/5/16 22:15**

Hi brother Jesus\_is\_God,

Quote:

-----Dialoging to consensus is not what we are to do.  
-----

I agree and I don't advocate that...whatsoever.

However, I am saying that consensus of opinion is almost an impossibility in many matters. But more importantly, I wonder if we reach an interpretation far too soon when we eagerly share it as "truth." And I wonder whether we should make such interpretations to be requirements for fellowship in our churches?

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 22:18**

I prefer to stay on topic of the Emerging Church on this thread.

I conceded to your view on post-mid-pre but this entity called the Emerging Church has nothing to do with what you've just said. Maybe you haven't studied it that much - I'll give you that - because if you realized the gravity of this New World Religion, I doubt that you'd post this and would not use "however" directly after "whatsoever" -

Quote:

-----  
ccchhrrriiisss wrote:  
Hi brother Jesus\_is\_God,

Quote:

-----Dialoging to consensus is not what we are to do.  
-----

I agree and I don't advocate that...whatsoever.

However, I am saying that consensus of opinion is almost an impossibility in many matters. But more importantly, I wonder if we reach an interpretation far too soon when we eagerly share it as "truth." And I wonder whether we should make such interpretations to be requirements for fellowship in our churches?

-----

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/5/16 22:30**

Hi brother Jesus\_is\_God,

I'm not sure that this is yet another Emergent Church thread. There were posts in the beginning (including the initial article) that were the concentration of my original posts...about forced doctrinal adherence that separates the Body of Christ along sectarian lines.

I certainly don't understand (nor want to understand) all of the Emergent Church debate. However, I wasn't writing about that issue (I merely mentioned it in a single sentence or two). I was focusing on something that I think is far more important -- the doctrinal divisions that tend to sever the relationship between believers in the greater Body of Christ.

Anyway, that was what I was focusing on.

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 22:39

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi Jesus\_is\_God,

There is something very wrong with many of the "emerging church" teachings. Its perspective is skewed by an "all roads" opinion of Scripture. **Yet**, at the same time, there is something wrong with the "dividing church" teachings -- where believers pass off other believers because they are so "certain" that they are right (and everyone else, therefore, must be wrong).

**Why** can't pastors and teachers concentrate on what is undeniable truth? We build up walls of separation. Churches become "institutions" with a peculiar "creed" that is almost demanded of its adherents.

**Is** this what God had in mind when the Church began? I think that there is something wrong with the "Church" if we feel the need to line up behind such peculiarities that serve to separate us from fellowship and encouragement in the Body of Christ

Dear Brother, again, this was what I was replying to. It could be misconstrued that you are coming against those who are revealing for us the beliefs and practices of this Emerging Church.

You need not study the Emerging Church if that is not what you feel called to - but to those in any danger of being pulled into to this or already in, by way of the PDL, etc., into this Inter-Faith-Political entity - a thread like this should not be multiplied - especially for the young in faith.

Thank you!

Re: For what it's worth - posted by MJones (), on: 2009/5/16 22:53

Quote:

sermonindex wrote:

We must put our energies towards preaching the bible and the gospel and not looking at every wrong thing.

We are not the enemy!

In my first 15 years of being a Christian, the enemy tempted me to do things I shouldn't to keep me from God, then took great pleasure in accusing me of my failure. Once I got a grip on handling that type of temptation and began making better choices, the enemy was there again, only this time, he was there accusing me of not being good enough to please God. He added an interesting twist to these accusations - he made it seem like it was God doing the accusing. So, feeling like God was not satisfied with my life, again he kept me from God.

When this is your Christian experience and the harder you try, the more accusing you hear of what else you must do, you in turn accuse others of all they are not doing.

But when you actually find God and taste the life He has for you, it is, in comparison, like being turned out into a wide open field. It is so good, all you want to do is tell everyone about it. You see the lies and accusations that have robbed you of what you now are experiencing. The last thing you want to do is criticize. You want the world to have what you have.

I have shied away from all the debating here, but after reading the initial post this morning, it has been all I could think about all day.

It is my very firm opinion that satan is successfully turning the church against itself. And those who do not really know God will fall into its trap. With Neil, I am sick of seeing satan have his way. Our energies are focused on the wrong thing. When you really find God, you will not come away accusing. You will not be sidetracked from finding more of what you have found and doing all you know to help others find it.

Until you actually find God, all you have is the effort you are putting into finding Him. You are hearing from the enemy that it is not enough but you think it is from God. Thinking that God is doing all the demanding, it is easy to justify accusing others for not measuring up.

At every turn, the Pharisees looked for fault. They did not know God. All they had was their effort to know Him. Who could do the most? Who could walk the tighter line? And since that was their experience with God, that is what came out - at every turn.

Jesus heals a man born blind. Oh! But wait, didn't He do it on the Sabbath?

At every turn, we can find fault. And we will as long as fault is being found in us. Jesus did some pretty cool things, but those who were looking for fault was always able to find it.

God did something new with Jesus, but because it didn't line up with what the Pharisees believed, they rejected it. I believe God is pulling out all the stops to draw people to Himself. Sure some may come for the wrong reason, but also, many will find Him. And because it does not line up with what some believe, they reject it. Because it doesn't line up with what we believe, we can give it a name and be against it. It becomes our focus and in it, we miss God.

The church has not been working. I believe God is shaking it up. Does He not have the liberty to do something new. Is He bound to our puny little way of thinking?

I know as I write this, fault will be found with it. But I am convinced that what God is doing will not be stopped. Critical that we are following Him. Critical that we do what we see Him do and say what we hear Him say.

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 23:05**

One of the top men in the Emerging Church - otherwise known to some as The New World Religion is Brian McLaren.

There are many inter-faith and political postings from and about this one man alone, nonetheless Rick Warren and Tony Campolo and Willis but this one link below is just one of the many that this Emergent group have joined themselves to -

[http://www.faithhousemanhattan.org/faith\\_house/endorsements.html](http://www.faithhousemanhattan.org/faith_house/endorsements.html)

If this is something on the taboo list of topics, I'd surely like to know.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/5/16 23:26**

Hi Jesus\_is\_God...

Quote:  
-----Dear Brother, again, this was what I was replying to. It could be misconstrued that you are coming against those who are revealing for us the beliefs and practices of this Emerging Church.  
-----

This is reading wayyyyyyy too much between the lines, brother.

As I stated before, I am not speaking about the "Emergent Church." I am talking about mere men who voice their opinions as if they were the Word of God. I am speaking about those men who would create strict requirements for fellowship based upon adherence to a peculiar set of doctrinal opinions. I am talking about those men who would call believers "unbelievers" simply because of a difference in opinion. I am talking about those men who would prefer to argue with believers about the pros or cons about "predestination"...than proclaim the Good News to a lost and dying world. I am speaking about men who create divisions based upon opinions of Scripture rather than a unity that comes from knowing and giving our lives to Jesus Christ.

My first post in this thread was not even directed at you or anything that you wrote. It was in regard to something that Br



other Taylor and Brother Neil wrote regarding denominational divisions. It had nothing to do with yet another long discussion about the "Emerging Church" (I don't know why you keep bringing it up in your responses to my posts). I am not "*coming against those who are revealing for us the beliefs and practices of this Emerging Church*" -- which would be a rather odd interpretation of what I wrote to begin with.

To be clear: I am simply saying that much of "denominational unity" is based upon a requirement of adherence to doctrines that aren't entirely clear in the Scriptures. Did God call the Body of Christ to separate according to peculiar doctrinal differences to the point of reserving our fellowship to those with whom we agree about all manners of specifics? Should a pastor, teacher or congregation push a particular sets of heavily debated doctrines as "truth" -- or did He call us to focus our teaching and fellowship on what is undeniable (such as truly coming to know Christ)...and let the Holy Spirit lead and guide a congregation in the rest?

Re: , on: 2009/5/16 23:28

Interesting, I went to the link. I did a word search on the link, to see if I could find the name Jesus Christ. It did not come up once.

Sad, but a true picture of the "church" that will enter the Great Tribulation.

Walt

Quote:

-----  
Jesus-is-GOD wrote:

One of the top men in the Emerging Church - otherwise known to some as The New World Religion is Brian McClaren.

There are many inter-faith and political postings from and about this one man alone, nonetheless Rick Warren and Tony Campolo and Willis but this one link below is just one of the many that this Emergent group have joined themselves to -

[http://www.faithhousemanhattan.org/faith\\_house/endorsements.html](http://www.faithhousemanhattan.org/faith_house/endorsements.html)

If this is something on the taboo list of topics, I'd surely like to know.

Re: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications, on: 2009/5/16 23:37

Quote:

-----  
waltern wrote:

The emergent Church is upon us! We must be vigilant, and let the body of Christ know that this is happening all over America! PRAY, PRAY, PRAY!!!

(<http://www.lighthouse trailsresearch.com/blog/>) Calvary Chapel Termination

A second event is scheduled between Rock Harbor and Calvary Chapel at the end of May, Movement 2009. The conference will take place at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa and will feature Rock Harbor's teaching pastor Mike Erre and worship team. Mike Erre is the author of a new book, *Death by Church: Rescuing Jesus from His Followers; Recapturing God's Hope for His People*. The book is filled with kingdom-now theology and numerous favorable references to and quotes by people like Brian McLaren, Dallas Willard, and other contemplative, emerging figures. Based on this book alone, it is accurate to say that Erre has all the earmarks of an emerging church pastor. In Erre's 2008 book, *Why Guys Need God*, there he quotes and references a number of contemplative mystic-proponents: Richard Rohr, Larry Crabb, Pete Scazzero, Rob Bell, and others. It is very clear by Erre's remarks about Richard Rohr (whom he references over a half a dozen times in the book) that he esteems him highly. And yet Rohr's spirituality would be in the same camp as someone like Matthew Fox (author of *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ*) who believes in pantheism and panentheism. Rohr wrote the foreword to a 2007 book called *How Big is Your God?* by Jesuit priest (from India) Paul Coutinho. In Coutinho's book, he describes an interspiritual community where people of all religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity) worship the same God. How ironic that Paul Smith's firing is sandwiched between two Rock Harbor events at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa. Members at that church should be very, very concerned.

Recently we reported on Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa's high school in which a teacher there asked his class to read, review, and study *How to Stay Christian in College* written by Protestant-turned-Catholic J. Budziszewski. The book has references in the back of some editions to mystic emergent Tony Jones, and Budziszewski himself is a proponent of contemplative prayer practices. Our article "*Concerned Family Asks Legitimate Questions of Christian Leaders*" illustrates what many families are going through in trying to protect their children and teens from spiritual deception. Christian parents must realize that the souls of their youth are at stake.



Paul Smith came on board to Calvary Chapel about four years ago to help with what could possibly be a sinking ship. Paul believed that the only answer for the movement was to hold to the basic tenets of biblical Christianity. As he learned of the various emerging/contemplative/Purpose Driven influences pouring into Calvary Chapel, he often spoke up but was also often received with resistance--until last Tuesday, when an impromptu meeting in the middle of the day brought his efforts to a halt.

When we spoke with Paul Smith this week, he was packing his things, preparing to leave Calvary Chapel. At approximately 80 years old, his mind sharp and his focus straightforward, Paul isn't sure where he will go from here. He isn't sure of the future of Calvary Chapel anymore either. But he is sure of this - the One whom He seeks to serve is faithful and will in these last days draw a line in the sand and ask every true believer to step on the side of biblical truth. Paul sent us an email a few days after his dismissal. We asked him if we could post part of it, and he agreed:

I have enjoyed serving our Calvary Chapel pastors through Calvary Chapel Outreach Fellowship. Calvary Chapel is a wonderful and surprising work of God. It has been used by God to hold fast to simply teaching the Word of God, book-by-book and verse-by-verse, the whole counsel of God.... It is my prayer that we hold fast to the sufficiency of the Word of God and the sufficiency of the Holy Spirit to guide this blessed ministry of God. My heart's desire is to follow the way of my Lord Jesus Christ. I like what the prophet Isaiah and David have to say about the true Judge who would come and dwell among us and His method and His heart in righteous judgment.

Isa 11:1-5: And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD ; And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD : and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.

This situation with Calvary Chapel is not isolated. Nearly every evangelical denomination and organization of any size in North America is going in this same direction to one degree or another. One key factor in why this is happening so rapidly is that Christian colleges, universities, and seminaries are heavily saturated with contemplative/emerging spirituality. Biola University, for instance, where many Calvary Chapel pastors have attended and graduated, is deeply involved in this "new spirituality."

The spirituality of the desert fathers has gotten a grip on the current theological thought and practice like no one could have predicted just a few years ago, thanks largely in part to the emerging church and the work of Rick Warren and Bill Hybels. Remember, mysticism is what gives the emerging church its momentum. Holistic doctor and author Dr. Rick Levy revealed that in 2008 17 million Americans were practicing meditation (eastern-style). That number is up from 10 million in 2003. At that rate, in another five years it will probably be somewhere between 20 and 25 million. There is no doubt that this surge of mysticism will have a profound effect on virtually every North American family. This statistic is sobering when you consider what Richard Kirby observed:

The meditation of advanced occultists is identical with the prayer of advanced mystics; it is no accident that both traditions use the same word for the highest reaches of their respective activities: contemplation. (Mission of Mysticism, p. 7)

Our prayer at Lighthouse Trails is that everyone involved in this issue would take that statement seriously. Mysticism (i.e., the occult) is overtaking all segments of society, and this means that the world is falling under the spell of sorceries (magical arts) that according to the book of Revelation will deceive all nations (Revelation 18:23).

We close with this: In Alan Jones' book, Reimagining Christianity, he talks about a mystical spirituality in which not only all the world's religions will be united but all humanity will be united whether religious or not. On the back cover of Jones' book, Brian McLaren claims that this view "stimulates" and "encourages" him "deeply" and that Christianity is moving away from "dogma" (doctrine) toward "authentic spirituality" (mysticism).

With the termination of Paul Smith and the embracing of and teaming up with an emerging church, is this "authentic spirituality" the direction that Calvary Chapel is going to go? The answer to that question is becoming clearer all the time.

Related:

"Brian McLaren's Hope for the Future - The Minds of Your Grandchildren"

This article or excerpt was posted on May 15, 2009@ 11:09 am.

Sincerely,

Walter

-----

I cut down your Article Walter because of the names in this section and the possibility that there are those out there that are not aware of the direction that Brian McLaren, etc are headed and may be able to, as you have said, PRAY, and also possibly wake up any Church involved in what is written above from going any deeper.

I felt that was why you posted this.

**Re: , on: 2009/5/16 23:44**

To ccchhhrrriiisss:

Doctrine is no longer being taught in the Church today--that is the problem. I just went online to find another Church in Huntington Beach, CA. When I went to their statment of faith I found this as one of their tenents:

"We consider it our mandate from Jesus Himself, to seek out those who do not know Him, and develop them into fully devoted followers of Christ."

No mention of witnessing the Gospel to them, and no mention that God is the one who "develops them into fully devoted followers of Christ", it has nothing to do with people. We are commanded to share the Good News, to Share the Gospel. He is the one who will convict them of sin, and draw them to Himself.

Understandibly, we will not be going there tomorrow morning, or ever.

This is what is missing in our Churches today, and why we have the "Emerging Church" to deal with. We no longer have Creed's, that Christianity has believed and understood since the beginning. Creed's are nothing more than Doctrine, that is found in the Bible, that all believers should find no problem with it.

If those that post here (SermonIndex) agreed about the creed of our forefathers, we would not even have reason to post opposing views about the very thing that the Creeds refer to.

Apostles' Creed

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.

And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried. He descended into hell. The third day He rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. From thence He will come to judge the living and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

Christian: the ancient text reads "catholic," meaning the whole Church as it confesses the wholeness of Christian doctrine, and has nothing to do with Catholicism.

Nicene Creed

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried. And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures and ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father. And He will come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead, whose kingdom will have no end.

And I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spoke by the prophets. And I believe in one holy Christian and apostolic Church I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen.

Us men means all people.

Christian: the ancient text reads “catholic,” meaning the whole Church as it confesses the wholeness of Christian doctrine, and has nothing to do with Catholicism.

Athanasian Creed

Whoever desires to be saved must, above all, hold the catholic faith (**meaning the whole Church as it confesses the wholeness of Christian doctrine, and has nothing to do with Catholicism.**). Whoever does not keep it whole and undefiled will without doubt perish eternally.

And the catholic faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity, neither confusing the persons nor dividing the substance. For the Father is one person, the Son is another, and the Holy Spirit is another. But the Godhead of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is one: the glory equal, the majesty coeternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Spirit: the Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Spirit uncreated; the Father infinite, the Son infinite, the Holy Spirit infinite; the Father eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Spirit eternal. And yet there are not three Eternals, but one Eternal, just as there are not three Uncreated or three Infinites, but one Uncreated and one Infinite. In the same way, the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, the Holy Spirit almighty; and yet there are not three Almighty, but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, the Holy Spirit is Lord; and yet there are not three Lords, but one Lord. Just as we are compelled by the Christian truth to acknowledge each distinct person as God and Lord, so also are we prohibited by the catholic religion to say that there are three Gods or Lords.

The Father is not made nor created nor begotten by anyone. The Son is neither made nor created, but begotten of the Father alone. The Holy Spirit is of the Father and of the Son, neither made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding. Thus, there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits. And in this Trinity none is before or after another; none is greater or less than another; but the whole three persons are coeternal with each other and coequal, so that in all things, as has been stated above, the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity is to be worshiped. Therefore, whoever desires to be saved must think thus about the Trinity. But it is also necessary for everlasting salvation that one faithfully believe the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Therefore, it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is at the same time both God and man. He is God, begotten from the substance of the Father before all ages; and He is man, born from the substance of His mother in this age: perfect God and perfect man, composed of a rational soul and human flesh; equal to the Father with respect to His divinity, less than the Father with respect to His humanity. Although He is God and man, He is not two, but one Christ: one, however, not by the conversion of the divinity into flesh, but by the assumption of the humanity into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.

For as the rational soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ, who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence He will come to judge the living and the dead. At His coming all people will rise again with their bodies and give an account concerning their own deeds. And those who have done good will enter into eternal life, and those who have done evil into eternal fire.

This is the catholic faith; whoever does not believe it faithfully and firmly cannot be saved. (This again is a reference to the ancient text that reads “catholic,” meaning the whole Church as it confesses the wholeness of Christian doctrine, and has nothing to do with Catholicism).

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
ccchhrrriiisss wrote:  
Hi Jesus\_is\_God...

Quote:

-----Dear Brother, again, this was what I was replying to. It could be misconstrued that you are coming against those who are revealing for us the beliefs and practices of this Emerging Church.  
-----

This is reading wayyyyyyy too much between the lines, brother.

As I stated before, I am not speaking about the "Emergent Church." I am talking about mere men who voice their opinions as if they were the Word of God. I am speaking about those men who would create strict requirements for fellowship based upon adherence to a peculiar set of doctrinal opinions. I am talking about those men who would call believers "unbelievers" simply because of a difference in opinion. I am talking about those men who would prefer to argue with believers about the pros or cons about "predestination"...than proclaim the Good News to a lost and dying world. I am speaking about men who create divisions based upon opinions of Scripture rather than a unity that comes from knowing and giving our lives to Jesus Christ.

My first post in this thread was not even directed at you or anything that you wrote. It was in regard to something that Brother Taylor and Brother Neil wrote regarding denominational divisions. It had nothing to do with yet another long discussion about the "Emerging Church" (I don't know why you keep bringing it up in your responses to my posts). I am not "*coming against those who are revealing for us the beliefs and practices of this Emerging Church*" -- which would be a rather odd interpretation of what I wrote to begin with.

To be clear: I am simply saying that much of "denominational unity" is based upon a requirement of adherence to doctrines that aren't entirely clear in the Scriptures. Did God call the Body of Christ to separate according to peculiar doctrinal differences to the point of reserving our fellowship to those with whom we agree about all manners of specifics? Should a pastor, teacher or congregation push a particular set of heavily debated doctrines as "truth" -- or did He call us to focus our teaching and fellowship on what is undeniable (such as truly coming to know Christ)...and let the Holy Spirit lead and guide a congregation in the rest?

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/16 23:59**

Hi everyone.

I think it would be misrepresenting Chris to suggest that he doesn't believe Christians should be united on fundamental doctrines.

I can't speak for him, but perhaps he would rather object to it being demanded that he accept, for instance, that a day is to be understood as thousand years, in order for him to be accepted into fellowship.

A self-serving 'defense of the faith' that is concerned more about saving face and being justified in the sight of men is destructive also.

**Re: , on: 2009/5/17 8:09**

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:  
Hi Jesus\_is\_God,

Quote:

-----I'm staying on Topic of this thread Chris.

-----  
As far as I can tell, so am I.

Quote:

-----IF we do not point out what this Emerging Church is doing and more importantly "becoming" - How is that Scriptural to you?  
I'm asking because there are countless N.T. passages coming to mind presently.

-----  
I don't understand your question. I am not an adherent to the "Emerging Church" or its philosophies. In fact, I have never read anything about the "Emerging Church" save what I have read here at SermonIndex.

-----  
Perhaps this help some:

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3CauWkSrRFQ&url=http://home1.gte.net/web23vhn/milton\\_green-no-frames.htm&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3CauWkSrRFQ&url=http://home1.gte.net/web23vhn/milton_green-no-frames.htm&feature=player_embedded)

Re: , on: 2009/5/17 8:38

Quote:

waltem wrote:

To ccchhhrrriiss:

Doctrine is no longer being taught in the Church today--that is the problem. I just went online to find another Church in Huntington Beach, CA. When I went to their statment of faith I found this as one of their tenants:

"We consider it our mandate from Jesus Himself, to seek out those who do not know Him, and develop them into fully devoted followers of Christ."

No mention of witnessing the Gospel to them, and no mention that God is the one who "develops them into fully devoted followers of Christ", it has nothing to do with people. We are commanded to share the Good News, to Share the Gospel. He is the one who will convict them of sin, and draw them to Himself.

If you believe the great commission as written, i.e., "make disciples", you must see that it is the CHURCH who does the developing as a mother. Hence their stated purpose is correct: "We consider it our mandate from Jesus Himself, to seek out those who do not know Him, and develop them into fully devoted followers of Christ." Having said that, discipleship is more about becoming unto God a people, "His Bride without spot or wrinkle" if you will, rather than being taught how to "get" more from Him or how to be sustained in the "getting" process. This wrong centuries old perspective, entertained by the vast church family that has helped foster the "Emergent church", is an open door for those who, in the "Name of Jesus", corrupt doctrine for their own agenda. It is of course the root cause of divisiveness. Getting rather than giving will always foster divisiveness. Being and becoming is the heart motivation of the gospel of Jesus Christ per John 17.

To witness has more to do with being than speaking. Few church families today meet that criteria. Those that don't will succumb to the emergent church way of "doing business"..

"Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,  
2 Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Hebrews 6:1-2 (KJV)

Are not the principles that part of our Christian understanding that will be sorted out if we embrace the perspective of "being" rather than "getting"? Keeping in mind the parable of the talents: In our striving "to be", will not Christ be found faithful in the giving more of His Life that we become a "delight" to the Father?

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 9:25

Quote:

.....corrupt doctrine for their own agenda.

One of the ways I think we can identify people that are doing this is the way they insult and accuse those that disagree with them.

For instance by characterising others in the harshest terms and by misrepresenting them without regard to the injury done to their persons or reputations, or to their own souls.

Re: , on: 2009/5/17 9:49

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Quote:

-----...corrupt doctrine for their own agenda.

One of the ways I think we can identify people that are doing this is the way they insult and accuse those that disagree with them.

For instance by characterising others in the harshest terms and by misrepresenting them without regard to the injury done to their persons or reputations, or to their own souls.

Absolutely! Even in the willful misrepresentation expressed in kind words, have I been the recipient, to know that injury..

Re: - posted by MJones (), on: 2009/5/17 9:54

Quote:

waltem wrote:

To ccchhhrrriiss:

Doctrine is no longer being taught in the Church today--that is the problem. I just went online to find another Church in Huntington Beach, CA. When I went to their statment of faith I found this as one of their tenents:

"We consider it our mandate from Jesus Himself, to seek out those who do not know Him, and develop them into fully devoted followers of Christ."

No mention of witnessing the Gospel to them, and no mention that God is the one who "develops them into fully devoted followers of Christ", it has nothing to do with people. We are commanded to share the Good News, to Share the Gospel. He is the one who will convict them of sin, and draw them to Himself.

Undertandably, we will not be going there tomorrow, or ever.

Walter,

I am afraid you are so wrapped up in defending the gospel that you are missing it's simplest form - that we be followers of Christ.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 10:00

Hi Intense,

About this,

Quote:

-----Absolutely! Even in the willful misrepresentation expressed in kind words, have I been the recipient, to know that injury..

Do you mean when you offered Neil forgiveness when he had not asked it of you, but instead expressed how you had wronged him?

Do you mean like that?

**Re: , on: 2009/5/17 10:01**

Quote:

-----

ChrisJD wrote:

Hi Intense,

About this,

Quote:

-----Absolutely! Even in the willful misrepresentation expressed in kind words, have I been the recipient, to know that injury..

Do you mean when you offered Neil forgiveness when he had not asked it of you, but instead expressed how you had wronged him?

Do you mean like that?

-----

How did I EVER wrong him? Present the words.

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 10:25**

Intense,

Quote:

-----How did I EVER wrong him?

-----

You should be asking him that. Not me.

My comments to you were about your giving forgiveness to someone who had just expressed to you that you wronged him.

This is what he quoted to you:

Quote:

Quote:Can the rest of us take for granted you and Neil are of the emergent church crowd?

Re: , on: 2009/5/17 10:54

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:  
Intense,

Quote:

-----How did I EVER wrong him?

-----  
You should be asking him that. Not me.

-----  
Then why are you interjecting yourself into this?"

Quote:

-----My comments to you were about your giving forgiveness to someone who had just expressed to you that you wronged him.

-----  
I didn't wrong him. I asked a question.

Quote:

-----This is what he quoted to you:

Quote:

----- Quote:Can the rest of us take for granted you and Neil are of the emergent church crowd?

-----  
Indeed, that was my question based upon my understanding of his posts. . so where is the offense in the question? In his indignation, he left no room for me to modify it. He as well as you just began a mental accusing campaign, with a little overflow onto the forum. . . and that I recognize as being based upon your overall disagreement with me on other "doctrinal" issues. Now, if you would like to clear the air, we can do that.

Re: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications, on: 2009/5/17 11:19

By email, I just received an interesting response from a friend, who is a retired Pastor:

**"It is very sad indeed that even a sound and solid organization like the Calvary Chapels can be infiltrated by the deceivers.**

**It is more than sad, it's pathetic. That people who say that they truly believe in the Christ of the Scriptures, and claim to believe in (and trust in) God's revealed Word, can be so terminally ignorant as to be "taken in" by the enticing words of false teachers, and give counsel to their own "feelings" and "experiences."**

**Every time you turn around one of these mystical morons has written yet another book, and another, and another !!! And Christian people would rather read that kind of garbage than to study God's Word. In one respect that is so, so sad.**

**But in another respect, we are seeing end-time prophecy come to pass. People are abandoning sound Biblical doctrines in favor of eastern mysticism wrapped in Christian-sounding rhetoric and the demonstration of lying wonders.**

**The chaff is being separated from the wheat".**

**Even so, come Lord Jesus!**



We must all be diligent, and if we cannot sway our Churches from going "emergent", then we will have to take it to our homes. Maybe that is where the Lord is leading us. In persecution, the Church always goes underground.

We have some missionary friends, who have spent time in Russia. Before the wall came down, both he and his wife spent time in Russia, delivering Bibles and ministering to believers. They asked the believers, who were meeting in a home, what they thought of not being able to meet in the Churches anymore. Their response was "there are not as many of us now, but we know that everyone in this room is truly saved. One thing is for certain, that all of us in this room are ready to give our lives for the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

Sincerely,

Walter

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 11:33

Hi Intense,

Quote:

-----Then why are you interjecting yourself into this?"  
-----

You made **yourself** the focus of the discussion:

Quote:

-----Absolutely! Even in the willful misrepresentation expressed in kind words, have I been the recipient, to know that injury..  
-----

Quote:

-----I didn't wrong him. I asked a question.  
-----

Whatever your opinion is about that, you should be talking to him instead of carrying on an argument with me about it.

Quote:

-----He as well as you just began a mental accusing campaign, with a little overflow onto the forum. . . and that I recognize as being based upon your overall disagreement with me on other "doctrinal" issues.  
-----

Intense, I have been addressing your words and not your thoughts.

You asked me to present your words and I did.

Quote:

-----Now, if you would like to clear the air, we can do that.  
-----

Quote:

-----Getting rather than giving will always foster divisiveness. Being and becoming is the heart motivation of the gospel of Jesus Christ per John 17.  
-----

I think that you will do better in representing the things that you are talking about by staying to what others have said and not representing them by airing what you believe is the content of their thoughts.

May God richly bless you,

Chris

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 11:40**

Waltern,

"By email, I just received an interesting response from a friend, who is a retired Pastor:"

Why was the word that now reads 'morons' changed from what it was when you just posted it?

**"Intense", on: 2009/5/17 11:42**

you asked this of ChrisJD: (in regards to our dialogue)

Quote:

-----Then why are you interjecting yourself into this?"  
-----

Because maybe he loves me as a brother in Christ, for which I am so grateful. Not the question to you, but the fact, that another follower of Jesus, loves me sight unseen. Knowing me not in the flesh, but in the Holy Spirit, that is the onus, the thrust of Jesus' "High Priestly Prayer" in John 17.

then you stated:

Quote:

-----I didn't wrong him. I asked a question.  
-----

the "question" being really slander buried into the guise of a "question", ie:

Quote:

-----Can the rest of us take for granted you and Neil are of the emergent church crowd?  
-----

Do not think for a second that i am unaware of the schemes of the devil, which are to divide the Body of Christ, thru accusation, thru assumptions, which are voiced in this:

"can the rest of us **take for granted**"...

If you desire to be an "inquistitor", the Lord will reveal to you the wrong spirit implicit n such an enterprise, I am confident of that.

**Re: , on: 2009/5/17 11:49**

Thanks for taking me up on the offer to clear the air.

You seem to have quite a knack for convoluting questions and answers with someone with whom you disagree, to accuse to guilt for any offense. That is a talent, one that fosters conceit.. I think you would do better to get understanding before setting yourself up in such a way.

You can have the last word . . I'm done.

**Re: "Intense", on: 2009/5/17 11:53**

Quote:

-----

Natan4Jesus wrote:

you asked this of ChrisJD: (in regards to our dialogue)

Quote:

-----Then why are you interjecting yourself into this?"  
-----

Because maybe he loves me as a brother in Christ, for which I am so grateful. Not the question to you, but the fact, that another follower of Jesus, loves me sight unseen. Knowing me not in the flesh, but in the Holy Spirit, that is the onus, the thrust of Jesus' "High Priestly Prayer" in John 17.

then you stated:

Quote:

-----I didn't wrong him. I asked a question.  
-----

the "question" being really slander buried into the guise of a "question", ie:

Quote:

-----Can the rest of us take for granted you and Neil are of the emergent church crowd?  
-----

Do not think for a second that i am unaware of the schemes of the devil, which are to divide the Body of Christ, thru accusation, thru assumptions, which are voiced in this:

"can the rest of us **take for granted**"...

If you desire to be an "inquistitor", the Lord will reveal to you the wrong spirit implicit n such an enterprise, I am confident of that.

-----

*Good grief . . (scratching head) what have we here?*

Re: , on: 2009/5/17 11:54

To ChrisJD:

**My retired friend, Chuck, is a retired Pastor, who sent a personal email to me, and he uses words from his heart. I decided to change a few words. Why does he get excited, because he hates sin, just like God hates sin, just as I hate sin. And what these Pastors are doing is sinful, what these Pastors are doing is destroying Christ's Church.**

**Actually morons is a nice word in reference to these wolves, dressed up as sheep, who are pastoring their Churches right into the Tribulation. They are actually preparing their Christian Churches to merge with the false church, headed by the false prophet.**

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Walter,

"By email, I just received an interesting response from a friend, who is a retired Pastor:"

Why was the word that now reads 'morons' changed from what it was when you just posted it?

Lord have mercy on us!, on: 2009/5/17 11:54

What sort of rhetoric is this?

Quote:

-----Every time you turn around one of these mystical morons has written yet another book, and another, and another !!! And Christian people would rather read that kind of garbage than to study God's Word. In one respect that is so, so sad.

"mystical morons"?

and then assumption stacked upon assumption, about what "Christian people" would "rather read"?

I have never heard a Jesus filled preacher ever use the terminology, "Christian people"! This is just grievous poisonous rhetoric. "Mystical morons"? I still can't get over that bile.

I dove into this mud pit filled with everything unholy, unloving and just plain outright fleshly, and now I'm climbing out. But as I'm climbing out the question begs, "who really are the 'wolves'?"

Re: Lord have mercy on us!, on: 2009/5/17 12:04

To Natan4Jesus:

You, my friend have never heard a fire and brimstone Preacher. Like I said, this was a personal email to me from a retired Pastor, who I have known for many, many years. He has led more people to a saving relationship with Jesus Christ than you can even count.

**Lighten up, Natan, your thin skin is showing through. I have heard more rebuke from your own pen on this web site, than I have ever heard from ANYONE else.**

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

Natan4Jesus wrote:

What sort of rhetoric is this?

Quote:

-----Every time you turn around one of these mystical morons has written yet another book, and another, and another !!! And Christian people would rather read that kind of garbage than to study God's Word. In one respect that is so, so sad.

"mystical morons"?

and then assumption stacked upon assumption, about what "Christian people" would "rather read"?

I have never heard a Jesus filled preacher ever use the terminology, "Christian people"! This is just grievous poisonous rhetoric. "Mystical morons"? I still can't get over that bile.

I dove into this mud pit filled with everything unholy, unloving and just plain outright fleshly, and now I'm climbing out. But as I'm climbing out the question begs, "who really are the 'wolves'?"

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 12:10

Walter,

Quote:

-----Actually morons is a nice word in reference to these wolves, dressed up as sheep, who are pastoring their Churches right into the Tribulation. They are actually preparing their Christian Churches to merge with the false church, headed by the false prophet.

The original word that you altered without telling others was an abbreviated form of a curse word.

You also removed the rest of the post that you wrote below the letter(EDIT: after rechecking the post, it looks as though the portion I mentioned that appeared to have been removed was possibly altered in emphasis/color rather than being removed. If that is the case I was wrong and apologise for causing any confusion).

EDIT: This above does not pertain to the word that was changed which now reads 'moron' but was before an abbreviated curse word.

Re: , on: 2009/5/17 12:20

*musings*. . This is unbelievable!

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/5/17 12:23

Hi again everyone,

Paul told Timothy and Titus and those who would have oversight of others must not be self-willed, strikers, or brawlers(1Ti 3:2-3)(KJV).

G4131

&#960;&#955;&#951;&#769;&#954;&#964;&#951;&#962;

ple&#772;kte&#772;s

plake'-tace

From G4141; a smiter, that is, pugnacious (quarrelsome): - striker.

G269

&#945;&#787;&#769;&#956;&#945;&#967;&#959;&#962;

amachos

am'-akh-os

From G1 (as a negative particle) and G3163; peaceable: - not a brawler.

Re: Calvary Chapel Termination Has Profound Implications, on: 2009/5/17 12:27

When experience trumps doctrine, what is the limit of the imagination of man? When the foundations are destroyed, how can the temple stand?

Satan himself is very aware of this reality, and has proceeded to DIVIDE AND CONQUER by seducing men to believe another gospel, divorced from the restraints of Holy writ and command.

We are in the midst of the Great Falling Away, and the beginning of the End. "Oh, How the mighty have fallen!"

"Has God Said?" ; Satan continues to Eve, ...."and you shall surely be a god yourself", and will have more wisdom, "knowing the difference between good and evil." This is the FIRST fundamental LUST, and the same as Lucifer committed as he strove to usurp the very Throne from the Father Himself.

This is the anti-thesis to the Cross itself. Rather than deny you yourself, fulfill myself. The spirit of man lust to envy, and prone to become as our Creator to know. It is the heart of rebellion, and supremely Babylonian in nature.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss () , on: 2009/5/17 14:54

Hi ChrisJD (and everyone)Â...

Quote:  
----- I think it would be misrepresenting Chris to suggest that he doesn't believe Christians should be united on fundamental doctrines.

I can't speak for him, but perhaps he would rather object to it being demanded that he accept, for instanceÂ...

-----  
Yes, brother, this is how I feel.

I do believe that there are many doctrines that are plain enough from the Scriptures that nearly every true believer can agree upon. These doctrines are clearly spelled out in their entirety in the Word of God. While we may disagree with the branches or implications of those doctrines, their underlying root is common in all believers.

Why did I interject within this conversation in the first place? It had nothing to do with anyone's desire to warn believers about the philosophies of the "Emergent Church." Rather, I was focused upon comments about denominations. I truly believe that the Body of Christ, as a whole, is separated by doctrines that are not entirely spelled out by the Word of God. Denominations and local congregations are often alienated from one another by a set of sectarian creeds that are strongly embraced by some and strongly rejected by others.

My point is this: Should our local congregations, pastors, teachers or denominations DEMAND that believers adhere to a peculiar set of doctrinal beliefs or practices? Should believers be REJECTED from fellowship with a local fellowship of believers based upon whether or not they adhere to that same peculiar set of doctrinal beliefs or practices? Is it the role of a local Church to set up so many doctrinal peculiarities in the first place?

Differences of opinion are not limited to the modern Church organization or denominational structure. They existed during the early days of the Church as well. I urge the brethren to read Acts chapter 15. There were already sharp disagreements regarding doctrine. Some believers were teaching that circumcision was a requirement for salvation. It became so heated that a delegation was sent to the Apostles in Jerusalem to find an answer to this question. When Paul reported to the apostles, they deliberated over the question.

Eventually, Peter stood up and gave some great counsel. He said, "Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the LORD Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they" (Acts 15:10-11).

James added, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day" (Acts 15:19-21).

In other words, the apostles didn't make an excessive list of doctrines that they felt were imperative for the church. They didn't create some sort of spiritual contract that would need to be followed in order to be a part of the Church. In fact,

t, they did the opposite. James urged the brethren to "trouble not them" (in other words, to "not make it difficult"). In fact, he explained that "Moses" has been preached since ancient times...and that the Word of God is still read in synagogues (Acts 15:21). Today, most of our meetings are not for the pure "encouragement" between the brethren as we see that day approaching (Hebrews 10:24-25) or even a reading of the Word of God. Rather, our meetings often involve the public *interpretation* of Scripture.

I think that we have largely missed the point that Peter and James were trying to make. Today, many of our churches (including the "Sunday morning services") have often turned into "indoctrination centers" where even peculiar doctrines are presented as undeniable truth. "Admission" into the local Body is conditional upon adherence to the "creed" of the local Body (or a pastor...set of elders...or a national denomination). Often, the focus is no longer on simply knowing Jesus, but how we interpret particular sets of Scripture.

This, of course, isn't confined to a local congregation or a national denomination. How many very heated debates have taken place on SermonIndex? Most of these are not about the simple matters of faith in Christ Jesus. Rather, they involve doctrinal peculiarities. Too often, we judge (silently or rhetorically) those around us by whether or not they see the same things as we do. Even more often, I feel that we have a tendency to present our views as if they are "written in stone." However, I believe that our doctrinal peculiarities **MUST** be seasoned with an indication that these are personal persuasions. I also think that we should not present any non-essential doctrinal views as a condition for fellowship or admission into a congregation (let alone, as a condition for salvation).

Why is this? The Gospel is literally "good news." It isn't (nor should it be) complicated or convoluted by the opinions of man. It is a simple message of God's love for a fallen world that He created. Yet the modern church is plagued by a desire to use our own experiences and doctrinal views as the primer by how they judge the maturity or authenticity of the faith of others. A person can come to Christ in sincerity; but, if that person doesn't eventually embrace a particular set of doctrinal views, they are dismissed as immature, unwise...or worse.

Most modern denominations (and many, many local congregations) are bound, not simply by the Blood of Jesus, but by compulsory adherence to a particular set of doctrinal views. I certainly believe in discussing issues and ideas about the Word of God. However, is that what happens here? Do we *discuss* doctrines...or do we present doctrines as truth? Maybe the problem is that we are *too easily* persuaded about something? Or perhaps we too quickly present something as "truth" without realizing that it is merely an interpretation?

My whole point in this was not to create some sort of ecumenical bridge between believers. Rather, I wanted to point that believers are already bound by the Blood of our Savior. Yet far too often, we burn those bridges because of doctrinal peculiarities. We surround ourselves with believers who feel the same as we do...or we spend our time trying to get them to see things our way. I don't care how "certain" you feel about a doctrinal peculiarity or how long and intensely you have prayed and studied about it: There will still be some other believer who has also prayed and studied about the same matter who arrives to a different opinion. Unfortunately, there are many believers, congregations and denominations who will be willing to dismiss you as a "heretic" solely because of a matter of doctrinal difference.

Now, most of the time, we don't consider people "heretics" for our differences. We simply view them as wrong...less knowledgeable...less spiritual. I am not saying that we must believe the same way about every matter (not at all). What I am saying is that we can agree on those fundamental doctrines that are most important, and gracefully allow brethren to disagree on other matters.

There is so much diversity of opinion on SermonIndex. We come from different backgrounds, associations and affiliations (or lack of affiliations). Yet we gather because we are blessed by the resources available here. One thing that I love about men like Leonard Ravenhill is that they were far less concerned with doctrinal peculiarities than with a far more important underlying message: What will you do with Jesus? Are you truly hungry for a real and intimate relationship with Jesus Christ? Is knowing Jesus Christ the center and focus of your life?

Perhaps this is the essence of what I am saying. Have we complicated the matter of faith in Christ to ourselves and others? Is this the reason the modern Church is in the condition that it is in? Is this the reason that faith in Christ isn't so contagious in this dying world? Is the reason that revival is thwarted in the greater Body of Christ because we have built doctrinal walls between believers that are locked with the locks of personal perception? Perhaps we have mingled what we consider to be the "foundation" of the Church with the sands of our own understanding?

God help us return to the simplicity of the "good news" of Jesus Christ! We can discuss matters of doctrine...and even di



ffer in opinion about the meaning of some things. Yet we should always remain steadfast in the centrality of simply knowing God.

Re: , on: 2009/5/19 11:10

ccchhhrrriiisss, appreciated your answer.

You have provided an answer consisting of over 1600 words.

You conclude your post with the following:

Quote:  
-----Perhaps this is the essence of what I am saying. Have we complicated the matter of faith in Christ to ourselves and others ? Is this the reason the modern Church is in the condition that it is in? Is this the reason that faith in Christ isn't so contagious in this dying world? Is the reason that revival is thwarted in the greater Body of Christ because we have built doctrinal walls between believers that are locked with the locks of personal perception? Perhaps we have mingled what we consider to be the "foundation" of the Church with the sands of our own understanding?

God help us return to the simplicity of the "good news" of Jesus Christ! We can discuss matters of doctrine...and even differ in opinion about the meaning of some things. Yet we should always remain steadfast in the centrality of simply knowing God.  
-----

My response is the absolute opposite of your conclusion.

I was not addressing sermonindex, I was addressing the problems in the Church, that have created their slide into apostasy. and specifically my Church, Calvary Chapel.

Today, within the Church, we have true believers, who are the sheep, as well as goats (liberals, & non-believers) who are pretending to be sheep. These goats are the ones that are constantly pushing for a broader path and a wider gate.

Christ told us there is only one way to heaven, His way, with the narrow way, and the strait gate, and FEW THERE BE THAT FIND IT

(Matthew 7:13-20)

3. Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: 14. Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. 15. Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. 16. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? 17. Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. 18. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. 19. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. 20. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

The Church of today has not heeded Christ's commands. We are to be separate, and set apart. **The Church is described in the Bible as an assembly of Believers.** The Pastors of our day have made it an assembly of the believers and the non-believers, an assembly of the sheep and the goats! That is the reason we are sliding into apostasy!

Today, we have our "Christian Colleges", Biola as only one example, who are nothing more than Christian in name, who are teaching "new spirituality" (ie contemplative/emerging spirituality) which is nothing new at all. It is Satan's form of spirituality and is nothing more than Catholicism & Hinduism combined.

**If our Christian Churches were worth their salt, and had actually taught the doctrines of our faith to the parents and children, then what is taking place at Biola would be exposed and discredited.**

**The Churches have failed in teaching doctrine, and that failure goes right back to the newer versions of the Bible, created by the Liberals (& both closet Catholics) Westcott and Hort in 1881.**

Sincerely,

Walter