

# **Shall We Write Off Kenneth E. Hagin? Dave Hunt? How About E. W. Kenyon?**

**By Karl Kemp**

## **CONTENTS**

1. Introduction..... 3
2. Some Excerpts from *Occult Invasion: The Subtle Invasion of the World and Church* by Dave Hunt. This section also includes some excerpts from *The Seduction of Christianity: Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days* by Dave Hunt and T. A. McMahon, and many of my comments. This section deals extensively with Hunt's accusations that Hagin was teaching occult faith..... 6
3. I read (with some skimming) several of Hagin's books to see how much of his teaching about faith could fit in the category of occult faith instead of Bible faith. We will discuss the results of this study here. This section also includes a brief discussion of my involvement with Kenneth E. Hagin's ministry and some of my Christian background..... 19
4. I'll include several excerpts from "Contending for the Faith," which is chapter 3 of Dave Hunt's book *Beyond Seduction: A Return to Biblical Christianity* (Harvest House Publishers, 1987)..... 43
5. Some Excerpts from Dave Hunt's *Occult Invasion* where He Calls Kenneth Hagin a False Prophet, etc., and seems to write him off..... 44
6. On pages 120, 122, and 494 of *Occult Invasion* Hunt refers to Hagin's booklet titled *Having Faith in Your Faith*. This is a very important reference that we must discuss..... 48
7. Now we will discuss the article, "The Law of Faith," that is included in the November, 1974 issue of *The Word of Faith* by Kenneth E. Hagin Evangelistic Ass'n. Hunt referred to this article on page 64 of *Beyond Seduction*, for one place..... 50
8. I'll quote a key sentence from page 119 of Hunt's *Occult Invasion* and then a similar sentence from page 64 of *Beyond Seduction*. He backs up both sentences by referring to pages 62 and 173-176 of Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (Kenyon, 1945, 202 pages). Then we will discuss these references..... 53
9. I'll include another brief excerpt from page 64 of Hunt's *Beyond Seduction*; this excerpt is important in that it demonstrates that even though Kenyon didn't

emphasize the point (his entire emphasis was to teach, encourage, and exhort Christians to walk in the full salvation provided for them in Christ Jesus), he believed that non-Christians can develop their spirits to bring about miraculous results..... 57

10. Hunt has another important quotation from Hagin on pages 344 of *Occult Invasion*, under the heading "Ye Shall Be as Gods," in the chapter "Playing God: The Lust for Power." The quotation is from Hagin's 63 page book, *Zoe: The God Kind of Life* (Rhema Bible Church, first printed 1981 and still in print now, July 2013, pages 35, 36)..... 60

11. A few pages back I briefly quoted from Kenyon's *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption* to demonstrate that Kenyon's view of Adam before the fall was far too high and his view of the Lord Jesus was too low. (However, as I have mentioned, sometimes Kenyon presented an orthodox view of God the Son and the Trinity.) Here I'm going to include some excerpts from Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1945) to demonstrate that Kenyon's view of born-again Christians is far too high in comparison with God. For one thing, Kenyon probably was the source for Hagin's infrequent similar statements. As I mentioned, these two books by Kenyon are two of the primary places where he taught that Jesus died spiritually, took on the nature of the devil, etc..... 65

12. *Mind, Might, and Mastery: Human Potential in Metaphysical Religion and E. W. Kenyon*, A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Liberty University Graduate School of Religion in Candidacy for the Master of Arts in Christian Thought (Apologetics), by Kevin Scott Smith, 1995..... 67

13. *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum* [which means after the Civil War] *Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty* by Dale H. Simmons (The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1997, 351 pages)..... 68

14. *E. W. Kenyon and His Message on Faith: the True Story* by Joe McIntyre (Charisma House, 1997, 362 pages)..... 72

15. *The Word-Faith Controversy* by Robert M. Bowman Jr. (Baker Books, 2001)..... 86

16. *Christianity in Crisis* by Hank Hanegraaff (Harvest House Publishers, 1993)..... 89

17. I'll quote a few sentences from *Occult Invasion* by Dave Hunt from the Chapter on " 'Christian' Psychology" under the heading "Occultism and Selfism"..... 93

Some Key Passages of Scripture and Key Topics that are discussed in this paper:

Mark 5:34..... 33; 11:22-24..... 4, 10, 16, 20, 21, 28, 29, 31, 32, 42, 49, 51, 62, 89  
 Galatians 5:16..... 10-13, 30, 55, 74; 5:22, 23..... 12, 32, 55; 5:24..... 11; 5:25.....  
 12, 55  
 Ephesians 5:1..... 32  
 Romans 4:17..... 28, 89; 5:17..... 61; 8:1-4..... 12, 13, 30; 10:9, 10..... 33, 34  
 Hebrews 11:1..... 30, 33, 56; 11:3..... 29, 30, 44, 50, 56, 62, 89; 11:6..... 51  
 2 Peter 1:3, 4..... 40, 57

On Jesus dying spiritually..... 3, 4, 15, 16, 27, 42, 45, 59, 68, 69, 71, 75-87  
 The meaning of "the Spirit" and "the flesh"..... 10-12  
 Once Saved, Always Saved?..... 45, 46  
 New dating method for the Shroud of Turin..... 92, 93  
 Evidence that Jesus was nailed through the palms of His hands..... 93, 94

Abbreviations: cf. = compare; e.g. = for example

**1. Introduction.** Many have written off Kenneth E. Hagin, including Dave Hunt, based on what Hunt says in his books. And many have written off Hunt. I don't believe we should write off either one of these brothers. After spending a lot of time working on this paper, I decided I needed to spend more time learning about E. W. Kenyon and what he taught, and I changed the title of this paper from *Shall We Write off Kenneth E. Hagin? Dave Hunt?* to include *How About E. W. Kenyon?* It is clear that Hagin was influenced by Kenyon. I had read several of Kenyon's books and a few books that dealt with him quite a bit, but I realized that I didn't know enough about him to understand where he was coming from. I'm still not an expert on Kenyon, but now I know quite a bit more about him and what he taught.

I spent a few weeks finding and reading some more books that dealt with Kenyon. Three of the books added quite a bit to my understanding, the books by Joe McIntyre, by Dale Simmons, and by Robert Bowman, especially the first two books. (All three books are discussed in this paper.) As I make clear in this paper (also see my paper *Did Jesus Die Spiritually?*), I am very concerned about some of the things that Kenyon taught, but I don't believe the Lord Jesus has written off Kenyon either. The Lord Jesus (with God the Father) is the only One with the authority to write off and reject any person, and it is clear that He doesn't appreciate our passing wrong judgments for Him (cf., e.g., Rom. 14:4; 1 Cor. 4:1-5; Matt. 7:1-5). All three brothers are now deceased, but their extensive work and influence lives on, which makes this paper quite relevant for our day.

I agree with Hunt that it was a serious error for Hagin to begin to teach that Jesus died spiritually,<sup>1</sup> even if he didn't emphasize that teaching. (I don't believe I

---

<sup>1</sup> In the process of writing this paper, I realized that we must define what we mean by Jesus dying spiritually. All some Christians mean by that terminology is that Jesus was separated from God the Father in His atoning death. I agree that He was, in some ways, separated from God the Father, for the first and only times throughout all eternity, through bearing our sins with the guilt

have ever heard Hagin teach that, and, to the best of my knowledge, it is rare that it appears in his writings.) It is clear, I believe, that Hagin picked up that error from Kenyon. But I don't agree with Hunt that Hagin had an occult view of faith. (I'll define what Hunt means by an occult view of faith as we continue.) Hagin made a few statements over the years that would fit an occult view of faith, but, based on what I have observed, read, and heard, Hagin taught and lived in line with a Bible faith that was solidly centered in God (the God of the Bible).

Our faith must be centered in God and His Word; He answers prayer; we look to Him for all things; we thank Him for all the things we receive; He saves; He heals; we make it a top priority to live (including what we pray) in the center of His will (as defined by His Word), by His grace; we don't do anything on our own, apart from Him (Jesus is the vine; we are the branches), or for our glory; we understand, for example, that if we command a mountain that needs to be moved to move in (by the authority of) the name of Jesus (cf. Mark 11:23), God is the One who moves the mountain (one way, or another), not our (creative) faith, or our force of faith. Yes, our command to the mountain (before God) in faith is effective, but only by the authority and power and direct involvement of God, and in the will of God; we have been created and saved for His glory. God is directly involved with every detail of our lives and ministries.

The authority we have in the name of Jesus to move mountains, to resist demons and cast them out, etc., which God has given to us, is effective only because God (who always is directly involved) has the power to back up this authority. If an evil angel (or all the evil angels), for example, says I am going to keep that mountain from moving, God has the power to move that angel (or angels) and that mountain. We will deal with this topic in some detail in this paper, always looking for the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches, and see my *A Paper on Faith* on my internet site (Google to Karl Kemp Teaching).

I agree with those who have written off Hunt that sometimes he was too quick to write off other Christians (including Hagin), which is a serious problem, but I believe he was a sincere, Bible-centered Christian, who was devoted to God and His truth and that we need to hear a big part of what Hunt said on many topics, very much including faith. He had much insight into serious problems that we Christians must deal with.

I desire to be a peacemaker, and I want to be fair to Kenneth Hagin, Dave Hunt, and E. W. Kenyon. I pray that this paper will to prove to be a blessing to those who have great respect for Hagin's ministry and for those who have written him off; for those who have a great respect for Hunt's ministry and for those who have written him off; so too for Kenyon. My goal for this paper is not to win an argument, but to please God and be a blessing to His people. One primary goal for this paper is that any readers who are misunderstanding any of the Bible verses, or topics, that are discussed will see where they are missing the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches and make the necessary corrections.

---

and the penalties. However, for Kenyon and those who follow him, spiritual death included the ideas of Jesus taking on the nature of the devil, which resulted in the need for Him to be justified and born again (like we are), and the idea that that a big part of His atoning work was accomplished when He was tormented in hell for three days after He died on the cross.

How precious is the truth! It is a great blessing to be able to make any necessary corrections NOW, before we stand before God, and WE WILL STAND BEFORE HIM.

One goal for this paper is to try to demonstrate that Kenneth Hagin did not teach an occult view of faith. He occasionally taught things that were wrong over the years (especially the very wrong idea that Jesus died spiritually, which he learned from E. W. Kenyon), but as far as I can see those wrong ideas (many of which he picked up from Kenyon) always (or almost always) remained secondary additions to his teaching. They were not foundational to his teaching on faith. (For Kenyon some of the wrong ideas were foundational; they were part of the foundation on which he built his presentation of the gospel, his version of the gospel that he considered to be a great improvement over the more standard presentations of the gospel.)

In my opinion, if Hagin's ministry was to be likened to a building with many floors, his wrong ideas could be likened to a several rooms (or maybe a floor) you should avoid in that building. Most ministers have taught things that were not right, but it is very hard for most of us to think that we could have anything wrong. It's amazing that most ministers and the groups they are associated with think that they happen to have everything (or at least almost everything) right. That attitude (which goes along with pride) makes it difficult to receive correction.

Another goal I have for this paper, which in some ways is more important than trying to demonstrate that Hagin did not teach an occult view of faith, is to help Christians understand what occult faith is and how they can, and must, avoid it (whether Kenyon or Hagin taught it, or didn't teach it). It is rather easy to miss the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches, and the enemy of our souls works diligently to "help" us miss the balanced truth. We must make the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches a top priority!

It is beyond the scope of this paper for me to comment much on faith teachers other than Hagin and Kenyon. It seems that Kenyon, although he could clearly see that salvation was not available through metaphysical religions (including New Thought, Christian Science, Unity Church, etc.), he was influenced by them to some extent. Even though he taught that they were false religions, Kenyon was impressed with the fact that they were getting results in areas like healing.

How much Kenyon was influenced by metaphysical religions is controversial and a difficult question to try to answer. After doing the research for this paper, I believe I can say that D. R. McConnell, in his influential book *A Different Gospel* [Hendricksen, 1988], overstated how much Kenyon was influenced by the metaphysical religions. (I believe the three books by Joe McIntyre, Dale Simmons, and Robert Bowman that are discussed in this paper suffice to demonstrate this point. They all agree, by the way, that Kenyon was influenced to some extent by metaphysical religions.)

I am not making an attempt in this paper to try to determine how much Kenyon's thinking was influenced by these metaphysical religions, or even to try to prove that his thinking was influenced by them at all. For me, the really important thing is to show that Kenyon's teaching includes quite a bit of error, regardless of where he picked up the errors. I am confident that he was trying to

be faithful to God and the Bible. Much, if not most, of Kenyon's writings could be helpful for Christians who are grounded in the basics of Christianity, but I cannot recommend his writings because of the substantial numbers of places where he (from my point of view) misinterprets the Bible. Some of the errors are quite significant (especially what Kenyon taught about the atoning death of Jesus and His dying spiritually, taking on the nature of the devil, etc.) and, as I mentioned, many of his errors seem to be foundational to what Kenyon thought was a new and improved presentation of the gospel that would revolutionize the Christian church if accepted.

I will always quote from the New American Standard Bible, 1995 edition, unless noted otherwise. Sometimes I will make comments in the middle of quotations using brackets [ ] or [[ ]] to make them more obvious. I am not using many footnotes because I am going to split this paper up into several articles to put on several Christian article sites, and the sites do not allow footnotes.

**2. Some Excerpts from *Occult Invasion: The Subtle Invasion of the World and Church* by Dave Hunt** (Harvest House Publishers, 1998). I'll also include excerpts from *The Seduction of Christianity: Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days* by Dave Hunt and T. A. McMahon here, and many of my comments. This section deals extensively with Hunt's accusations that Hagin was teaching occult faith. I'll list the chapter titles included in this 647 page book: 1) Why This Book? 2) Evolution and Its Role. 3) What Is the Occult? 4) The Death of Materialism. 5) Remote Viewing. 6) A Dark and a Light Side? 7) Naturalism or Supernaturalism? 8) Native, Indigenous, and Nature Religion. 9) Spirit Communication and Possession. 10) Drugs, Imagination, and the Occult. 11) Ecology, Shamanism, Science, and Christianity. 12) The Influence of Eastern Mysticism. 13) New Respectability in a New Age. 14) Holistic Medicine. 15) Twelve Steps with "God As You Conceive Him." 16) The Seduction of Youth. 17) Playing God. The Lust for Power. 18) What about UFOs, ETT's, and Near-Death Experiences. 19) Apparitions of Angels, Ghosts, and Mary. 20) Occultism and the Roman Catholic Church. 21) Psychology and the Occult. 22) 'Christian' Psychology. 23) Charismatic/Evangelical Occultism. 24) "Spiritual Warfare" and Revival. 25) A.D. 2000: Millennial Madness. 26) The Coming World Religion.

I have two primary reasons for wanting to discuss this book. For one thing, Dave Hunt (who died in 2013) has taken the time to research many topics that most Christians know little about, things that are quite relevant to us evangelicals here at the end of this age. For one thing, you can learn a lot about how the occult has invaded the world, much of the Christian church, and to some extent the evangelical church, and how it is spreading in our day. Although Hunt wasn't always correct or balanced in his criticism of the faith movement, much that he said was correct and needs to be heeded.

I have learned a lot from Hunt's books, including the books, *The Seduction of Christianity: Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days* co-written with T. A.

McMahon (Harvest House Publishers, 1985) and *Beyond Seduction: A Return to Biblical Christianity* (Harvest House Publishers, 1987). All three books are out of print, but a facsimile version is available from Amazon.com for *Occult Invasion* and a large number of used copies of the other two books are available at a reasonable price at Amazon.com.

A second reason I wanted to discuss *Occult Invasion* (and the other two books) is to demonstrate that sometimes Hunt is too quick to write off evangelical ministers because he finds a problem(s) (sometimes a very real problem(s)) in what they teach. All three books are packed with important information, but I don't recommend anyone read the books who will be quick to accept the author's judgments regarding other ministries. Errors in what a minister teaches should be pointed out (that's important; we need the truth), but we need to go very slow about writing off ministers. If we don't use some restraint, we may have to write off everybody, including Hunt.

I am going to use what Dave Hunt (and the coauthor of one of the other books) says about Kenneth E. Hagin, who was a key leader in the faith movement, to illustrate this important point. I have followed Hagin's ministry quite a bit, starting in the spring of 1966, and I believe we need to hear most of what he taught. How desperately we need the balanced truth, especially the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches. We will never find, or live, the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches if we don't humble ourselves before Him and His Word, and we need to humble ourselves before our brothers and sisters in Christ too.

I'll quote part of what Hunt says on page 39 of *Occult Invasion*, the first page of his chapter titled, "What is the Occult?" "The word *occult* comes from the Latin, *occultus*, which means 'concealed' or 'hidden.' It involves mystic knowledge and magic powers received from the spirit world and dispensed for the benefit of devotees or directed destructively at enemies by those who have been initiated into its secrets. The masters of occult power are known as medicine men (or women), witch doctors, witches, psychics, priests, sorcerers, astrologers, gurus, yogis, shamans, mediums, seers, or healers.

Some of those involved with occult powers attribute them to a variety of deities, others to a 'Force' inherent within the universe with a 'dark' and 'light' side which humans can tap into. Still others claim they are simply using a normal power of the mind which can be cultivated in a special state of consciousness. There are others who attribute occult powers to the God of the Bible. ...many professedly Christian leaders are involved in the occult and are leading their churches into this error, as we shall see."

On pages 40, 41 of *Occult Invasion* Hunt briefly discusses Napoleon Hill, the author of the best-selling book *Think and Grow Rich* and other books. I was shocked many years ago when I learned in chapter 1 of *Seduction of Christianity*, in a chapter titled "Success and Sorcery," that Hill made it clear that he had received the information and techniques contained in that book from what we

could call spirit guides (demons). I'll quote several sentences from pages 16-21 of *Seduction* that deal with this topic:

"Most of the masters of business success/motivation and PMA [Positive Mental Attitude] techniques have been seduced into sorcery, and are seducing millions of other people as well. Most of the basic ideas and techniques behind self-improvement courses that literally permeate society today can be traced back to one man, Napoleon Hill. ... Napoleon Hill's books are offered at Christian bookstores across the country and recommended by numerous Christian leaders. ... Hill explains in some detail that he learned the mind-power techniques contained in his books from disembodied spirit entities. Demons masquerading as Ascended Masters used Hill to deceive the millions who have adopted the 'success' techniques they gave him. ... The 'Supreme Secret' they authorized Hill to 'reveal' to the world has been preserved in occult tradition for thousands of years...: '*Anything the human mind can believe, the human mind can achieve*' [emphasis in original] (Napoleon Hill *Grow Rich with Peace of Mind* (Ballantine Books, 1967), p. 176). This seductive idea lies behind the Human Potential movement, which is another name for the New Age movement. ... The 'secret of the ages' is also called by Hill 'The Magic Power of Belief' [same reference and page number]. Its basic premise is that the human mind has mysterious inherent powers that are capable of creating one's own reality: 'Truly, deeply, believe you will have great wealth, and you will have it' [same reference and page number]. This is the sorcerer's counterfeit 'faith' [an occult faith] and is the basis for what the secular world calls PMA.... ...."

One of the primary points that Hunt makes in his books is that the power that makes these techniques work is from the devil, the occult power of the devil and his kingdom. There is a gigantic difference between tapping into occult powers and being an effective salesperson because you have a good personality, believe in the product, think positive (think in terms of making sales, not in terms of not making sales, etc.), and truly want to help the customer. And there is a super-gigantic difference between tapping into occult powers by occult faith (not Bible faith) for success, healing, etc. and living for God (the God of the Bible) in His truth, righteousness, and holiness, by grace through Bible faith (faith that is based on God and His Word and gives Him all the glory) and receiving all the success, healing, and every other blessing He has for us in this age (and especially in the eternal age to come) by grace through faith (Bible faith).

I'll quote a few sentences from pages 12, 13 of *Seduction of Christianity*. "...most Christians are so uninformed about occultism that they wouldn't recognize it except in its most blatant forms. ... In the following pages we will document the sobering fact that not only liberal but conservatives as well are being seduced in overwhelming numbers. The extent to which antichristian and even occult beliefs and methodologies have been integrated into Christianity within the last few years is staggering, and this trend is accelerating at an alarming rate.

... One word that is often used to encompass all pagan/occult practices is 'sorcery.' [The meaning of the word "sorcery" in this book:] any attempt to manipulate reality (internal, external, past, present, or future) by various



[supposed] mind-over-matter techniques that run the gamut from alchemy and astrology to positive/possibility thinking.

Ancient sorcery's mind-over-matter techniques often seem to work [yes, by the occult power of the kingdom of darkness] and are radically changing our world—from science and medicine to psychology and education. ...."

I'll quote a paragraph from page 113 of *Occult Invasion*, "In every culture throughout human history shamanism has been based upon the belief that the spirit world could be manipulated by thoughts firmly held in the mind, by words repeatedly spoken, and by pictures formed in the imagination. The modern application of these ancient shamanistic beliefs is found in the Power of Positive Thinking, Positive Speaking, and visualization. All three of these occult techniques are practiced today in the arenas of education, psychology, business and within the church."

It is true, of course, that Christians must think, speak, and act in a "positive" way, as defined and required by the Word of God, but everything we do is supposed to be done with reference to God, that His will be done, by His grace, by His power, and for His glory. We are not (we had better not be) little gods using occult techniques (whether we consider them to be occult techniques or not) to try to bring things into alignment with our will. God knows our hearts, including our motives. We must (we have the privilege to) walk in line with God's Word and by the Holy Spirit, in His imputed and imparted righteousness, on a continuous basis, by grace through faith (faith in Him and in His Word and for His glory).

We are missing what Bible faith is all about if our faith is disconnected from God and His Word (if He is left out of the equation) and placed in ourselves, or in our faith, or in an occult "law of faith" that will work for anybody (Christian or not), or in an occult "law of confession" that will work for anybody, or in a law that says faith is a force we can use to move mountains, etc., or that since God created by faith, we (once we have become born-again Christians) can create by faith, etc. We will discuss all of these things in this paper.

These things have always been clear to me, and I have always taught these things and pointed them out when speaking with believers from the faith movement. (Many of my best friends, and students, have been involved in the faith movement. Some have been Rhema [Kenneth Hagin's Bible Training Center] graduates.) See my "A Paper on Faith" on my internet site ([karlkempteachingministries.com](http://karlkempteachingministries.com)). It isn't directly related to this paper, but I recommend reading my paper *Some Comments on Destined to Reign by Joseph Prince and a Discussion on the Topic of Righteousness, Holiness, and the Victory Over Sin*.

I'm not the judge. For one thing, God is the only One who knows what we are believing and doing in our hearts. Some Christians may be saying some things wrong about faith (in a way that doesn't fully line up with what the Bible teaches) but in their hearts they are living in a way that glorifies God; they are making God, His will, His truth, and His righteousness and holiness top priority; they are looking to Him for all things and giving Him the glory for all things, etc. Anyway, it

is very important that we bring what we believe into agreement with God's Word in every area (as required), and faith is a word of key importance in the New Testament.

As I mentioned, when I speak of the faith movement in this paper, I am going to limit my discussion almost entirely to Kenneth E. Hagin and E. W. Kenyon (for one primary thing, I don't know much about the teaching of the other faith teachers; but I have to say that I been shocked by several things I have read, or heard, from a few of them), but I want to quote a sentence (a sentence I strongly disagree with) from what Hunt said on page 119 in *Occult Invasion*: "The entire 'Faith movement' rests upon the occult belief that 'faith is a force just like electricity or gravity' [in an endnote Hunt shows that these words in single quotation marks were quoted from Kenneth Copeland in a TV interview with Paul and Jan Crouch on Feb. 5, 1986], which obeys laws and thus even non-Christians can use it."

I haven't followed Copeland's ministry hardly at all, but Hunt is leaving a wrong impression here. Copeland wrote a 32 page booklet titled *The Force of Faith*, but he is talking about a force that born-again Christians have available to them, not non-Christians. As I make clear in this paper (and see my *A Paper on Faith*), I don't believe it is Biblical to speak of a "force of faith." That expression lends itself to an improper view of faith. The Bible speaks of having faith in God (and His Word). He has the "force" (power) to move the mountains that need to be moved, etc. If we could move mountains through our creative faith, or force of faith, without the direct involvement of God, He wouldn't be receiving much glory for moving the mountains. If a "Christian" is moving mountains (working miracles) with an occult faith, the devil (or a subordinate spirit in his kingdom) is the one moving the mountains (working miracles).

We'll discuss Mark 11:23, which is a verse that speaks of our commanding mountains to move, as we continue, but I'll point out here that Mark 11:22, the verse right before 11:23, demonstrates that it is our FAITH IN GOD (not our creative faith, or our force of faith; God is the One who has the power, the force) that moves mountains that need to be moved; God (the One in whom we have faith) is the One who moves the mountains, one way, or another. And Mark 11:24, the verse that follows 11:23, speaks of God's answering prayers that are prayed to Him in faith.

Galatians 5:16 is a super-important verse. I'll quote the verse from the NASB (1995 edition), which is the essentially the equivalent of the KJV, "But I say, walk by the Spirit, and you [most certainly] will not fulfill the [sinful] desire of the flesh." Hagin (probably following the lead of Kenyon; see the seventh paragraph that follows) substantially confuses the issue on Gal. 5:16. He said that we should change the capital "S" for the word Spirit in Gal. 5:16 to a small "s," because the apostle Paul was speaking of our born-again spirit here, not the Holy Spirit. I'm totally sure that is wrong. For one super-important thing, 2 Cor. 7:1 shows that our spirits can be defiled.

Galatians 5:16, which is extremely important, is one of the clearest statements in the New Testament that teaches that born-again Christians are called,

enabled, and required to walk by the Holy Spirit on a continuous basis, by grace through faith, in the righteousness and holiness of God, with the victory over all sin. The apostle Paul said that if we walk by the Holy Spirit on a continuous basis by faith, we will walk with the victory over all the works of the flesh, which means the victory over all sin.

I discussed Gal. 5:16-25 verse-by-verse on pages 195-200 of my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin: Full Salvation Through the Atoning Death of the Lord Jesus Christ*. Because I consider the interpretation of this verse (and similar verses) so important, I'm going to quote the three paragraphs that I have under Gal. 5:16 in the book:

It is common for the apostle Paul (and others) to use "the flesh" to speak of fallen man (man in spiritual death, man separated from the Spirit of life). "The flesh" is not at all limited to the physical body. (The NIV has "the sinful nature instead of "the flesh" throughout Gal. 5:13-25, and often. The *Amplified Bible* at Gal. 5:16 defines "the flesh" as "human nature without God.") Often, as here, there is a contrast between "the Spirit" and "the flesh" (cf., e.g., John 3:3-8; 6:63; Rom. 7:5, 6; 8:1-14; Gal. 6:8; and 1 Pet. 4:1-6).

For a Christian to walk according to the flesh is to walk according to the old man, but this ought not (need not) be (cf. Rom. 6:6; Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:11-13; 3:5-9). [Many of the verses cited in the three paragraphs that I am quoting from my book are discussed in the book. I highly recommend that you obtain a copy of the book, AND STUDY IT. These things are extremely important; they are at the heart of what Christianity is all about. The book is available on my internet site or at amazon.com.] The Christian is to be dead to the old man [this is the Christian ideal presented in the New Testament, and it is not presented as an unrealistic ideal]; he has crucified the flesh with its passions and desires (Gal. 5:24). ("The flesh" and the "old man" are very similar in meaning, if not identical. We can speak of the old man being crucified with Christ [Rom. 6:6; cf. Gal. 2:20], and we can speak of crucifying the flesh [Gal. 5:24].) The old man, however, will live and manifest itself in sin to the extent that the Christian does not walk by (after) the Spirit on a continuous basis, appropriating God's grace through faith. Only the Spirit has the power to keep the old man/the flesh from manifesting itself in sin.

A primary reason why the flesh is such a formidable opponent for the Christian is that Satan and his horde of demon spirits are very active in the realm of the flesh. Satan is the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:3; John 12:31; 16:11; Eph. 2:1). Fallen man could probably sin in all the ways listed in Gal. 5:19-21 without the involvement of demon spirits, but demon spirits work in each of these areas, greatly intensifying the problem. This reality makes it all the more necessary for the Christian to walk by (after) the Spirit and to not give the devil any place. Ephesians 4:27 says: "and do not give the devil an opportunity." As the margin of the NASB shows, a more literal translation would be "place" instead of "opportunity." These words of Eph. 4:27 were written by the Apostle Paul in a context of exhorting Christians to walk in righteousness and holiness, having laid aside all sin. Romans 13:14 says: "But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh in regard to its lusts [plural of *epithumia*]."

It is a serious step in the wrong direction to shift from the all-important Holy Spirit who indwells all born-again Christians (e.g., Rom. 8:9) to our born-again spirits. I believe Hagin would agree that we must keep God the Father in the spotlight (along with the Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit) and make sure that He gets all the glory. We must also understand the gospel, including the things God has provided for us, and the things He requires of us, and then do what He requires of us by His sufficient grace through faith. The New Testament puts a strong emphasis on the need for us TO WALK BY THE HOLY SPIRIT on a continuous basis by faith (cf., e.g., Gal. 5:16-25; 6:8; Rom. 8:1-17 [Romans 8:1-17 are discussed verse-by-verse on pages 116-123 of my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin*, and other scriptural references are cited there.]).

On pages 29, 30 of *The Hidden Man* [Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1996], Kenyon says that Gal. 5:16 refers to the recreated human spirit, not the Holy Spirit. And he translates "the senses" instead of "the flesh" (see the next paragraph on this serious problem). On page 30 he says that the fruit spoken of in Gal. 5:22, 23 is the fruit of the recreated human spirit, not the Holy Spirit. On page 30 regarding Gal. 5:25; he says, " 'If we live by the spirit, let us by the spirit also walk.' That is the human spirit." The KJV and NASB, for example, rightly have a capital "S" for the word "Spirit" twice in Gal. 5:25. I believe Kenyon was making a serious mistake on Gal. 5:16, 22, 23, 25, and on many other verses. As I mentioned, it is very important to see that the apostle Paul was speaking of the need for us to walk by the Holy Spirit on a continuous basis.

I'll quote a little more of what Kenyon said as he continued on page 30, "Romans 8:1-3 deals with the same problem. Third verse, 'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh (senses) [[The "flesh" doesn't refer to the senses. It refers to fallen man, man without the Holy Spirit, man in spiritual death. Man in the flesh isn't able to fully keep God's law (the Mosaic Law, which was the foundation for the old covenant). Romans 8:1-17 are discussed verse-by-verse on pages 116-123 of my book, *Holiness and Victory Over Sin*.]], God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (senses) and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh' (or senses). What sin is condemned in our flesh? It is not sin of conduct as we understand, it is sickness."

I am totally sure that Kenyon is wrong here, and it is a foundational error in one of the most important passages of the New Testament. The heart of the gospel that the apostle Paul proclaimed is that the sin which formerly reigned over us when we were in the flesh (spiritually dead, without the indwelling Righteous, Holy Spirit of life) has been condemned through the cross of the Lamb of God and has no more legal authority or power over born-again Christians.

As the apostle goes on to show in Rom. 8:4, Christians are enabled to fulfill the requirements of God's Law, which is the equivalent of saying that we walk in His righteousness and holiness in our daily lives, as we walk by the HOLY SPIRIT, by grace through faith. Kenyon, however, on page 30 says that Paul was speaking of our recreated human spirit, not the Holy Spirit, in Rom. 8:4 and that the flesh equals the senses. Then on page 31 he (wrongly) speaks (as he often does) of the "creative faith" and "dominating faith" of our born-again spirits. I must

say that the more I study Kenyon, doing research for this paper, the more I have strong reservations. Two of the passages that I consider to be the most important passages in the New Testament to understand the gospel are Gal. 5:16-25 and Rom. 8:1-14.

Kenyon isn't consistent in the way he speaks of the Holy Spirit. Sometimes he rightly emphasizes our total dependence on the Holy Spirit, as the New Testament does. Other places he puts most of the emphasis on our super exalted status with our recreated human spirits, which enables us to live on terms of equality with God, to create by faith, as God does, etc. I'll say more about Kenyon's serious inconsistencies as we continue.

I'll include an excerpt from Dale Simmon's book (the book is discussed later in this paper) where he quotes from Kenyon. This is the most extreme example I know of where Kenyon way overstated the status of born-again Christians, which he frequently did (Kenyon was waxing eloquent; I think most Christians will agree that this is serious error): "So close is our identification with God that 'we become a mirror in which the Father sees Himself'" [quoting from Kenyon's *New Creation Realities* (ninth edition, 1964, originally published in 1945), page 158]. Kenyon's tendency to blur the distinction between Creator and created is somewhat explicable [but seriously wrong] in light of his views on humanity's original station [in other words, in the light of Kenyon's extreme view on what Adam was like before the fall]" (quoted from page 99 of Simmon's book). We will speak a lot more about these things as we continue with this paper.

Along the same line, Kenyon was inconsistent in the ways he spoke about faith. Sometimes he (rightly) spoke of our faith in God, but he also (wrongly) often spoke of our creative faith, where we, like God, create things by our faith. On page 56 of *Two Kinds of Faith* (1942), Kenyon made the confusing statement that "faith is the result of action." (Actually action is the result of faith; we act and walk by faith.) In the next sentence he says, "Believing is taking the step up to the object, the thing that you want. Faith is having arrived." (?) I will have more to say about Kenyon's views regarding the super exalted status of born again Christians and regarding our creative faith later in this paper.

I'll include another excerpt from page 122 of Hunt's *Occult Invasion*, where Hunt makes a similar accusation: "If the power of God is a force like gravity that works according to scientific laws (as...Hagin...[and others] claim), then anyone (Christian or atheist) who follows these laws scientifically may utilize God's miraculous power. Hagin declares that even non-Christians can receive miracles by applying God's 'laws of faith.' " Hunt refers to three pages of Hagin's 1980 mini-book *Having Faith in Your Faith* to back up what he said here. I'll quote key parts of this mini-book later in this paper. (Hunt also refers to the same pages of this mini-book on pages 120 and 494.)

I had never read that mini-book, and I disagree with much that Hagin said on those three pages, but I am totally sure that Hagin didn't say all that Hunt thinks he said. For one super-important point, the rest of what Hagin said throughout this mini-book (and essentially everything else he ever said throughout his lengthy ministry) makes it clear that Hagin was speaking of the *faith of born-*

*again Christians*, except for one easy-to-understand qualification, which I'll mention as we continue. Hagin did say in the three pages Hunt referred to, "It used to bother me when I'd see unsaved people getting results, but my church members not getting results. Then it dawned on me what the sinners were doing. They were cooperating with this law of God—the law of faith." I believe we should forget "the law of faith" just as we should forget "the force of faith." Neither idea is Biblical, and both lend themselves to an occult view of faith.

It would be easy to misunderstand what Hagin said here (as Hunt did), but I'm sure that Hagin was limiting what he said to people who were looking to the God of the Bible and Christianity. The examples Hagin gives in his article "The Law of Faith," which we'll discuss later, should suffice to confirm this point. Hagin was not including people who have an occult faith in a god who doesn't really exist, or an occult faith in some great human potential, or in some great Force, etc.

And I'll include another excerpt from page 355 of *Occult Invasion* where Hunt makes a similar accusation against Hagin (and the entire "Faith movement), an accusation that I believe is seriously wrong: "Nowhere does the Bible teach that any man or woman can decree whatever he or she desires and make it happen by adherence to some universal law, by Positive Thinking or speaking it forth in a Positive Confession. That delusion, however, is shared by all occult systems, and is taught dogmatically by the Hagins...and other Positive Confession leaders."

Almost everything Hagin ever taught that I am aware of makes it clear that his teaching about faith was intended for born-again Christians who are living for God, in accordance with His Word, and that it is God who gives them the things they need and desire. As I mentioned Hagin also understood that non-Christians who were open to the God of the Bible and Christianity could, on occasion, receive from God by faith.

I have heard Hagin say that just like Jesus mentioned that he hadn't found such faith with anyone in Israel like he found with the Gentile centurion in Matt. 8:5-13, that he, on occasion, found non-Christians quicker to receive by faith than most Christians. In most such cases the people go on to become Christians by faith. I trust that most of my readers will agree that God sometimes heals non-Christians, or answers other prayers for them, before they become Christians, and especially if He is dealing with them about become Christians.

If Hagin were to use an expression like the "law of confession," for example, he would typically be speaking of the requirement for *Christians* to confess God's Word, in faith, and to refrain from confessing things that don't line up with God's Word. He didn't teach about an occult law which will work for people who practice occult principles and religions. Hagin even makes it clear that a "law of confession" is not going to work for Christians who are living in sin.

I should also say that I am quite sure that some people in the faith movement have crossed the line and are practicing an occult faith to one degree, or another. People around the faith movement who aren't born again, or who are not living with God and His Word and His will being their top priority, for example, could practice an occult faith. And I have to admit that some of the faith teachers are responsible for some of this confusion. (As I demonstrate in this paper, Hagin

said several things that could lead to an occult view of faith if they are isolated from the total thrust of what he taught about faith.) I wouldn't be surprised to learn that some "faith teachers" themselves may be teaching (and living) an occult faith to one degree, or another, but I am confident that Hagin does not fit in this category. It is beyond the scope of this paper for me to discuss other faith teachers (with the exception of Kenyon to some extent, because his teaching influenced Hagin and many others quite a bit). For one thing, I don't have enough information to adequately comment on other faith teachers.

On pages 118-120 of *Occult Invasion*, Hunt has a section titled "Kenneth Hagin and 'Positive Confession,'" and he discussed him (and others) on pages 344, 483-497. (Also see chapters 3 and 4 of his book *Beyond Seduction*.) Hunt can cite a few places in Hagin's extensive writings that make it sound like he believed that Christians, or non-Christians, can use the "law of faith" to work their will, through believing and confessing what they want. However, as I have mentioned, based on what I have read and heard and know of Hagin's life and ministry, which is a lot, his entire teaching about faith was directed to, and intended for, born again Christians (and for those who are open to the Lord Jesus Christ and Christianity) that had absolutely nothing to do with an occult faith that anybody can use, Christians or non-Christians. For Hagin, God got the glory for the things we receive, or do, by faith; God wasn't left out of the faith equation; He was right in the center of what faith is all about for Hagin, and he very much lived his Christian life in rather constant communion with God.

A significant part of Hagin's ministry, along with his evangelistic work and his teaching the Word of God, was devoted to ministering to those who needed healing, including physical, mental, and spiritual healing (including dealing with demon spirits), with the ministry and gifts the Lord Jesus had given him. One point was super-clear, the people who came for healing, whether Christians, or not, were required to look to the Lord Jesus Christ for healing (not to Hagin, or our creative faith, or a law of faith, etc.) and to give Him (and God the Father who sent Him) all the glory for everything that was done. For one thing, Hagin was required to make it known that he had been anointed to minister to the sick, etc. by the Lord Jesus Christ, who had appeared to him. I should also mention that Hagin was a fanatic about emphasizing the need for us (all ministers, all Christians) to be established in the Word of God. It isn't good enough to try to be established in gifts of the Spirit or experiences, even if all of the experiences come by the Holy Spirit.

Hagin picked up several wrong ideas from others over the years (especially from Kenyon) and perhaps added a few of his own; however, based on my observations, those wrong ideas typically remained very much secondary to his God-centered, Bible-centered understanding of faith and Christianity. ((Hagin picked up the serious error that Jesus died spiritually from Kenyon, but he was solid on the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, including His

preexistence in the beginning with the Father,<sup>2</sup> and he frequently spoke of the death of Christ (His blood, His cross). See my paper *Did Jesus Die Spiritually?* on my internet site. Based on what I have seen, Hagin didn't emphasize that doctrine,<sup>3</sup> but it was taught at Rhema and has done a lot of damage. Not only is that a serious doctrinal error, but it also had the effect of turning off multitudes of Christians from all the good things Hagin had to give to the Body of Christ.)) Hagin began to minister in 1934, but he says he had never heard of Kenyon (who died in 1948) until 1950, when a brother in the Lord gave him some of Kenyon's books (see the Preface of Hagin's book *The Name of Jesus*, 1979).

I am not trying to minimize the fact that Hagin did say things about faith on occasion which could result in substantial damage for those not grounded in a solid understanding of faith as it is taught in the New Testament and of new-covenant salvation. The problems were amplified when at least some of the faith teachers who got their start listening to Hagin picked up errors (errors that were not part of the faith message that the Lord Jesus had sent Hagin to preach and errors that were not foundational to Hagin's teaching about walking before God by faith and receiving from Him by faith) and they expanded on them, including, for example, the idea that we can create by faith (or the force of faith), since we have the God-kind of faith. We shouldn't be talking about creating by faith, or a force of faith, or becoming little gods, or about existing on terms of equality with God, etc., which has been done by some in the faith movement. God must receive all the glory; He must be in the center of our hearts; we must be humble before Him; we are totally dependent on Him.

I always understood that If God and His Word (rightly divided) is not at the very heart of what we are doing, we could very well tap into an occult power. The devil has always been willing to do things for those who turn their eyes from God and His Word (His word rightly divided) and look for power, success, healing, or anything else. I believe the temptation to tap into occult power was what enticed Eve in the Garden of Eden. (See my paper on Genesis chapters 1-3.) Occult power perfectly fits what the pride of man is looking for (and we all have the potential to yield to pride), and the devil can be very subtle and make his poison look, and taste, good for a while, but it kills.

It is very clear to me that Hagin did not learn faith from Kenyon, which you often hear from his critics (see the following paragraph for example). He learned to walk by faith and to receive from God by faith, based on what the Bible says (very much including verses like Mark 11:22-25). Most of this started when he was 16 years old (he became bedfast four months before he became 16 in 1933; he became a born-again Christian through a powerful experience the first day he became bedfast; he had been raised in a Southern Baptist church); he was on his death bed, waiting to die. Every doctor who had examined him said there was

---

<sup>2</sup> See page 28 of *The Name of Jesus* [Rhema Bible Church, 1979], for example.

<sup>3</sup> Hagin understood that the doctrine was controversial. For one thing, Hagin was very good friends with, and had very significant respect for the ministry, of J. R. Goodwin (including his teaching ministry) and his wife, who were Assembly of God ministers, starting in 1938. Mel Montgomery informed me in an e-mail that Hagin understood that the Goodwins rejected that teaching of Kenyon.



nothing the medical profession could do to heal his very serious organic heart problems and other problems; he had to die, and rather soon.

I'll quote a paragraph from pages 118, 119 of Hunt's *Occult Invasion*. "Kenneth Hagin's gospel can be traced back to the writings of E. W. Kenyon, who first taught 'the positive confession of the Word of God' [[Hunt has an endnote: "E. W. Kenyon and Don Gossett, *The Positive Confession of the Word of God* (Custom Graphics, 1981), pages 133-37, 152-55." As I make it clear in this paper, I don't believe that the heart of Hagin's teaching on faith came from Kenyon, but his teaching was supplemented (substantially supplemented) by Kenyon's teaching, sometimes with positive effects, but sometimes with negative effects. (I can't think of anything that Hagin learned from Kenyon that he needed to fulfill his assigned ministry, but I can think of quite a few things that he learned from Kenyon that were wrong, some of them seriously wrong.) Also, I trust my readers will agree that it is good to confess the Word of God, and wrong to confess things that go against the Word of God or things that insult God one way or another. I don't believe Kenyon said any more than this in the pages Hunt referred to here.<sup>4</sup>]] and must be recognized as the real founder of today's Positive confession movement. Kenyon studied at the Emerson College of Oratory in Boston, a hotbed of the emerging New Thought philosophy. [[Hunt has an endnote: John Coffee and Richard L. Wentworth, *A Century of Eloquence: The History of Emerson College, 1890-1980* (Alternative Publications, 1982)." See D. R. McConnell, *A Different Gospel* on Kenyon's interaction with metaphysical religion. McConnell "did his graduate work at Oral Roberts University in theological and historical studies." You can learn from McConnell's book, but I don't agree with all of his conclusions regarding Kenneth Hagin or E. W. Kenyon. I believe the three books by Joe McIntyre, Dale Simmons, and Robert Bowman, which are all discussed in this paper, suffice to show that McConnell has overstated the extent to which Kenyon was influenced by the metaphysical religions.]] Kenyon's teaching about 'the power of words' and his warnings never to make a 'negative confession' [[Hunt has an endnote: "Kenyon and Gossett,

---

<sup>4</sup> I'll include two short excerpts from Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1945, page 157) to demonstrate that Kenyon often (rightly) spoke of God's direct involvement in bringing things to pass in response to our confession of His Word. "If we confess our freedom, that the Son has made us free [John 8:31-36], God makes that confession a reality." "When we confess His Word, He watches over it to make it good, but there is no action on the part of God without our confession." I wouldn't say that God never acts apart from our confession, but it is important for us to believe/have faith in, and to speak in line with, God's Word. And I'll include an excerpt from page 189 that (rightly) emphasizes our dependence on God and His Son and puts them in the center of what takes place in our lives, "It makes no difference how difficult the problem may look to us we have One seated at the Right Hand of God the Father who ever lives to make intercession for us." And although Kenyon sometimes put the emphasis on our exalted status of living on terms of equality with God and our creative faith, etc. (which is serious error), he often said things like the following: "Phil. 2:13, 'For it is God who is at work within me, willing and working his own good pleasure.' ... It is the most thrilling fact this side of heaven. We are united with God in Christ. ... He said, 'Lo, I am with you always.' He is there to bless you, strengthen, to empower, to give wisdom until our whole being swings in rhythm to His will. He has not left us without authority. ... Our call is to go empowered with His power, filled with Himself, our lips with His words upon them" (pages 172, 173).

*Confession*, pages 120-36, 152-55, 182-85, etc." I don't agree with everything that Gossett and Kenyon said on these pages, but essentially everything they said on these pages is centered in God and on thinking and speaking in agreement with His Word.]] deeply influenced Hagin and many others who are recognized as leaders of this movement. Kenyon also taught that man is a little god 'in God's class' [[We will discuss these words later in this paper; Kenyon greatly overstated the status of born-again Christians in some of his writings, even as he greatly overstated the status of Adam before the fall.]] and therefore can use the same faith-force that God does. [[Hunt has an endnote: "E. W. Kenyon, *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne?* (Kenyon, 1945, 5<sup>th</sup> ed.), pp. 62, 173-75." We will discuss this last sentence from Hunt and the cross-reference to Kenyon later in this paper. Kenyon made a serious mistake with his teaching that born-again Christians can use the same faith-force that God does. For one thing, the Bible doesn't speak of God having a "faith-force," or creative-faith, or faith.]] We allegedly create our own reality with the words of our mouths: 'What I confess; I possess' [Hunt has an endnote: "E. W. Kenyon, *The Hidden Man: An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind* (Kenyon, 1970), p. 98."]. If these words ("What I confess; I possess") are disconnected from a God-centered, Bible-centered faith, where we are making it a top priority to live for God and give Him all the glory, they could easily be understood in an occult sense. As I have mentioned, I am afraid that some people in, or on the edges of, the faith movement are using an occult faith. As I have also mentioned, I am confident that Hagin was solidly grounded in a God-centered, Bible-centered faith, not an occult faith.

Hagin learned about faith for healing, and the faith of Christians in general, from the Lord Jesus (mostly by the Holy Spirit) teaching him what the Bible says on the topic. After he was healed by God through faith (he knew that he was healed by the Lord Jesus, and God the Father who sent Him, not by some universal "law of faith") and had learned more about faith through the Word and other experiences, he says (and I believe it) that God commissioned him to teach faith. Essentially none, if any, of that early teaching had any input from Kenyon, or anybody else, with any ideas that were not Biblical.

It is clear that Hagin's later teaching was influenced by the teaching of others (especially the teaching of Kenyon; it is clear that Hagin respected Kenyon's teaching on faith, healing, etc.) in many of the details. I suppose the primary factor that led to the similarity of the details of Hagin's teaching with others was the fact that Hagin had a photographic memory after he became a born-again Christian. After being healed and going back to high school, he found that he could read a chapter of a history book and then quote the chapter word for word. He could quote large parts of the Bible without having tried to memorize any verses.

This could be a great blessing, but it led to problems for Hagin. It is clear that sometimes Hagin would quote extensively from others in some of his sermons/teachings. (I heard him say on an old audio recording that he often quoted others in his sermons/teachings. His motive was simply to bless the people he was ministering to with the best he could provide.) This probably would

not have resulted in any serious problems if it were not for the fact that the editors of many of Hagin's earlier books transcribed the words from the recordings without realizing that much of that material had originally been quoted from others.

I'm confident that this happened to a significant extent, and I am rather confident that some, if not most, of the places where Hagin's writings sound quite different than what he typically taught (and are often wrong), came to be written that way. I'll give some key examples from Hagin's writings as we continue with this paper.

Hagin's popular booklet *The Authority of the Believer* (32 pages; original edition), was taken essentially word for word from audio tapes of Hagin's earlier teaching. (I had copies [two seven-inch reel-to-reel tape recordings] of the recordings that were made during a meeting in 1963 where Hagin was teaching on that topic. Most of the book was essentially word-for-word the same as the recordings.) D. R. McConnell (*A Different Gospel* [Hendrickson Publishers, 1988], page 69) points out that "as much as 75% [of that book] was taken from a series of articles published in 1932 by John A. MacMillan under the same title...." It is clear, I believe, that Hagin quoted extensively from MacMillan in those 1963 teachings. (I later got a copy of MacMillan's booklet too.) It is beyond the scope of this paper for me to interact much with McConnell's book. For one thing, I decided during the course of writing this paper that I am not especially interested in discussing *where* Kenyon got his wrong ideas (the topic is complicated and controversial). However, as I have mentioned, I am quite sure that McConnell overstated Kenyon's involvement with metaphysical religions.

It is clear, I believe, that Hagin quoted extensively from Kenyon after he began to read his writings, and that some (much) of that material ended up in Hagin's books. It is interesting that there is an article on Kenyon's "Gospel Publishing Society" site, titled "Plagiarism of E. W. Kenyon by Kenneth E. Hagin?" I'll quote a small part of this article. "In his book, *A Different Gospel*, D. R. McConnell goes to some length to show that Kenneth Hagin plagiarized the writings of E. W. Kenyon. Some have contacted the office of Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society quite irritated about the situation. So what is our response? ...

First of all, it must be noted that Kenneth Hagin, to the best of my knowledge does not actually write his books. What I mean by this is that his books are for the most part transcriptions of his speaking ministry. ... Hagin has noted that he has an almost photographic memory. Reading or hearing something once was all that was necessary for him to recall it verbatim. ... We consider Kenneth E. Hagin to be a great man of God. ... Kenyon is probably delighted that Kenneth E. Hagin has been so successful in getting the message of faith, so dear to Kenyon's heart, out to so many in the world of this generation. ...." (I should point out that McConnell's book was very critical of Hagin AND Kenyon.)

**3. I read (with some skimming) several of Hagin's books to see how much of his teaching about faith could fit in the category of occult faith instead of Bible faith.** I had read essentially all of these books before, but it had been a

long time; I started reading his literature and listening to his recordings in 1966. I followed his teaching extensively until about 1975, when I first read his teaching about Jesus dying spiritually. I don't think I have ever heard him teach on that subject on an audio recording, or on the radio, TV, or at a meeting I attended. He didn't emphasize that teaching, and he was clear on the deity of Christ (and the Trinity), but I considered that teaching to be a serious problem. I continued to follow his ministry, but with some reservation. By 1995, or so, I had backed off further since, for one thing, I learned that the doctrine that Jesus died spiritually was still being taught at Rhema. Since that time I haven't purchased any more of his books or teaching tapes or read his monthly magazine *The Word of Faith*, but I still have significant respect for his ministry, and I still listen to his audio recordings, not that I agree with everything he says. (I probably have had something like 200 of his audio recordings.)

The first book I chose to read was Hagin's 126 page book *I Believe in Visions* (1972, 126 pages). I didn't find any evidence for any ideas of faith that were not totally centered in God and His Word; there is nothing about a law of faith that will work for anybody, etc. Later in this lengthy section, I'll comment on a few rather serious problems I have with a few details in Hagin's account of the vision he had when the Lord Jesus appeared to him in December, 1952 (in chapter 4 of *I Believe in Visions*). The second book was the *Bible Faith Study Course* (13<sup>th</sup> printing in 1984, 127 large pages). I'll list the articles in this book: "How Faith Comes #1" and #2; "What Faith Is #1" and #s 2-4; "What It Means to Believe with the Heart #1" and #2; "How To Turn Your Faith Loose #1" and #s 2-4; "Seven Steps to the Highest Kind of Faith #1" and #s 2-4; "Six Big Hindrances to Faith"; "Confession Brings Possession"; "Actions that Correspond with Faith"; "How to Write Your Own Ticket with God"; "Doubt, Thief of God's Greater Blessing"; "You Can Have What You Say"; and "How to Train the Human Spirit." I cannot say that I agree with everything Hagin says in these articles, but they contain very little content that could (wrongly) be understood to teach an occult view of faith, and the content of this book is very much centered in God and His Word: we look to Him on the basis of His Word; we receive from Him; we believe, speak, and act in line with His Word; we give Him all the glory, etc. I'll briefly discuss the few places where some people who aren't born again, or Christians who aren't centered in God and His Word, could take off with a "faith" that isn't centered in God if they were to limit themselves to those few sentences, paragraphs, etc.

I'll quote part of a paragraph from page 88, in the chapter titled "The God Kind of Faith." "Now let us focus our attention on the statement, 'Have faith in God' [Mark 11:22]. Or, as the margin [referring to a marginal note found in some Bibles] reads, 'Have the faith of God.' Or, as Greek scholars tell us, 'Have the God kind of faith.' [The Greek could be translated 'Have the faith of God' or be understood in the sense 'Have the God kind of faith,' and you sometimes hear that a translation like "Have the faith of God" is a more literal translation. That isn't true! There is super widespread agreement that the Greek noun for *faith* here is an *objective* genitive, meaning that it should be translated 'have faith in God,' where God is the *object* of the faith. You can't get any more literal than

that. The KJV, NKJV, NASB, NIV, Amplified Bible, and the New Living Translation, for example, all have "faith in God." Our faith (Bible faith) must be centered in God and His Word. He (with His Son, the Holy Spirit, and His Word) IS WORTHY OF OUR FAITH!]] Jesus demonstrated that He had the God kind of faith. ...."

If we understand Jesus to speak of the God kind of faith (Jesus was the One speaking in Mark 11:22-25), we open the door for some to think in terms of their God-kind-of faith moving mountains, while God is passive (without any involvement of God), which is totally wrong. For one thing, IT IS SIGNIFICANT THAT MARK 11:22 SPEAKS OF HAVING FAITH IN GOD, AND 11:24 SPEAKS OF PRAYING TO GOD (in faith, without doubting in our hearts). Ultimately, one way, or another, God is the One who moves mountains that need to be moved, and He must receive all the glory. We may be the ones who command the mountain, demon, etc. to move, on occasion, but when we do, we do it in the name of (by the authority of the name of Jesus) and before God the Father who hears our words. Our command in faith is nothing without the power of God backing up our words; He (one way, or another) moves the mountains that it is His will to move (in line with His Word and His assignments to us as His ministers and His born-again and adopted children).

It is clear that Hagin did not think in terms of God's being uninvolved when things take place through our faith, or fail to thank Him or give Him all the glory. ((There is an unfortunate statement in Hagin's 1974 article "The Law of Faith," which we will discuss below, where Hagin speaks of a "law of faith" that works without "any intervention of God," but that mistaken statement goes against essentially everything Hagin says about faith throughout the years, and how he lived his life, and must not be given any weight. Hagin probably picked up (and quoted) those words from someone else and he didn't stop to think what he was saying. (Most of us have done that.) And it is very significant, as we will see when we discuss that article, that Hagin only applies that supposed "law of faith" to those who have faith in the God of the Bible, and he speaks of God doing the healing.)) I have to say, however, that I have, on occasion heard faith-movement Christians speak of faith in a way that seemed to leave God out of the equation. He wasn't directly involved in the things that took place through their faith (through their creative-faith; their force of faith). They created the swimming pool in their back yard by their faith, etc. A godly Christian might say something like that—I have heard such things from godly Christians—but such comments don't give much thanks to God or glorify Him, do they? (Well, we could thank Him for making us so great through Christ that we don't need Him anymore. No, I'm not serious!) As I mentioned, all too often many of us don't think about what we are saying. And there always is the temptation (sometimes it can be a strong temptation that we are aware of; sometimes it is takes place in subtle ways that sneak around just below the level of our conscious awareness of them) to gain some glory for ourselves. Pride is at the root of sin!

I'll quote a few sentences from the last paragraph of Hagin's article, "The God Kind of Faith" (in the *Bible Faith Study Course*). "There are two things to notice about the God kind of faith [I believe we should forget about the "God kind of

faith"; it isn't a Biblical concept, and it lends itself to an occult view of faith]; first a man believes in his heart [It is important to know that genuine, Bible faith is of the heart], second, he believes in his words. [We must believe (have faith) in God and know that our words are in accordance with God, with His Word and His will.] ... TO GET GOD TO WORK FOR YOU [my emphasis].... [I wanted to quote these last words to demonstrate that even here (where Hagin spoke of having the God kind of faith and having faith in your words), it is clear that he was not leaving God out of the equation. Ultimately (one way, or another) God does the work, and He must receive the glory. Furthermore, it is clear that Hagin wasn't thinking of a law of (occult) faith that will work for anybody. He makes it clear in this discussion that it only born-again Christians who have this faith, for one thing.

Let's briefly discuss the article (in the *Bible Faith Study Course*) titled, "Confession Brings Possession." A person could understand these words in a way that would leave God out of the equation, but Hagin clearly doesn't leave God out of the equation in this article. Hagin speaks, for example, of thanking God for the things we confess, because it is God who brings these things to pass (these things that are in alignment with His Word and His will). Our confession, in faith, before God, of things that line up with His Word and His will for us can be considered a form of prayer (we are looking to Him to bring these things to pass), and it glorifies God. Our faith glorifies God, even as the answer to our prayers glorifies Him, because it is understood that He did it. (I appreciate Rom. 4:20, "He [Abraham] staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God" [KJV]; we glorify God by having faith in Him and His Word/promises.)

God is the One who answers our prayers; the answer (desired results) does not come because of some law of faith, or force of creative faith, or creative power that we have in ourselves. And although God's Word is alive and powerful, the combination of our faith and God's Word isn't going to move mountains by itself—we can never leave God Himself out of the equation! (We can never leave God out of any aspect of our lives!) If we leave Him out of the equation, the results may well come from the god of this world, and that will NEVER work for ultimate good.

I'll include two excerpts from the article "Actions that Correspond with Faith" (in Hagin's *Bible Faith Study Course*) to further demonstrate that Hagin does not leave God out of the faith equation, far from it. "If you don't take the Word [of God] to be yours [by believing it, confessing it, praying in line with it, and acting upon it], HE DOESN'T HAVE ANYTHING TO MAKE GOOD IN YOUR LIFE [my emphasis]" (page 98). "... The language of faith says, 'I can do all things in Him. Our Father strengthens us. I cannot be conquered and I cannot be defeated.' ... 'Greater is He who is in you than he that is in the world.' You are fortified from within. ... Not only am I born of God, a partaker of His love, but I have dwelling in me the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead. I have God's wisdom, strength, and ability in me [Hagin's emphasis]. I'm learning how to let that wisdom

govern my intellect. I'm letting Him govern my mind and speak through my lips. I'm daring to think God's thoughts after Him. I'm daring to say in the presence of all my old enemies, 'God is my ability' " (pages 101, 102). Statements like this that give God all the glory are typical for Hagin throughout his lengthy ministry.

For the record, Kenyon would have agreed with everything that Hagin said in the last quotation from pages 101, 102. In fact, it seems clear that much of what Hagin said here was borrowed from Kenyon (whether consciously or unconsciously), sometimes word for word, sometimes condensed, etc. See Kenyon's *Two Kinds of Faith* (1942), pages 44, 45. I just happened to note the very strong similarity when I was reading in Kenyon's book after I had quoted from Hagin in this paper. As I mentioned, Hagin had a photographic memory, and he often quoted extensively, or borrowed heavily, from Kenyon in his teachings, and many of Hagin's books were transcribed from audio recordings of his earlier teachings.

The article titled "How to Write Your Own Ticket with God" (in Hagin's *Bible Faith Study Course*) could lead to presumption and other errors if not accompanied by things like humility and putting God first in every area of your life, looking to Him, living for Him (which includes obeying Him), and speaking and praying in line with His Word and will. (These things are all included in what faith in God means in the New Testament, when the word *faith* is used in a full sense. Notice how the word *faith* is used in Hebrews chapter 11, for example.) It is clear in Hagin's article that WE RECEIVE FROM GOD and we give Him the glory for the things He has done. We are not using some occult faith to create the things we want while God (the God of creation, the God of the Bible) is an onlooker. Every aspect of our full and eternal salvation comes by the grace of God through faith in God and His Word. He is our God through new-covenant salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Holy Spirit, who indwells all true Christians! (I'll comment further on Hagin's article *How to Write Your Own Ticket with God* when briefly discussing Hank Hanegraaff's *Christianity in Crisis*.)

And lastly, I'll comment briefly on the article "You Can Have What You Say" in the *Bible Faith Study Course*. It is obvious that these words could be understood in a way that would leave God out of the equation, but it is clear that Hagin intended these words in a context where the Christian life is totally oriented to God and His Word and His will, and for His glory. That's the way Hagin attempted to live his life, in obedience to God and His Word and His will, in truth, fellowship, and worship. He was very aware of the fact that he would have to answer to God for his life and ministry. For one thing, he had learned the hard way that there is a limit to how much God will put up with disobedience. There were at least two occasions where he was on the verge of death that God told him that he had to choose whether to repent and do what He required him to do, or to die, and there were other times that He chastened him severely for disobedience.

It is also true that we must be careful not to say things (to confess things) that go against what God has said. What happened at Kadesh in Numbers chapters 13, 14, which Hagin referred to in this article, provides a powerful illustration. The

ten spies who brought back an *evil* report (that's what God called their report), who were followed by the people of Israel in rebelling against God, said that they could not take the land of Caanan (the power of those dwelling in the land was too great, they said) and they rebelled against God. Of course God never expected them to take the land of Caanan on their own, any more than He had expected them to defeat Egypt.

The people said that it would have been better to die in Egypt or in the wilderness. I'll quote Num. 14:28-30, "Say to them, 'As I live,' says the LORD [Yahweh]. 'Just as you have spoken in my hearing, so I will surely do to you; your corpses will fall in this wilderness, even all your numbered men, according to your complete number from twenty years old and upward, who have grumbled against Me. Surely you will not come into the land in which I swore to settle you, except Caleb the son of Jephunneh and Joshua the son of Nun [who were the two faithful spies of the twelve who were sent to check out the land of Canaan].' " I have learned over the years that most Christians don't know what happened to the ten spies. Numbers 14:36-38 show that they "died by a plague before the LORD [Yahweh]." (On the super-important name *Yahweh*, see my paper *The Name Yahweh and God the Father and God the Son*.)

It is very important for us to speak in agreement with God's Word. It causes serious problems when we say we cannot do what God calls us to do, for one thing. We have a gigantic problem with Christians believing and saying we cannot stop sinning against God. To make matter worse, much worse, I have discovered that large numbers of Christians (even the majority) think the New Testament teaches that we cannot stop sinning this side of glory. How can God help us do what He has called us to do while we are believing and saying we cannot do it. We can do what He calls us to do by His sufficient grace (which includes all the work of the indwelling Holy Spirit) through faith! I'm sharing good news! And forgiveness is provided if we should sin when we sincerely repent. (See my book, *Holiness and Victory Over Sin: Full Salvation Through the Atoning Death of the Lord Jesus Christ*.)

Next I chose Kenneth Hagin's *Bible Prayer Study Course* (no date, 169 large pages) to read (sometimes skimming), looking for the kind of problems Dave Hunt was concerned about. I'll list the articles in the book: "Seven Steps to Answered Prayer #1" and #2; "The Prayer of Binding and Loosing"; "Praying in Jesus' Name"; "Praying for Results"; "Agreement in Prayer"; "7 Most Important Things in Prayer #1" and #s 2-4; "Praying with Tongues"; "The Prayer of Faith"; "The Prayer of Worship"; "United Prayer"; "The Prayer of Commitment"; "What Jesus Said About Prayer #1" and #2; "What Paul Said About Prayer #1" and #s 2, 3; "What Others Said About Prayer"; "The Will of God in Prayer #1" and #s 2, 3.

I don't believe there is anything in any of these articles where Kenneth Hagin says anything about a law of faith that will work for anybody, or of a force of faith, or of our creating by faith, etc. The faith that Hagin speaks of is a faith that is totally grounded in God and His Word. We pray to God the Father in the name of



Jesus in accordance with God's Word, which includes our asking for things that are God's will for us. I only noticed one place in this book where what Hagin said could be taken out of the context in which he said it and be misused in an occult sense. I'll deal with that as we continue.

First I'll include an excerpt from the beginning of this book (on page 5) that is so typical of Hagin's emphasis when it comes to praying in faith. "Step number one is to decide what you want from God and get the scripture that definitely promises you these things. ... IF THE SCRIPTURES DON'T PROMISE YOU THESE THINGS, YOU DON'T HAVE ANY BUSINESS PRAYING FOR THEM [my emphasis]. You shouldn't want anything that the Word of God says you shouldn't have. Many are trying to pray beyond their faith. It's the Word of God that gives you faith. The reason people are not praying with confidence and faith is that they're not finding the scriptural proof. They don't know for sure if it's God's will or not. They hope it is.

Get these scriptures firmly fixed in your heart and not just in the mind. You'll have to meditate in the Word of God. Joshua 1:8 [KJV] says, 'This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein; for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.' Another translation says, 'that thou mayest be able to deal wisely in the affairs of life.' It comes about by meditation in God's Word. That's the way you'll build God's Word into your inner consciousness. You feed upon the Word. Be ready to use these scriptures against demons who will try to make you doubt God and rob you of what you want. It is the devil who tries to make you doubt God."

Hagin emphasized that we are instructed to pray to the Father in the name of Jesus. (See page 15 in this book for example.) He was always very clear on the distinction between the Persons of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. (On the Trinity, see my papers *Who Do We Worship?*; *Who Do We Pray To?*; *More on the Trinity*; and *The Name Yahweh and God the Father and God the Son*.)

What Hagin says on pages 31 and 32 about the instructions the Lord Jesus gave him to solve his desperate financial problems at that time could be turned into an occult technique if it were taken out of the context of being centered in God (the God of the Bible; the God of creation).

We need to consider a preliminary question. Did the Lord Jesus really reveal these things to Hagin, or was he deluded or deceived by a messenger of Satan? I am very much aware that many sincere people, including some sincere Christians, have been deceived by clever demonic messages that they thought were from God. Based on what I know of Hagin, I believe he received this revelation from the Lord Jesus. I believe it is also important to note that Hagin didn't say that Jesus instructed him to teach all Christians to follow these steps.

At that time Hagin was serving God on a full time basis, going from church to church holding meetings, but he was going deeper in debt every month. (The

financial problems began when Hagin quit pastoring churches to begin to travel, at the instruction of the Lord Jesus.) For one thing, as Hagin mentions other places, Jesus required an attitude adjustment on Hagin's part (and his wife's too). Hagin resented the fact that he had to be away from his wife and two young children most of the time after he was required to begin a traveling ministry. When Hagin saw that he couldn't rightly continue to complain about his assignment (from God), he repented. Also, I am quite sure that Hagin was a special target for the devil, who was making it a top priority item to try to stop his ministry. I believe the Lord Jesus Christ, and the devil, believed that Hagin's ministry was quite important.

Hagin says the Lord Jesus gave him a three step solution to his financial problems: (Actually Hagin only mentions two of the steps here, but he mentions the other step other places, and I believe it is important for us to consider that other step.) (1) To claim before God (God who always was in the center of Hagin's life and ministry, not some occult technique, etc.) the money he needed/wanted (this is a type of prayer before God); (2) to send the ministering spirits (angels of God) to fulfill their role in bringing the money to Hagin; and (3) to command the devil (and his hosts) to take his hands off of the money.

The Bible warns Christians that we must not worship angels or look to angels for anything. (I'm sure Hagin agrees!) We must look to God for everything we need, not angels, even though God frequently uses His angels to minister to us (cf., e.g., Heb. 1:14; Rev. 19:10; 22:8, 9; the Bible frequently mentions the ministry of God's angels; it also warns us to be very careful we don't look to, worship, or submit in any way to Satan or his angels or demons [cf. Col. 2:18; 2 Cor. 11:12-15]).

I'll quote a few sentences from page 143. ((One of the biggest problems I used to see around many faith movement people was that they insisted that if they would pray in faith they would receive an answer to their prayers, their prayers for healing, for example. They didn't want to hear about any conditions for their receiving; they said that whether a person was living in sin, or not, wasn't relevant. I don't think this problem is as widespread now as it used to be. Anyway, Hagin always made it clear (not that he made it clear every time he spoke of praying in faith) that we shouldn't expect an answer to our prayers before we repent, where repentance is required.))

On page 143 Hagin was dealing with James 5:13-18. "...If he has sinned he will have to confess it. ... If he hasn't confessed it to God, he is not going to get healed with unconfessed sin in his life. ... You are not going to get healed with unconfessed sin in your life no matter who prays." Hagin's teaching makes it clear that sometimes we are required to make things right with another person we have wronged. Repentance includes making things right to the extent we are able to do so.

One last comment regarding the *Bible Prayer Study Course*. I'll quote a few sentences from page 167, "We know...that saving the lost is [God's] will. We know that because we know the Word. It was to that end that Jesus died. 'God so

loved the world, that he gave his only begotten [unique] Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The point I want to make here is that Hagin frequently spoke of the death of Christ, or the cross of Christ, or the blood of Christ, etc. That was his emphasis even though in a few of his writings he made the serious mistake of (following Kenyon and) speaking of Jesus dying spiritually, taking on the nature of the devil, of His needing to be justified and born again like we are, and of His being tormented in hell for three days.

Quite a few times faith people have rejected my ministry because I said that Jesus didn't die spiritually, take on the nature of the devil, etc. It is sad when Christians make a wrong doctrine a test of orthodoxy. I am totally sure that Hagin did not make that mistake, and I have read that Kenyon did not make that controversial (wrong) doctrine a test of orthodoxy.

I determined to read (actually reread) one last book of Hagin to see how much he said, if anything, of God's law of faith that will work for anybody, saved or not, etc. *What to Do When Faith Seems Weak & Victory Lost* (RHEMA Bible Church, 1979, 123 pages). I'll quote the chapter titles of this book: 1) Recognize the source [God or Satan? We need to resist temptation (including the temptation to doubt God and His Word or to let our mind dwell on things that are against God and His divine order) and all the work of the devil]. 2) Be sure the promises of God cover the things you ask for. 3) Be sure you are not living in sin. 4) Be sure no doubt or unbelief is permitted in your life. 5) Sincerely desire the benefit. 6) ASK GOD IN FAITH NOTHING WAVERING [my emphasis]. 7) Do not tolerate a thought to the contrary. 8) Count the thing done. 9) GIVE GLORY TO GOD [my emphasis; Give the glory to God even before the answer to your prayer comes into manifestation]. 10) Act as though you have received. And, In Summation. Just reading the chapter titles shows that the faith spoken of in this book is centered in God; We ask God in faith, based on His Word; we receive from Him; and we give Him all the glory.

I'll quote a few sentences at the beginning of chapter 2 (page 25), "FAITH—BIBLE FAITH—IS BASED ON THE WORD OF GOD [my emphasis]. It comes by hearing the Word of God. 'So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God' (Rom. 10:17 [KJV]). If you get out beyond the Word of God, you have no basis for faith—and you will be in trouble." On page 33 he said, "RECOGNIZE THAT WHEN WE ARE TALKING ABOUT FAITH, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT FAITH IN GOD [my emphasis]—and faith in God is faith in His Word." On page 71, 72 he said, "The Bible says, 'Resist the devil, and he will flee from you' (James 4:7). When you resist doubt, you are resisting the devil. Whatever is of the devil, when you resist that, you are resisting the devil. If fear comes, speak to it. ... One of the greatest fights you will ever have in life is to fight fear. How are you going to do it: With the Word of God. 'Resist the devil and he will flee from you' (James 4:7). The Bible says that God has not given us the 'spirit' of fear: 'For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind' (2 Tim. 1:7)."

We need to spend some time discussing Hagin's step 8 of this book, "Count the thing done that you have asked" (pages 99-113). As long as we are clearly praying in accordance with God's Word, and we are walking in agreement with the covenant He has made with us (we shouldn't think that we have a covenant right to appropriate the blessings of the covenant while we fail to walk in agreement with the covenant [by God's grace]), it is biblical to believe we have received when we pray. In Mark 11:24, for example, Jesus speaks of believing you have received the things you have prayed for before you see the answer (based on God's character, His covenant promises, and His ability to deliver). Jesus said, "Believe that you have received them, and they will be *granted* you." He didn't say, however, that they will necessarily be granted to you immediately. (And he didn't say that you can be assured of an answer while you press on in sin, in violation of the covenant God has made with us, without repentance.)

When Hagin received his healing and left his death bed behind (in 1934), based on Mark 11:24, he said something like, If it takes 50 years, or 100 years, I am going to continue to confess that I believe I received my healing when I prayed. Keep in mind that the Lord Jesus led Hagin to step out in faith for his healing, based on the Word of God. I don't believe Hagin was out beyond the Word of God into presumption.

Although somebody could take the words, "Count the thing done that you have asked," in an unbiblical sense, Hagin is speaking of having faith in a Bible-faith sense, where our faith is in God, and the things we have asked for are clearly promised us in God's Word, and where God is the One who gives us the things we have asked Him for and He is thanked and given all the glory for giving us these things. This is the way Hagin typically speaks of faith, including in the books I mentioned above and this book. However, Hagin says several things in this chapter that substantially confuse the issue. Much of this material could have come from somebody that Hagin was quoting in a teaching, perhaps Kenyon. Anyway, Hagin is responsible for the content.

On pages 100, 101, Hagin says "We are faith children of Abraham because we have the same kind of faith that he had. What kind of faith did he have? He called those things that be not as though they were." He then quoted Rom. 4:17 (KJV), "(As it is written, I have made you a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth the things which be not as though they were." I discussed Rom. 4:16-21 in some detail on pages 50 and 51 of my *A Paper on Faith*, which is on my internet site (Google to Karl Kemp Teaching). Hagin continues, "Somebody said, 'Yes, but that's talking about God there, who calls those things which be not as though they were.'"

First, if it is wrong for me to call things which be not as though they were, it is wrong for God to do it. [[I believe this is an unfortunate statement. God is able to call things that be not as though they were because He is God and He can, and does, change things, like He did when He gave Abraham and Sarah (who had not been able to have children, not to mention their advanced ages at that time) the promised son, Isaac. We are not God (or little gods; and we do not have

creative faith<sup>5</sup>), and the only time we are able to call things that be not as though they were is when we are saying something that God has already said, or saying something in full agreement with the covenant He has made with us (like when we say "I believe I have received" before we see the answer, based on a verse like Mark 11:24). What God said He can and does make good, and He gets the glory. We don't change things by faith, but God changes things when we pray, in faith, in line with His Word and will.]]

Second, why does God call those things that be not as though they were? Because He is a faith God. [[[This double bracket continues for thirteen paragraphs. Then I'll continue to quote from Hagin.) Here we have a substantial error. I don't know where Hagin picked up this idea that God is a faith God (it could be from Kenyon; as I will demonstrate, he taught that), but it is undoubtedly related, at least to some extent, to a misinterpretation of Heb. 11:3. I'll quote the verse, "By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible." Kenyon, in his book *Two Kinds of Faith* (Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1942, page 20) interpreted Heb. 11:3 of God's creating the universe by faith. He said, for example, "Faith-filled words brought the universe into being...." However, it is very important for us to see that Heb. 11:3 is speaking of OUR faith, just as the word *faith* at the beginning of verses 1, 4, 5, 7, and many other verses of Hebrews chapter 11, refers to OUR faith.

By faith in the Word of God (in Genesis chapter 1), we understand that our universe was created by God. Hebrews 11:3 doesn't say that God created the universe by faith. ((This double parenthesis continues for ten paragraphs. I'll quote a little more from what Kenyon said on page 20, "and faith filled words are ruling that universe today. ... I have known of several women who have had organs restored that surgeons had removed through operations. Creative faith is just as real today as it was when Jesus walked in Galilee." I assume that God worked a miracle for these women through the Lord Jesus Christ in response to faith in God and His Word. If so, then God (not the creative faith of Kenyon, or these women, or anybody else) must receive the glory for those miracles. However, if they received a miracle through some occult faith technique (I don't believe this happened), then God should not be glorified (we don't glorify God for what the devil does) and the "miracle" will not result in ultimate good.

It is beyond the scope of this paper (and beyond my knowledge) for me to try to fully present what Kenyon taught, but I believe it will be helpful to go a little further here, since the idea of Christians (and even non-Christians) having creative faith that works in accordance with a "law of faith," apart from the involvement of God, is a key point in Hunt's accusation against Hagin, Kenyon, and others. Throughout this paper I make it clear that I don't believe Hagin believed or taught this. I'm not denying that Hagin made a few comments that could fit that viewpoint (most of us have made unfortunate comments), but those few comments go against the whole thrust of Hagin's teaching and his life.

---

<sup>5</sup> On page 196 of Kenyon's *In His Presence* (1944), he says, "Romans 4:19-21 gives us a picture of Abraham's creative faith."

But how about Kenyon? On pages 29-31 of *The Hidden Man* (1996) Kenyon says, "Creative faith, Dominating faith, Healing faith, and Saving faith, are all in the spirit." As he continues he makes it clear that he is speaking here of the recreated human spirit of born-again Christians. He goes on to (wrongly) say that when the Bible speaks of walking by the Spirit in Gal. 5:16, 25 and Rom. 8:4 it means to walk by the recreated human spirit, not the Holy Spirit. And he says that "Your spirit is the realm of creative faith, of dominating faith, faith that rules demons and disease." (I discussed much of what Kenyon says on Gal. 5:16, 22, 23, 25 and Rom. 8:1-4 above, on pages 12, 13.)

On page 35 of *The Hidden Man*, Kenyon says, "...we are dealing with the basic laws of man's being, the great spiritual laws that govern the unseen forces of life. There are several great forces that emanate from the recreated human spirit. ... The first force of the recreated human spirit is faith. ... God is a faith Spirit. He brought the universe into being by faith. ... He is a faith God. He works by faith. As recreated men and women, we are to work and live by faith. ...."

On pages 114 of *In His Presence* (1944, page 114) Kenyon said, "Faith is the mightiest force in the universe. It is the creative ability of God. IT IS THE CREATIVE ABILITY OF MAN [my emphasis]. ... Man was created in the image and likeness of the Faith of God." It is significant that back on page 113 Kenyon had just wrongly interpreted Heb. 11:3 to teach that God created by faith, and in the following paragraph he said, "That explains the first verse [Heb. 11:1], 'Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen,' or 'Faith is giving substance to things hoped for.' " For the faith of Christians to give substance to things hoped for would be creative faith. On page 211 of *The Hidden Man* (1996) Kenyon, referring to Heb. 11:1, said, "Faith is giving substance to a thing that has never been real as yet. ... Faith is changing the base metal into the purest gold."

I'll go a little further with what Kenyon said to try to bring some balance to this picture. Kenyon was quite inconsistent on several points.<sup>6</sup> It seems that Kenyon didn't try to reconcile these inconsistencies; it is quite possible (even probable) that he considered all of his teaching to be accurate *revelation knowledge*; from his point of view, he wasn't limited to *rational sense knowledge* like so many Christians are. (We'll come back to the point of Kenyon's inconsistencies later in this paper.)

Even though Kenyon did often (wrongly) speak about the creative faith that born-again Christians can and should have, sometimes he demonstrated that he didn't (or at least he didn't always) isolate the creative faith of born-again Christians (who live on terms of equality with God) from God's involvement with the things that supposedly take place through our supposed creative faith.

---

<sup>6</sup> On page 165 of *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1945) Kenyon mentioned another translation for Heb. 11:1, "Faith is the title deed to things prayed for; the evidence that they are yours before they are seen." And he comments, "Faith is counting prayer answered before the Father has acted." But statements like these don't take away his widespread wrong interpretation of Heb. 11:1 and 3, where Kenyon teaches about our creative faith that is like God's creative faith, and about our giving substance to things hoped for.

A few paragraphs back I quoted part of what Kenyon said on pages 29-31, 35 of *The Hidden Man*. He spoke, for example of "the great forces that emanate from the recreated human spirit. ... The first force of the recreated human spirit is faith." I am somewhat surprised that he also said in the same chapter, back on page 27, that "The Holy Spirit makes His home in the physical body and DOMINATES THE HUMAN SPIRIT that has been recreated." I don't know how to reconcile these two ideas; they seem to be inconsistent to me (and Kenyon does this often), but I'm thankful that sometimes Kenyon spoke of born-again Christians' obvious, continual dependence on the Holy Spirit. This is what the New Testament teaches.

Kenyon is speaking of the faith of born-again Christians in the following excerpts from *Two Kinds of Faith* (1942): "Salvation, Redemption, Eternal Life, the New Creation, THE INDWELLING PRESENCE OF THE SPIRIT [my emphasis], the legal right to use the Name of Jesus, and all of our privileges as sons and daughters of God, are based upon grace through faith. No one earns them. ..." (page 26). "Faith is a problem only when we do not know the Lord and we do not know the Word. Give place to the God inside of you. ... Just reckon on the God inside of you. Plan your work with the consciousness of His ability to put it over. ... You know when you command that disease to stop being that it will stop being. ... You know that when you take the Name of Jesus Christ for finances to meet an obligation that as sure as the Father sits on His throne the money will come. You know that His Word in your lips will save the lost, heal the sick, give courage and strength to the weak and victory to the defeated. ... How rich and beautiful life becomes when the Word gains ascendancy in our hearts! It will be a great day to you when you know that YOUR FAITH DOES THINGS, WHEN YOU BELIEVE IN YOUR OWN ABILITY TO REACH THE EAR OF LOVE [my emphasis; "To reach the ear of love" refers to God's hearing our prayers and our words of command to a disease, for example.] When you know that YOUR PRAYERS ARE ANSWERED, THAT GOD HEARS YOU [my emphasis], you are no longer dependent on another's Faith, you have your own" (pages 36-38). These words demonstrate that Kenyon's concept of creative-faith doesn't eliminate (at least it doesn't always eliminate) God's direct involvement with the things that come to pass. (As I mentioned, Kenyon wasn't consistent, and sometimes he seems to eliminate the need for God's direct involvement with the things that come to pass, since we [being those who have been recreated on terms of equality with God] have creative faith, the same faith that God used to create our universe. I believe large numbers of faith-movement Christians have understood the faith of Mark 11:22, 23 this way. Why even bother to argue for our having creative faith, like God has creative faith, if we are thinking of God's changing things, moving the mountains, etc. through our FAITH IN HIM?

One of the primary purposes for this paper is to show that we need to think in terms of FAITH IN GOD, with His direct involvement in everything that takes place, and with Him receiving all the glory for everything that is accomplished.))

The word *faith* is a perfect word to use for what WE are required to do. ((It is the most important word used in the New Testament to show what God requires of

us. We are saved by faith. We appropriate God's saving grace in its fullness by faith. Saving faith isn't something God gives us, but it is our response to His saving grace; we couldn't have saving faith if God didn't do His part first, which includes sending His Son to die for us, His restraining the evil one so he couldn't destroy us, His sending the gospel to us, and His drawing, convicting, revealing, enlightening, etc. We don't earn salvation in any of its aspects by faith; we receive and cooperate with God's saving grace in all of its aspects by faith. See my *A Paper on Faith* for more on this super-important topic.)) God will make us strong in faith as we look to Him; also, there is a charismatic gift of faith (1 Cor. 12:9) and faith/faithfulness is a fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22).

We have faith in God and in His Word. As Hebrews chapter 11 shows, faith includes an attitude of the heart where we put God first, trust Him, look to Him for all things (including the eternal city [cf. Heb. 11:10, 16]), believe Him, and obey Him. We must understand that we are enabled to obey God and live in His righteousness and holiness through His saving grace in Christ. It isn't a reasonable, or Biblical, concept to speak of God having faith in someone or something. You could say that He has faith in Himself, or in His Word, or in His Son, or in the Holy Spirit, but that doesn't need to be said, AND THE BIBLE DOESN'T SAY IT. He didn't create by faith! He created by virtue of who He was, and is! (Now I'll continue to quote from Hagin on page 100 of chapter 8 (point number 8) of *What to Do when Faith Seems Weak and Victory Lost*.)]]

Third, we are faith children of a faith God. [[No! God isn't a faith God, and we don't create by faith, or move mountains by faith; but God creates and moves mountains in response to our faith. It makes a big difference how we think about these things. It isn't just a matter of semantics. As I mention several places throughout this paper, when we start talking about us creating or moving mountains by our faith, we are sounding more like those with occult faith than a Biblical faith in God. This opens a door that should not be opened. The Biblical point of view is that our faith is in God!]] Therefore, we ought to act like God and call those things which be not as though they were. ... Children of God ought to act like God (Eph. 5:1). [[We should act like God when it comes to walking in the righteousness and holiness of God, and forgiving, etc. These are the things the apostle Paul mentioned just before Eph. 5:1, but we are not called to become creators or those who move mountains by OUR faith. We can, of course, create art, or a book, etc., but that is a different use of the verb *create*, and when Christians create art, etc., they are not doing it [hopefully they are not doing it] apart from the grace of God in Christ.]] One way God acts is, He calls those things which be not as though they were [God does, but we aren't God! Of course we can call the things that be not as though they were when God has already said it, and we can say the answer to our prayer is on the way (based on Mark 11:24) when we have prayed (in faith) in line with the will of God]."

In the same chapter, on page 106, Hagin further confuses the issue by saying "My faith is giving substance to the things not seen. No, I don't see the healing, and I don't feel it. But my faith is giving substance to it." He was basing this



statement on Heb. 11:1 (KJV translation), "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."<sup>7</sup>

The problem is that this statement of Hagin lends itself to the mistaken idea (an idea that I don't believe Hagin intended to communicate) that our faith, in itself (without the direct involvement of God), is bringing about (creating) the healing. We receive God's promise of healing by grace through faith. GOD GIVES SUBSTANCE TO THE HEALING; He brings it to pass; He creates it; and He receives all the glory for the healing, etc. I'll quote the NASB translation for Heb. 11:1, "Now faith is the ASSURANCE [my emphasis] of *things* hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." I believe the translation of the NASB communicates the intended meaning.

I believe the things Hagin says in chapters 1-7 of this book (*What to Do When Faith Seems Weak and Victory Lost*) and in chapter 9 to the end of the book show that he understood that God is the One who heals us, etc., but he confuses the issue by the things he says here in chapter 8, and sometimes Christians (or those who aren't genuine Christians) whose faith is not firmly grounded in God and His Word, latch onto misstatements and try to build their lives on them. As I mentioned, some of the things Hagin said here in chapter 8 were probably borrowed from somebody else, probably Kenyon. They don't fit well with the thrust of Hagin's teaching on faith throughout his lengthy ministry.

Well, didn't Jesus tell the woman who was healed when she touched His garment that her faith had made her well (Mark 5:34)? Yes, but what did He mean? The context shows that she was healed by receiving/appropriating by faith the healing power with which Jesus was anointed by God the Father (Acts 10:38). (And healing power like that isn't manifested apart from the active involvement of God, who is actively involved in every aspect of our lives and ministries.) Her faith did not create the healing! And God the Father and His Son must receive all the glory. Again, it makes a very big difference how we think about these things in our hearts. It is all too easy to miss the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches, and Satan is always eager to help us misinterpret God's Word. For one thing, we need to humble ourselves before God and before one another.

We haven't quite finished with chapter 8 of Hagin's book *What to Do When Faith Seems Weak & Victory Lost*. On page 108 Hagin quotes Rom. 10:9, 10 from the KJV and comments on these words. (Romans chapters 9-11 are discussed verse-by-verse in a paper on my internet site.) I'll quote Rom. 10:10 from the KJV (in the form which Hagin used), "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and WITH THE MOUTH CONFESSION is made unto salvation." I'll quote part of what Hagin said here (on pages 108, 109), "It is his confession that brings it [salvation] into being. [[Hagin made it clear here that what we

---

<sup>7</sup> I am confident that the writer of Hebrew (or the ultimate Author of the book of Hebrews) did not intend to say, that "my faith is giving substance." Hagin could have picked up this wrong understanding of Heb. 11:1 from Kenyon. See Kenyon's *The Hidden Man*, page 211, for example (which I briefly discussed back on page 30). On page 64 of *The Hidden Man*, Kenyon says that "Faith is the creative force in the human spirit."

believe in our heart is based on what the Bible says, and he understands that God saves us, but it is confusing (and wrong) to say that our confession brings salvation into being. I believe it would be better to translate the last words of Rom. 10:10 "and with the mouth he confesses, resulting in salvation," with the NASB. "Resulting in" is an effective way to translate the Greek preposition *eis* that is used here. Our believing and confessing the gospel is necessary, but God is the One who "brings our salvation into being," not our believing/having faith in God and His gospel, or our confessing it. As I have mentioned, it makes a big difference how we think about these things.]] ... God is a faith God. We are faith children. ... Count the thing done that you have asked. [[Note that Hagin mentioned asking (God). As long as we remember that we are asking God (God Who answers prayer; God Who hears us when we [in Jesus name, before Him] command a mountain to be removed and be cast into the sea and Who moves mountains that need to be moved; God Who creates; God Who saves; etc.) and give Him all the glory, we will maintain the right (Biblical) perspective.]] Follow in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, who followed in the steps of the faith of God. [As we have discussed the Bible doesn't speak of God's having faith.] Call those things that be not as though they were." Abraham had faith in God, which included knowing that God would bring to pass all that He had promised He would bring to pass. Abraham didn't have any wrong ideas (like some people in the faith movement do) about his ability to change things through his faith/confession like God changes things.

As it has often been pointed out, some Charismatics are weak in their understanding of the Bible (for one thing, it's easy to put the emphasis on experiences and being "spiritual"; and some disdain the need to really study the Bible verse-by-verse, in context), and there is a lot of sloppy thinking. (That problem isn't limited to Charismatics,) I have always appreciated hearing Hagin say that he agreed with Smith Wigglesworth, who was mightily used by God in miracles, etc., who insisted that we must exalt the Word of God above our experiences that take place through the Spirit of God. For one thing, if we don't put the emphasis on God's Word, we may well be led astray by doctrines, prophecies, miracles, etc. that have come from the kingdom of evil. I have heard Hagin say many times that Christian ministries must be based first and foremost on the Word of God, not on gifts of the Spirit. He said he saw many ministers eventually fail because they tried to build their ministries on the gifts of the Spirit.

I have heard some faith teachers go far with wrong ideas about faith, ideas that line up better with what the occult teaches about faith. Hunt is right, if our faith is based on a law that will work for anybody, then, for one thing, God is left out of the equation. He would be a bystander, and He wouldn't be glorified for the things that take place, as He must be glorified. Also, as Hunt rightly says, our faith must be in God and His Word. Faith isn't a force we use, and we don't create things by faith, or move mountains by faith. God is the Creator; He moves mountains; and He must receive all the glory. We aren't little gods, but we do have the great privilege to be born-again sons of God, who will reign with Him, starting when we are glorified at the end of this age.

If we have an occult faith, the power that brings the results will be Satan's power. We don't want those results! I am convinced that sincere Christians can stray from biblical reality and get involved with Satan's kingdom of darkness, and it isn't all that difficult to do. For one thing, we have been warned to test those who are ministering among us and the Spirit, or spirits, that are anointing (speaking and working through) them. First, we must test what they are saying against God's Word. We must also determine whether they are living in line with God's Word, in His righteousness and holiness. When Christian ministers aren't living right before God, which includes believing and living in line with the balanced truth of what His Word teaches, it can open the door for Satan to work through them, very much including doctrines of demons and miracles caused by demons (and he and his gigantic number of helpers are willing to "help" all that they can).

As I mentioned, I started following Kenneth Hagin's ministry in the spring of 1966, and for many years I read essentially everything he wrote. That includes the lessons he sent out before he started publishing books. I went to quite a few of his meetings (in greater St. Louis and in Tulsa) and listened to many audio recordings of his teachings. His teaching blessed me in many ways: It encouraged me to press on in faith and to resist the evil one; I learned a lot about demons and spiritual warfare through his ministry. And it encouraged me that I could walk with the victory over sin and demons. It isn't good enough to trust God to make all things work together for good while we aren't doing the things He requires of us, which includes walking in faith and resisting the evil one. Sometimes we must step out in faith, take some initiative in faith in line with the Word of God; faith is active, and it involves more than passively trusting God. Hagin's teaching also encouraged me that I could really cast my cares upon God because He cares for me (1 Pet. 5:7); etc.

Do I believe that the visions and revelations Hagin says he received from God were from God and actually happened? For the most part, at least, Yes, I do! I am not saying, however, that I can endorse every single thing that Hagin says that God has revealed to him, or every detail, in the accounts of the visions he shares. I agree with everything that God revealed to Hagin, but that is different than agreeing with everything that is said in Hagin's accounts of what God revealed. For one thing, different accounts of the same vision sometimes differ on details, and quotations of things Jesus said are not always word for word quotations.

There are a few places that I know of where Hagin spoke of things that he supposedly received from Jesus by revelation (typically dealing with issues that are not foundational issues of Christianity; Hagin didn't learn that Jesus died spiritually by a revelation from God, for example) where I have to disagree with what he said. I believe that he has misunderstood, or that his memory was faulty, or that his own ideas (or the ideas of others), got involved in recounting the vision. These things can happen when you are giving accounts of things that happened fifteen, or twenty, or thirty years ago. Things get more complicated with many of Hagin's writings because many of them were taken from audio

recordings of his earlier teaching/preaching, and editors can introduce errors too. Also (as I discuss other places in this paper), Hagin frequently quoted, or borrowed heavily, from others when he was teaching/preaching without mentioning that he was quoting, or borrowing heavily, from others.

I'll give two examples from Hagin's account of the vision that took place in December 1952 that is recorded in chapter 4 of his *I believe in Visions* (1972), where I believe he made a mistake, one way, or another. (The same vision is described, for one place, in Hagin's *Demons and How to Deal with Them*, Vol. 2. That account, which was published some four years before *I Believe in Visions*, is quite condensed compared with the account in *I Believe in Visions*. And I have audio recordings of Hagin's teaching at a church in 1963 where he dealt with this vision.) On pages 69-71 Hagin shares what Jesus told him about the four divisions of evil spirits that the apostle Paul listed in Eph. 6:12 (NASB), "For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers ["principalities" (KJV)], against the powers, against the world forces of this darkness, against the spiritual *forces* of darkness in the heavenly *places*."

Hagin said the Lord told him that "the highest spirits with which you have to deal are the rulers of the darkness of this world." And, "It is always one of these rulers of the darkness of this world that possesses a person. They rule not only over those who are within the darkness of this world, but they also tell the principalities what to do. Then the principalities rule over the powers and tell them what to do. The lowest type of demons [which would have to be the "powers," according to this account] have very little to do. They do very little thinking of their own, and are told what to do." I believe that this account got messed up, one way, or another.

The Greek noun that was translated "powers" by the KJV and NASB is the noun that is almost always translated "authority" or "authorities" by the NASB. The NIV translates "authorities" in Eph. 6:12. I am confident that it is not true that the "authorities" "have very little to do" and "do very little thinking of their own, and are told what to do." Hagin could have picked up this faulty "information" from some other books he was reading; he read a lot.

In the audio recordings from 1963 Hagin says that the Lord told him that rulers of the darkness of the world rule over the powers (not over the principalities, as in the account in *I Believe in Visions*), who in turn rule over the principalities, who do very little thinking for themselves. As I mentioned, it isn't reasonable to speak of the powers ("authorities") having "very little to do" and that they "do very little thinking on their own, and are told what to do." The same thing is true for the "principalities" (translated "rulers" in the NASB, which is a good translation). In Eph. 3:10, for example, the apostle Paul mentioned "the rulers and the authorities in the heavenly places," using the same Greek nouns translated "rulers" and "powers" in Eph. 6:12 (NASB).

When you consider that that the demon-possessed man from Gadara that Jesus delivered had a very large number of demons dwelling in him (Mark 5:1-20; Luke 8:26-39), it is reasonable to think that most of the demons (or all of them, except the one who possessed him) could have been lower level spirits subordinate to the rulers/principalities, or something like that. Some two

thousand swine were drowned (Mark 5:13). A Roman legion could contain as many as six thousand soldiers. I tend to agree with the commentators who say "legion" was used in Mark 5:9 and Luke 8:30 in a figurative sense of a large number, probably at least a few hundred, if not more.

The second example is more troublesome. Hagin tells how at one point in this vision where the Lord Jesus was teaching him about the devil and demons and anointing him to begin to minister more effectively in this area, a demon came and put a cloud between the Lord Jesus and Hagin and began to make a noise so that Hagin could no longer see the Lord or understand what He was saying. Hagin was surprised that the Lord didn't stop the spirit, and he eventually commanded the spirit in the name of Jesus to stop his interference and to leave the premises, which it did.

Hagin says, the Lord knew what he was thinking and told him that if he hadn't used his authority to stop that demon, He couldn't have. I realize that there are some things that God can't do for us (for example, He doesn't resist temptation for us or keep us from listening to demons or the people who speak for them, and the New Testament shows that we have been given the assignment and the authority to cast out demons), so I wouldn't have much of a problem, if any problem, if this was all that was said in Hagin's account.<sup>8</sup> However, Hagin went on to say that Jesus told him that we shouldn't pray for God to do anything about the devil, because He isn't going to do anything more about the devil until He binds him at the beginning of the millennium. And Hagin says that Jesus told him that He delegated the "all authority" (Matt. 28:18) that had been given to Him on the earth to the church, and He supposedly told Hagin, "I can only work through the church [not apart from the church], for I am the head of the church."

I have heard Hagin say things like you can see a book with your head, but you can't pick it up without the rest of your body, and in the same way, the Lord is dependent on the church for Him to do things on the earth. I believe that is an unfortunate statement. (It is true that God does a lot through His people on the earth, but I believe it goes way too far to infer that He can't do anything on the earth without us.) Significantly, when the New Testament speaks of the Lord Jesus being the "head" of the church, it is using the word "head" in a figurative sense, meaning that He has authority over the church (see 1 Cor. 11:3, for

---

<sup>8</sup> One of the most important things I have learned through Hagin's ministry is that demons are working against us on a rather consistent basis ((trying to keep us from becoming Christians in the first place; doing everything they can do to try to keep us from knowing and walking in the fullness of what God has provided for us in new-covenant salvation, especially trying to keep us in bondage to sin and to keep us from the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches; they are always trying to keep us as ineffective as possible in the kingdom of God (especially ministers), and if possible to get us back into his kingdom of darkness)), and the victory over demons is far from being automatic, and it isn't always easy. God requires us to do our part in achieving and maintaining the full victory over sin and demons by grace through faith. This victory is not something God can just give us apart from our continuous cooperation with His Word and His Spirit, which includes using the authority we have been given, through an active faith (faith in God and His Word).

example). We are not supposed to think of a physical human body with Jesus being the "head" of the body and us being the rest of the body.

Hagin told Jesus that He couldn't accept the idea that He couldn't have dealt with that demon (and we have to include the idea that God isn't going to do anything more about the devil until the beginning of the millennium) and asked Him to prove that by the New Testament. He says the Lord gave him Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-18; James 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:8; and Eph. 4:7. These passages effectively demonstrate that there are some things that we must do by the enabling grace of God in Christ, but they don't begin to demonstrate that everything that the Lord Jesus does on the earth throughout this age must be done through the church.

We have been informed in this account that God the Father isn't going to do anything more about the devil until the beginning of the millennium (for one thing, He is going to send Michael to cast the devil and the evil angels down to the earth at the sounding of the seventh trumpet, which will take place, I believe, right in the middle of Daniel's 70<sup>th</sup> week), but at the end of this chapter we are informed that the Lord Jesus told Hagin that, although we have the assignment and authority to deal with the first three categories of evil spirits of Eph. 6:12, He will take care of the "wicked spirits in the heavenlies," which was the fourth category of evil spirits mentioned in Eph. 6:12, and I trust we can agree that Jesus will not deal with those evil spirits independently of God the Father, so this statement, by itself, is sufficient to show that it isn't true that God isn't going to do anything more about the devil until the beginning of the millennium.

Although this account ended up in a confused state, one way, or another, from everything I know about Hagin, he understood how dependent we are on God's direct involvement in our lives if we are going to be faithful to Him and walk with the victory over sin and the kingdom of Satan. In other words, some of the things stated in this account are inconsistent with what Hagin believed and how he lived his life and ministered. Hagin knew that God exercises His authority on the earth to limit what the devil and his hosts are permitted to do, including his limiting our being tempted beyond what we are able to endure (1 Cor. 10:13). We Christians have the authority on the earth to be what God requires us to be and to do the things He requires us to do (in accordance with His Word), but our authority over Satan is clearly rather limited, and the authority and victory we do have is dependent on our continued relationship with God by the indwelling Spirit of life, wisdom, righteousness, and holiness, and through prayer. We haven't been given the authority to take over the earth before the Lord Jesus returns, for example, as some teach. See my paper "Some Comments on 'Prophetic Scriptures Yet to Be Fulfilled' by Bill Hamon and Acts 3:19-21 with Mal. 4:5, 6; Matt. 17:11; Rev. 10:7; and 11:15."

Hagin understood, for example, that he was totally dependent on God's direct involvement in distributing and then manifesting gifts of the Spirit at the appropriate time that enabled him to be effective in spiritual warfare. (Hagin frequently mentioned that the gifts of the Spirit operate in accordance with the will of God, which includes His timing. Many of our prayers (prayers which God answers, as He is directly involved with our entire lives and ministries) are

necessarily directly or indirectly against the devil, who does everything he can to frustrate God's plans for what is taking place on the earth, including all of the things pertaining to our lives and ministries.

I don't suppose Hagin stopped to think about the seriousness of communicating the ideas that God is not going to do anything about the devil until the end of this age and that the Lord Jesus can only work on the earth through the church. Hagin was probably being influenced by teaching he had received from others, perhaps mostly from Kenyon. Hagin had significant respect for Kenyon's *revelation* knowledge.

It is instructive to read what Kenyon said on pages 45-47 of *Two Kinds of Righteousness* (1965) about the extent of our authority on the earth. (This goes along with what Kenyon frequently said about the super-exalted status we have as born-again Christians, which I demonstrate in this paper. It also goes with his idea of the super-exalted status that Adam had before the fall, which I demonstrate in this paper.) I'll include some excerpts: "He [Jesus] said 'In my name, ye shall cast out demons.' When he declared that, He let us into the secret that we were to be masters of Satan. For if we can cast out one demon, we can cast out all demons. If we have dominion over the Adversary, we have dominion over all his works. ...

When Jesus said, 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth,'—that was for the church, that was for this dispensation. **THAT AUTHORITY WAS NOT FOR JESUS BUT FOR US** [my emphasis]. ... He calls us to do the things that Jesus began to do—set men free, break the bonds of Satan over men and women, heal the sick, break the power of demons over communities and nations. [It is clear that we have a role to play in doing these things, but it isn't biblical to think of us doing these things without the continuous and active involvement of God, or to think of God's being limited to doing everything on the earth through us, the church.] ...

When He said, 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore and use this authority. I will give you the legal right to use my Name. I will give you the Power of Attorney.' He bids us come boldly to the throne room, to the throne of grace and make our requests known. [This last sentence helps bring some balance to this picture that significantly overstates the authority we have been given.] ... **HE HAS PUT ALL THINGS IN SUBJECTION UNDER OUR FEET** [my emphasis]. He gave Jesus, our Lord, to be the Head over all the governments of the world. [The Lord Jesus isn't going to take over the governments of the world until the Father sends Him back to judge the world (and to do some other things) at the end of this age (e.g., Rev. 11:15-18).] **WE ARE TO FUNCTION AS RULERS THAT DOMINATE SPIRITUAL FORCES AND REIGN AS KINGS NOW IN JESUS CHRIST** [my emphasis]. Understand that he who can rule spiritual forces can also rule political conditions. The church should absolutely dominate the political elements of the world for the benefit of the human race. ... Let us take **OUR LIMITLESS PRIVILEGES** [my emphasis] **AND ACT THE PART OF GOD'S OWN RULERS IN THIS WORLD OF DARKNESS AND HATRED AND SELFISHNESS** [my emphasis]." Let us do everything that we can do **IN THE WILL OF GOD!**

I'll also include a few brief excerpts from Kenyon's *In His Presence* (1944) that further demonstrate Kenyon's over exalted concept of our role in the things that take place on the earth: "You become His 'Mike [microphone].' He speaks through you. You are His transmitter, His willing instrument through which His will can be done. What He wishes done is done. YOU SEE THAT IT IS CARRIED OUT. He can cast out demons through your lips now. ... YOU HAVE HIS 'ALL AUTHORITY' THAT WAS GIVEN TO HIM AFTER HE AROSE FROM THE DEAD. ... I hardly dare give you the next sentence: His Word in your lips makes you a superman. YOU HAVE ALL AUTHORITY OVER THE POWER OF THE ENEMY. ... YOU ARE MASTER OF THE LAWS OF NATURE THAT WOULD HURT AND HINDER. YOU STAND QUIET IN THE PRESENCE OF HUMANITY'S NEEDS KNOWING THAT YOU HAVE AUTHORITY TO OPEN THE FLOOD GATES OF GRACE [my capitalization for emphasis], of life and love and let them pour over the wounded broken-hearted men and women struggling in life's uneven light" (pages 187, 188).

And I'll include an excerpt from page 22 of Kenyon's *In His Presence* that demonstrates his super-exalted concept of our status as born again Christians, with our recreated spirits. (I have several similar excerpts in this paper.) "Let me state it again: Jesus in His earth walk as the Incarnate Son of God, beginning with His baptism, lived exactly as every child of God should live today [As I demonstrate in this paper, Kenyon taught that we are incarnate sons of God too, which isn't true. The Spirit of God dwelling in us is not the same thing as God the Son becoming flesh (John 1:14) through the virgin birth.] God wasn't any more His Father than He is ours. He said, 'The Father loveth you even as He loves me.' [Jesus said that the Father loves us even as He loves Jesus in John 17:23, but that doesn't give us a relationship with God the Father equivalent to the relationship that the Eternal Son of God has with the Father, far from it, but we do have a glorious relationship with the Father through God the Son.] He was the Son of God. You are a son of God. He was Deity. You are a partaker of the Divine Nature, that is Deity. [[We are partakers of the divine nature through being united with the Lord Jesus and by the indwelling Spirit of God (2 Pet. 1:3, 4), but we don't become deity/divine, and there is a gigantic difference between the Lord Jesus and us, and there will still be a gigantic difference between the Lord Jesus and us even after we are glorified and begin to reign with Him. He is deity (with God the Father and God the Spirit); we will worship Him forever.]] He had the Holy Spirit dwelling in Him. You have the Holy Spirit dwelling in you. The difference is that Jesus gave the Holy Spirit right of way in a sense of which we have never yet learned. He took advantage of the God-life within Him in a way that we have never yet been able to take advantage of the God-life within us. ...."

It is true that grace has been provided for us to be righteous and holy and to accomplish what God the Father wants us to accomplish, which is a key point that Kenyon was making here, but we must be careful to understand, and to emphasize, the gigantic difference between God the Son, who is deity, and us adopted (born-again) sons of God who are not, and never will be, deity/divine. It is true that Jesus said that we would do greater works than He did, because He was going to return to the Father (after He had overthrown sin, Satan, and



spiritual death through His all-important atoning death and resurrection). For one super-important thing, we (under God) can offer people (all who will repent and submit to God, His Son, and the gospel in faith) the new birth (and the indwelling Holy Spirit of God) and new-covenant salvation, things that were not yet available when Jesus ministered on the earth.

I was part of the faith movement (almost entirely limited to the ministry of Kenneth Hagin), but I wasn't at all limited to that movement. (( (This double parenthesis continues for four paragraphs.) After working as an engineer on various space projects throughout the 60s, I quit engineering at the end of 1969 and went to seminary (Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis, which is a conservative [Bible centered] Presbyterian seminary), receiving an MA in Biblical Studies, with high honors, in 1972. I had become a born-again Christian in 1964 while attending a conservative (Bible centered) Presbyterian church, and my life changed totally. Thanks be to God! I continued to be an active member of that church until 1972. I got involved with the charismatic renewal and Hagin's ministry early in 1966.

I have learned a lot from Presbyterians (who are Calvinists), and I am thankful for them, but I never was satisfied that they hold the fully balanced truth of what the Bible teaches. For one thing, I believe the Arminians have a lot right, and that the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches on many of the basics of Christianity is to be found between what the Calvinists and the Arminians teach, but I am closer to what Arminians teach. I try to listen to what all evangelical (Bible believing) Christians have to say. For one thing, I try to be open to see where I need to make corrections in what I believe. I have always used a lot of Bible commentaries, and an exhaustive Bible concordance. Learning Greek and Hebrew has been very helpful in my study of the Bible, but the most important thing I try to do is be led by the Holy Spirit in my studies, mostly by an inner witness. If we limit ourselves to OUR ability to think right we will be in trouble.

The primary topic of my studies since 1964 has always been holiness and victory over sin. The better we understand the gospel, the better we can live it, by grace, through faith. I have always put a high priority on learning the meaning of the key words used in the Bible, words like grace, faith, righteousness, holiness, redemption, repentance, and atoning sacrifices. (I have spent more than a hundred hours each on the words faith, righteousness, and holiness, for example. Christians differ substantially on the meaning of these super-important words, and on many other words of key importance.) We will never understand the meaning of verses of the Bible until we understand the meaning of the words used in the verses.

I published my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin: Full Salvation Through the Atoning Death of the Lord Jesus Christ* in 1992. I have always tried to put the priority on believing, and living in line with, the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches, in the righteousness and holiness of God, by His enabling grace, through faith.))

I have always tried to point out the errors in the faith movement (every error hurts), which didn't make me very popular with some of them, but we have to

answer to God, don't we? At the same time I have always said that I appreciate the ministry of Kenneth Hagin, with some qualifications (I have received quite a bit of criticism for supporting his ministry too). As the years went by I had to note places where I disagreed with Hagin, and especially regarding the very wrong idea that Jesus died spiritually and all that means according to Kenyon. It was a sad day for me (about 1975) when I first became aware that Hagin was teaching that. He didn't emphasize that teaching, and I don't believe I have ever heard him teach it, and he didn't make it a test of orthodoxy. Also, he was always clear on the deity of Christ and on the Trinity.

I am thankful that I can say with total assurance that Hagin's faith and almost all of his teaching about faith was grounded in God (the God of the Bible and His Son) and the Bible (he was fanatic about trying to base everything he believed on what the Bible teaches), not in some (occult) law of faith of God that will work for anybody. I have heard him say things like "we have the God kind of faith," and "what we confess we possess" (we briefly discussed those sayings above; if we are confessing things that are God's will for us, in accordance with His Word, and thanking Him and giving Him the glory for giving us these things, there is nothing occult about that). Based on everything that I know, God Himself and His Word always was the foundation for Hagin's faith, including the way he lived.

For example, Hagin understood, and emphasized, that we are to pray (pray in faith) to God the Father in the name of Jesus. He understood that God must be thanked for everything we receive by faith. He understood that there are conditions for our receiving from God by faith. For example, he emphasized that we cannot skip Matt. 11:25 (while we rejoice in Mark 11:22-24), which says we must forgive others if we want to be forgiven and to receive from God, and he emphasized that we must walk in love and live as God requires us to live if we want to walk in the blessings of God. He emphasized that our faith must be based on God's Word, and that faith comes by hearing the Word of God (Rom. 10:17). And many times I have heard him say that we cannot receive from God by faith if we are asking for things that are not His will for us. He frequently spoke of Christians giving the faith movement a bad name by going to unbiblical extremes.

One of the primary problems I have always had with the faith movement over the years is that the emphasis was almost always on receiving healing or finances. It has always seemed clear to me that the primary thing we need to emphasize is receiving and walking in the righteousness and holiness of God by grace through faith. For one thing, much of the spiritual, physical, mental and financial sickness of Christians has come because of sin. Kenneth Hagin and some other faith teachers believe that Christians can and should walk with the victory over sin, but they seem to assume (wrongly assume from my point of view) that most of their hearers don't have much of a sin problem. The fact that those in the faith-movement (and many others) typically define righteousness as right standing with God lends itself to the problem. See my paper *Some Comments on Destined to Reign by Joseph Prince and a Discussion on the Topic of Righteousness, Holiness, and the Victory Over Sin*.

4. I'll include several excerpts from "Contending for the Faith," which is chapter 3 of Dave Hunt's book *Beyond Seduction: A Return to Biblical Christianity* (Harvest House Publishers, 1987). "Clearly, a correct view of faith is essential to biblical Christianity. Therefore to come short or to be confused in the area of faith is a very serious matter" (page 45). "Often those who emphasize faith the most seem to be the least biblical, twisting the Scriptures to fit their peculiar ideas. ... One of the most basic errors that is accepted not only in the secular world but within the church as well is that faith is some kind of force" (page 46). "The issue is truth: *What* and *in whom* one believes determines whether faith has been misplaced or not. ... True faith rests in God's love and care, relieving us of every burden and producing 'the peace of God which passes all understanding' (Philippians 4:7)" (page 47). "There is a vast difference between believing that what I'm praying for will happen because I *believe it will happen* and believing that *God will make it happen* in response to my faith in Him. ... Many Christians mistakenly conclude that *faith* is a *power* which enables those who possess it to move mountains at command and to gain their every desire simply through a positive confession. Rather than being a *power* that we direct, faith is confidence in God and in what *He* will do. [As I mentioned, when we speak (before God) to a mountain that needs to be moved in the name of Jesus, our faith doesn't move the mountain; God does, and He must receive the glory.] ... Nor can I believe that I will receive what I pray for unless I know that it is God's will and that I am in a relationship of purity and obedience that will allow Him to bless me in this way (1 John 3:22; 5:14, 15). ... The deadly error that faith is a force to tap into and use is widely disseminated not only in secular media such as the Star Wars film series, but surprisingly over Christian radio and television and in books and magazines. ..." (pages 48, 49).

"Faith is indeed preached, but nearly always as a power for gaining health and wealth and personal blessing. *The faith* that has moral content—that demands holiness and obedience and produces peace and joy—is all too often neglected. [We must emphasize the fact that we are enabled (by grace) to walk in the righteousness and holiness of God and to obey Him through faith. This is a big part of what new-covenant salvation through the atoning death of the Lamb of God, and by the indwelling Righteous and Holy Spirit, is all about.] And although the *Word* is emphasized, it is often twisted and abused by those who claim to be its chief proponents" (page 50).

"While the leaders of Positive Confession seem to be sincere Christians and at times preach a clear biblical gospel, there can be no doubt that their errors are extremely serious and could be fatal—if not for them, then certainly for some of their followers who take what they say to its logical conclusion. They [Some] have a wrong view of faith: Instead of trust in God as its object, it is a metaphysical force. ... They [some] have a wrong view of man: He is a little god in God's class who has the same powers as God and can use the same force of faith by obedience to the same laws that God also must obey. ... (page 53).

Hebrews 11:3 says, '*By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God,*' but the faith teachers turn this declaration around to say, 'We

understand that it was *by faith that God framed the worlds.*' By that simple twist, faith is not *man's belief in God* and what He has revealed, but *a force that God used* to make the universe and that man can also use by following the same 'law of faith.' Attention is subtly turned from *God* to *faith* and the results are devastating. ..." (pages 55, 56).

And I'll include one last excerpt from this chapter. "The most heretical element involved is the teaching that the power of belief is a universal force that works for *anyone* who follows 'the law of faith' " (page 56).

For the record, I agree with much (or most) of what Hunt says in this chapter. I had been saying most of these things more than ten years before this book was published. I had to face these things because I was involved with Hagin's ministry to a significant extent. However (as we discuss in this paper), I don't believe Hagin believed that "belief [faith] is a universal force that works for anyone." (As I mentioned, I don't know much about the other faith teachers, but I do know that almost everything I have read of Kenyon's teaching about faith dealt with born-again Christians, and did not apply to those who were not born-again Christians. I am confident that the same thing is true for many other faith teachers.) For one thing, the faith that Hagin typically spoke of was faith in God (the God of the Bible) and in His Word, and I don't believe he ever excluded God from the things that come to pass through faith. Bible faith and occult faith are two totally different things. We discuss this important point other places in this paper too.

I'll give an example of occult faith: I remember overhearing two men speaking in a restaurant several years back. They were speaking loud, wanting to be overheard. The one man was boasting to the other man what he had done through his (occult) faith. He had been driving down the road when a young driver shot past him. He cursed that young man and rejoiced when a little further down the road the young man was on the side of the road with his engine on fire. That had nothing to do with God's universal "law of faith" that will work for anybody. That had to do with tapping into the occult power of Satan, which is very real. If our "faith" is getting results for us and our lives are not submitted (in Bible faith) to God, His Son, His Word, and His new-covenant plan of salvation, the results aren't coming from God, or His supposed universal "law of faith." Unbelievers can, of course, cry out to God (the God of the Bible) for help: That isn't an occult faith. God helped all of us before we submitted in faith to His Son and His new-covenant plan of salvation.

**5. Some Excerpts from Dave Hunt's *Occult Invasion* where He Calls Kenneth Hagin a False Prophet, etc., and seems to write him off.** (I'll include some two pages of comments before giving the excerpts from Hunt.) Apparently it seemed obvious to Hunt that Hagin is a false prophet, etc., but that is a serious charge to make, and I don't believe the Lord Jesus Christ, the head of the Christian church, agrees with that charge. The fact that Hunt was able to point to a few places where Hagin made comments that would fit an occult view of faith certainly doesn't suffice to show that Hagin had an occult view of faith. As far as I

can see, Hunt only gives one reference in *Occult Invasion* to Hagin's writings where Hagin says he believes in a law of faith that will work for anybody. We will discuss that reference as we continue, but (although I don't agree with much that Hagin said on those few pages in his booklet titled *Have Faith in Your Faith*), I don't agree with Hunt that Hagin was speaking of a universal "law of faith" (an occult faith) that will work for anybody, whether they have faith in the God of the Bible and His Word, or not. In his earlier book *Beyond Seduction*, Hunt also mentions two other articles (in Hagin's monthly periodical, *The Word of Faith*), where he thinks Hagin was speaking of an occult law of faith that anybody can use. I was able to get a copy of one of those articles ("The Law of Faith" in the November, 1974 issue of *The Word of Faith*). We will discuss that article below, but, although I strongly disagree with one statement that Hagin made in that article, I don't believe Hagin believed in, or spoke of, an occult law of faith that will work for anybody in that article. I believe Hunt misunderstood what Hagin said. ((I literally spent more than five hours over a period that lasted something like six weeks trying to get a copy of the other article mentioned by Hunt, "The Secret of Faith," supposedly in the March, 1968 issue of *The Word of Faith*. I finally discovered that there was no March, 1968 issue, and I haven't been able to find what issue that article was in, including my contacting Rhema, the publisher of the article. It is interesting that I have found quite a few other books and articles that have that same wrong reference. It is clear that they included a reference to that article without getting a copy of the article or reading it.))

One of the primary points I want to make in this paper is that I believe Hunt seriously misunderstood the foundation and heart of Hagin's faith teaching. Hagin had some errors (one of them the very serious error that Jesus died spiritually, took on the nature of the devil, etc., which he picked up from Kenyon), and we need to point out errors, but we must be very cautious about writing off other Christians. (Most Christian ministers can point to errors [sometimes what they just perceive to be errors, and sometimes legitimate errors; some of the errors are quite serious] in what others believe and teach. Take what Calvinists say about Arminian doctrine and what Arminians say about Calvinistic doctrine for an example. There are major differences on foundational issues. I haven't heard it very often, but I have heard both Calvinists and Arminians deny that the other ones were saved—they wrote them off.)

See my paper *Some Comments on "Destined to Reign" by Joseph Prince and a Discussion on the Topic of Righteousness, Holiness, and the Victory Over Sin* for an example of what seems to me to be some obvious errors by a very popular charismatic minister, Joseph Prince. On pages 5-7 of that paper I briefly dealt with the topic, once saved, always saved? As I mentioned there, although I am sure that that doctrine is wrong and is contradicted by a rather large number of passages in the New Testament (see my paper *Once Saved Always Saved?*), I am not troubled much by Christians holding that doctrine as long as they don't abuse it. In a footnote on page 6 of the paper that deals with the book by Joseph Prince, I give an example of a very popular Christian minister of our day (a minister that I have a lot of respect and appreciation for) who substantially abuses that doctrine. I'll include that lengthy footnote here:

I'll give an example of what I mean by abusing the doctrine that Christians cannot lose their salvation from the book of one of the most respected Bible teachers in the world today. I respect him and typically agree with what he teaches, but certainly not on this topic. I was shocked (and having seen and heard some of the things I have seen and heard the past 45 years around Christianity it is hard to shock me) when I read several things that Charles Stanley said in his book *Eternal Security* (published by Thomas Nelson in 1990).

I'll give a few brief excerpts. "If abandoning the faith [he means Christians stop having faith in Christ and the gospel] or falling into sin short-circuits [terminates] salvation, I have the ability to demonstrate unconditional love to a greater extent than God. If there is a condition [including the conditions that we must continue to have faith in Christ and the gospel and to live for God]—even one—attached to God's willingness to maintain a relationship with His children, it is not unconditional" (page 5). [We cannot earn God's love, but there are conditions for remaining in a new-covenant relationship with Him.] "Can God declare me 'guilty' after He has already declared me 'not guilty'?" (page 28). "If Christ took upon Himself every single one of your sins, what is going to cause God to reverse His verdict of not guilty? [God cannot allow unbelieving rebels to have a place in heaven, and they wouldn't want to be there on God's terms.] Hallelujah, not a thing!" (page 29). "The Bible clearly teaches that God's love for His people is of such magnitude that even those who walk away from the faith have not the slightest chance of slipping from His hand" (page 72). "Consequently, God does not require a *constant attitude* of faith in order to be saved—only an act of faith" (page 77). "Forgiveness or salvation is applied at the moment of faith. ... And its permanence is not contingent upon the permanence of faith" (page 78). And (also on page 78), "You and I are not saved because we have enduring faith. We are saved because at a moment in time we expressed faith in our enduring Lord. Notice how Paul ends this passage: 'It [our salvation] is the gift of God; not as a result of works, that no one should boast' (Eph. 2:8-9)."

I'll add the following words to that footnote: Most Calvinists (Calvinists emphasize God's role in our salvation, and they don't believe that those elected by God can fail to come to salvation, or fail to persevere in salvation to the end) don't agree with the extreme idea that Christians can abandon their faith in Christ and/or live for the devil and continue in that state until the end and be saved. They believe that true Christians (the elect) *will persevere* in faith to the end. That's a gigantic difference from what Stanley is saying. He is seriously abusing the idea of once saved, always saved and, for one thing, effectively neutralizing all of the powerful warnings in the New Testament that Christians must repent or lose their salvation. See my paper *Once Saved, Always Saved?* for many clear examples.

What seems so clear to us isn't always so clear to God, and I am totally sure that He doesn't appreciate our writing off a minister (or any Christian) that He hasn't written off. If we err, we should err of the side of being generous. We certainly

want God to be generous with us when He judges us, don't we? It's no wonder that so many people strongly reacted to some of Hunt's books.

Some Excerpts from Dave Hunt's *Occult Invasion* where He Calls Kenneth Hagin a False Prophet, etc., and seems to write him off:

"Tragically, the...Hagins...[and others] convince themselves and others that the supposed miracles they perform are proof that they belong to Christ. Will some of today's charismatic leaders be among those who will say, 'Lord, Lord, did we not...' and to whom the Lord will reply, 'I never knew you; depart from Me [DEPART FROM ME, YOU WHO PRACTICE LAWLESSNESS]'. If not, then [them] who? ..." (page 484). That's strong language!

"... The charismatic movement in particular follows after men and women who speak perverse things and promise signs and wonders, among them Kenneth Hagin.... But the occult power manifest through false prophets causes their followers to overlook all else" (page 488). And that's very strong language!

"Today's false prophets boast of their power and use it to threaten those who would reprove them with God's Word. ... In one of the many visions of Jesus which Kenneth Hagin has received, he was told ('The Lord said to me') that there would be ministers who rejected him as a prophet who, as a result, would 'fall dead in the pulpit.' They should have been falling like flies, for there are thousands of ministers who have rejected Hagin's message."

Hunt misrepresented what Hagin says the Lord told him, and the context in which He told him that. Hunt referred to the book *I Believe in Visions* (Fleming H. Revell, 1972), page 115. I'll quote what the Lord Jesus said to Hagin, and the context in which He said it. "The Lord said to me, 'If I give you a message for an individual, a church, or a pastor, and they don't accept it, you will not be responsible. They will be responsible. There will be ministers who don't accept it and will fall dead in the pulpit.'"

I say this with reluctance, but this actually happened in one place where I preached. Two weeks from the day that I closed the meeting, the pastor fell dead in the pulpit. When I left that church I left crying. I told the pastor in the next church where I went to hold a meeting, 'That man will fall dead in the pulpit.' And just a very short time after that he did. Why? Because he didn't accept the message that God gave me to give him from the Holy Spirit." This wasn't an example of Hagin threatening all the ministers who rejected his ministry. Hagin was at this particular church to hold a meeting (undoubtedly having been sent by God), and the pastor rejected the message that God gave him through Hagin (which undoubtedly included a call to repent). That's quite different from what Hunt said here. And Hunt totally misrepresented the attitude of Hagin. Hagin put a priority on walking in love, and he certainly didn't rejoice when this pastor died in his pulpit. Hagin wasn't the type of person who would try to intimidate Christians to submit to his ministry, or else, but Hunt, and others, have accused him of that.

**6. On pages 120, 122, and 494 of *Occult Invasion* Hunt refers to Hagin's booklet titled *Having Faith in Your Faith*. This is a very important reference that we must discuss.** (It will be helpful for you to reread eight paragraphs of this paper, starting with the paragraph on page 13 that starts with the words "I'll include another excerpt from page 122 of Hunt's *Occult Invasion*." ) I'll quote part of what Hunt says on page 122 under the heading "Spiritual 'Science.' " "If the power of God is a force like gravity that works according to scientific laws (as...Hagin...[and others] claim), then anyone (Christian or atheist) who follow these laws scientifically may utilize God's miraculous power. Hagin declares that even non-Christians can receive miracles by applying God's 'laws of faith' (and he refers to *Having Faith in Your Faith* [Rhema Bible Church, 1980], pages 3-5). This is a small (five and one-half inch by three and one-half inch) 32 page mini-book. The first chapter is titled, "Have Faith in Your Faith"; it covers pages 1-5. I had never seen this booklet, which is out of print, but I was able to borrow a copy through the Inter-Library Loan.

I have to admit that I am somewhat shocked by chapter 1. It is so different than essentially all of Hagin's writings (or audio recordings) that I have read (or heard). ((This chapter, or part of this chapter, may well have been taken (by an editor on Hagin's staff) from an audio recording of Hagin's teaching of an earlier meeting, and Hagin may have been quoting from another minister's teaching in that earlier meeting (as he often did), but he is responsible for what was published in this mini-book. It is also possible that an editor on staff made some input to this article, for one reason, or another. Hagin's editors may have had a lot of authority, people like Buddy Harrison, his son in law, and Billye Brim.))

I don't agree with hardly anything that Hagin said in this short chapter, and I very strongly disagree with the part that I'll quote here, but (and this is very important) I am totally confident that Hunt misunderstands Hagin and, for one thing, he has a different meaning than Hagin does for the "law of faith." I'm totally confident that Hagin was not leaving room for an occult faith that will work for anybody, in accordance with a "universal law of faith" that God supposedly set up. The faith Hagin is speaking about is faith in God, the God of the Bible, the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. For the most part Hagin is speaking of the faith of born-again Christians, but he leaves room for a person who hasn't become a born-again Christian yet to receive some things from God (the God of the Bible) by looking to Him for help, for healing, for example.

I believe the examples that Hagin gives in his article "The Law of Faith" ((which Hunt refers to on page 64 of *Beyond Seduction* to supposedly demonstrate that Hagin taught "that *anyone* [meaning that you don't have to believe in the existence of, or be committed to the God of the Bible; just have faith in your idea of God, or skip that and just have faith in a universal law that is built into the fabric of the universe, or just have faith in the fact that we are all gods, or have faith in your faith, etc.] can develop these universal 'laws of faith' to get what he wants")) effectively demonstrate that Hagin limited the faith he was speaking



about to those who are looking to the God of the Bible. We will discuss that article ("The Law of Faith") in the next section of this paper.

I'll quote the most controversial part of this chapter (the first chapter of Hagin's booklet *Have Faith in Your Faith*; the part that Hunt was interested in on his page 122); Hagin was referring to Mark 11:12-14, 20-23, which he quoted here:

"Notice Jesus said '*Have faith in God.*' The literal meaning of that phrase is 'Have the faith of God.' [As we have discussed, "Have faith in God" is the literal meaning here.] Jesus used the fig tree to demonstrate that He had that God-kind of faith [Rather, He had faith in God the Father], then He said to the disciples—and to us—"You have that kind of faith." [He exhorted them to have faith in God, like the faith He manifested.]

He [Jesus] went on to say in the next verse, '*For...whosoever...shall say...and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith*' (v. 23). [[It is important that we keep these words in the context in which Jesus spoke them. He was speaking of people who have faith in the God of the Bible (verse 22), people who are looking to God to answer the requests made to Him, in faith (verse 24), people who live in line with His commandments, very much including the commandment to forgive (verse 25).]]

Jesus said He had the God-kind of faith [No! He said He had faith in God!]; He encouraged His disciples to exercise that kind of faith [to exercise faith in God who moves mountains (mountains that need to be removed in accordance with the will of God) yes]; and He said [in verse 23] that 'whosoever' could do it.

Why did he say 'whosoever'? Why didn't He say, 'If any of My disciples say it, or 'If some of My followers say it'? But He said, 'whosoever.' The reason is because all men are spirit beings. [[This short paragraph doesn't sound like Hagin at all. (I have noticed that Kenyon emphasizes the point that all people are spirit beings, but Kenyon typically puts all the emphasis on the fact that we must be born again before we can do much through our creative faith. I'll comment further on this point later in this paper.) Anyway, the fact that all people are spirit beings doesn't mean much. It's true that we aren't animals, but the angels (good and evil) and demons are spirit beings too. I'm totally sure that Jesus didn't leave any room for us to take verse 23 out of its context with verses 22-25 (and out of the greater context of everything else that He said) and to think of a faith that was not solidly grounded in God (the God of the Bible, His Father).]]

We live in a body, but we are spirit beings. (Our 'heart' is our spirit.) That is why Jesus said, '*whosoever shall say...and shall no doubt IN HIS HEART.*' [It is important to know that Bible faith is of the heart. For one thing, Bible faith includes being committed to God and His Word in our hearts.]

It used to bother me when I'd see unsaved people getting results, but my church members not getting results. Then it dawned on me what the sinners were doing: They were cooperating with this law of God—the law of faith."

The sentence, "It used to bother me when I'd see unsaved people getting results, but my church members not getting results," fits Hagin OK if we limit (as I'm confident Hagin would do) what we mean by "unsaved people" to those who looking to the God of the Bible, even though they haven't become born-again

Christians yet. I have heard Hagin speak of those who had not yet become born-again Christians submitting to his ministry and being healed, or receiving other answers to prayer. (See the following section of this paper that deals with Hagin's article, "The Law of Faith," for some important examples.) Many (or most) such people go on to become born-again Christians.

Hagin pointed out that some Gentiles manifested faith in the Lord Jesus and His ministry greater than the people of Israel. SIGNIFICANTLY, I DON'T BELIEVE HAGIN INTENDED THESE WORDS "THIS LAW OF GOD—THE LAW OF FAITH" TO INCLUDE ANY PEOPLE WITH OCCULT FAITH. I am quite sure that Hunt has misunderstood Hagin, but, admittedly, what Hagin said here is easy to misunderstand.

**7. Now we will discuss the article, "The Law of Faith," that is included in the November, 1974 issue of *The Word of Faith* by Kenneth E. Hagin Evangelistic Ass'n.** (Buddy Harrison was the editor and Billye Brim was the managing editor at that time.) Hunt referred to this article on page 64 of *Beyond Seduction*, for one place.

I'll quote Hunt's sentence that led to his referring to this article. "Kenyon's concept of 'creative faith' [[Hunt referred here, in a footnote, to page 20 of Kenyon's *Two Kinds of Faith*, 1942. We have already dealt with this topic (see pages 29-32 of this paper), but I'll comment briefly on what Kenyon said on page 20. He referred to Heb. 11:3 and made the mistake of thinking that that verse teaches that God created the universe by faith and that we can create by faith too. It is important to point out that Kenyon was speaking of born-again Christians being able to do these things, not unbelievers, and he put some emphasis on our doing the things that God wills for us to do, not for us to do our own thing. And the quotations above from Kenyon's *Two Kinds of Faith* demonstrate that he didn't isolate (at least he didn't always isolate; he was not consistent on this point) the supposed creative faith of Christians from God's direct involvement in the things that take place through faith.]] formed the basis for Hagin's teaching (some of which contains word-for-word repetitions of Kenyon) that *anyone* can develop these universal 'laws of faith' to get what he wants. Hunt then referred to Hagin's article, "The Law of Faith" to back up his statement. However, as I have mentioned, when you read all that Hagin said in this article, it doesn't back up Hunt's point that Hagin taught there is a "law of faith" that will work for anybody, including those with occult faith. For one super-important point, when Hagin goes on to illustrate (in "The Law of Faith") what he means by the "law of faith" that will work for anybody, he demonstrates that he is speaking of people who look to the God of the Bible. He is not including those who are in the occult, for example, and who have "faith," but not faith in the God of the Bible.

At the beginning of Hagin's three page article, "The Law of Faith." we are informed that this teaching was "transcribed from the first session of Rhema Bible Training Center."

I'll quote the first two paragraphs of the article. "In the spiritual realm God has put into motion certain laws, just as He has set laws in the natural realm. Those laws [like the law of gravity] in the natural realm work, don't they? It doesn't take any intervention of God to make them work. They just work. Just as sure as you get into contact with those natural laws or put them into practice, they work for you. Over in the spiritual realm, the same thing is true.

I have come to the conclusion that the law of faith is a spiritual law, that God has set in motion, and that as surely as you come into contact with it, it will work for you." Hagin goes on to quote Mark 11:22-24; Rom. 10:9-10; and Heb. 11:6. What Hagin said here (or whoever he is quoting) is wrong, and I'm not surprised that Hunt was able to read so much into what Hagin said here that I'm sure Hagin didn't intend to say.

It was a serious mistake for Hagin to speak of faith working without the "intervention of God." That idea, wherever it came from, goes against just about everything Hagin ever said, and the way he lived his Christian life. It even goes against several things Hagin said in this brief article. For one thing he quoted Heb. 11:6, which includes the words that God "IS A REWARDER [my emphasis] of them that diligently seek him [in faith]." God is actively intervening when He rewards those who seek Him. And in one of the illustrations Hagin gave in this article, he spoke of GOD BLESSING a man and said that "he received God's blessing because he honored God"; he honored Him by faith. Hagin asked the question, "How come GOD HEALS [my emphasis] in this family?" The woman who had faith that God would heal her children said, "I know GOD LOVES those little children." God's love was manifested in healing her children. Furthermore there was no idea of our creative faith, or our force of faith, etc. bringing about the blessings that were granted.

I want to emphasize the point that the Bible makes is clear that God is directly and actively involved with every aspect of our lives. Consider, for example, Prov. 3:5-8; Matt. 6:8-13, 25-33; 28:20; 10:29-31; Luke 12:22-31; John 17:23; Rom. 8:26-39; 1 Cor. 10:13; and Phil. 2:12, 13. He knows our thoughts and he hears our words (including when we pray for healing, or command a demon to leave, or command a mountain to move, etc., etc.).

For people not solidly grounded in the Christian faith, accepting what Hagin said here (speaking of a law of faith that will work for anybody, without the intervention of God, like the law of gravity) could cause great damage. By speaking of the "law of faith" working as consistently as a law like the "law of gravity," Hagin was probably trying to emphasize the point that God is generous and CONSISTENT to always help those who look to Him in faith. Anyway, we should drop that expression (the "law of faith") along with our creative faith, our force of faith, the idea that God has faith, etc.

As we have discussed, it isn't good enough to speak of people being healed or mountains moving because of a law of faith that God set up. Nothing is to be gained, and a lot is to be lost, by removing God from the very center of what is happening through a supposed law of faith, or anything else. Faith is an attitude of the heart where we put God first (in the center of everything) and trust Him,

believe Him, obey Him, and give Him all the glory. (See Hebrews chapter 11, for example, which is discussed in my *A Paper on Faith*.)

It is important to see, as I demonstrate in this paper, that it goes against the whole thrust of Hagin's teaching to deny God's direct intervention in what is happening in response to our faith. The more He is removed from being directly involved in the center of our lives, as the One who meets all of our needs in response to faith (faith in Him, His Son, and His Word), the more our relationship and fellowship with Him will be diluted, the less He will be thanked, glorified, and worshipped, and the less we will receive from Him. Hagin seemed to have fellowship and communion with God on a consistent basis on a far deeper level than most Christians do: He understood that God was directly involved with all of his life and ministry. He wasn't a remote God who only interacts with us through laws He has set up.

See section 3 of this paper, "I read (with some skimming) several of Hagin's books to see how much of his teaching about faith could fit in the category of occult faith instead of Bible faith." It is very important to see that Hagin doesn't teach about a law of faith that also works for those with occult faith (instead of Bible faith in the God of the Bible), which is the most important accusation Hunt makes against Hagin's teaching on faith.

Hagin goes on throughout most of the rest of this article, "The Law of Faith," to give three illustrations that demonstrate what he means when he speaks of the law of faith working for "whomsoever." These illustrations demonstrate that when Hagin spoke of non-Christians (or Christians who are not being fully faithful to God) receiving according to God's (supposed) "law of faith," he was speaking of people who look to God (the God of the Bible and to His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ); he was not including any people who have an occult faith.

In his first illustration, Hagin refers to a man who had not yet become a Christian but who attended Hagin's church with his wife and family. (He had not yet become a believer in the full sense of the word. Apparently the man's wife was a born-again Christian.) He was a contractor who had a partner who wasn't a born-again Christian either. A commercial building deal went bad for them, and they were advised to file for bankruptcy. The man and his partner decided to start paying tithes and within a month things had turned around for their business. Hagin didn't say any more about the partner, but the man who came to his church with his family went on to become a born-again Christian that year.

Hagin gave another illustration of a family that lived across the street from his church. The husband wasn't saved and the wife would only make it to church about every three months, and when she came she didn't bring their children. However, whenever their children were sick, she would always call for Hagin to come and pray for them, and they would always be healed. (They were healed by God through the healing anointing Hagin had received from God. That anointing worked by the direct involvement and intervention of God.) For one thing, she had faith (faith in the God of the Bible and faith in what the Bible says) that they would be healed. She would tell Hagin things like "I may not be walking in all the light that I have, but I know that God loves my children," and she would tell him what the Bible says about healing, etc. As I mentioned, Hagin thought in

terms of God's healing the children; so did their mother and undoubtedly the children did too; Hagin did not think in terms of a "law of faith" that will work for anybody without "any intervention of God". The thought that they were healed through some impersonal "law of faith" that God had set up, without His direct involvement, was totally absent from the hearts and minds of Hagin and the mother and undoubtedly the children, and rightly so.

Hagin's third illustration dealt with a deacon of his church and his wife, who was a Sunday School teacher. When Hagin prayed for their children they never got healed. Hagin says that when he would go to their house to pray for the children he would hear things like, "Well I told my husband there's no use in your calling Brother Hagin. We are just wasting his time. We don't ever get healed. I don't know why it won't ever work for us."

So, even though Hagin mentioned a "law of faith" that will work for anybody ("whosoever" Mark 11:23 KJV) in this article, he was speaking of people who look to God (the God of the Bible), even though they may not have become born-again Christians yet, or may not be adequately living for God. He wasn't speaking of a "law of faith" in the sense Hunt understood him. Hunt wrongly (but sincerely, but we need more than sincerity) accused Hagin of including occult faith in his "law of faith," that will work for people who do not have faith in the God of the Bible. He called him a false prophet and seemingly wrote him off.

It would be better to forget God's supposed "law of faith"; the idea isn't really Biblical, and Hagin hardly ever used that terminology. (Was he quoting, or borrowing heavily, from somebody here?) As I discuss in some detail in this paper, God saves, heals, moves mountains, etc., and He must be thanked and glorified for everything that He does. The more we would be healed by a "law of faith," which is like the "law of gravity," the more remote God would become, and the less we would feel a need to thank Him, live for Him, and glorify Him.

I know at least one reason that the "law of faith" approach appeals to some Christians. It's easier to think of some children not being healed (like with the deacon and Sunday School teacher's children that Hagin mentioned), for example, because of an impersonal "law of faith" than to speak of God's not healing them. However, what we need to do is straighten out the things we are believing and/or doing wrong and begin to walk in the full salvation that God has provided for us at a very high cost to Himself in the sacrifice of His Son and in His outpoured Spirit, in accordance with His Word, by grace through faith, for His full glory and for our full good. We glorify God to the max when we appropriate and walk in the full salvation that He has provided for us. On the other hand....

**8. I'll quote a key sentence from page 119 of Hunt's *Occult Invasion* and then a similar sentence from page 64 of his *Beyond Seduction*. He backs up both sentences by referring to pages 62 and 173-176 of Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (Kenyon, 1945, 202 pages). Then we will discuss these references. ((This sentence by Hunt in his book *Occult Invasion* is in the same general context in which he referred to Hagin's *Having Faith in Your Faith* (which I quoted from and discussed above). And this**

sentence by Hunt in his book *Beyond Seduction* is in the same general context in which Hunt referred to Hagin's *Having Faith in Your Faith* and to the two articles in Hagin's *Word of Faith* magazine. We just discussed the November, 1974 *Word of Faith* article "The Law of Faith." As I mentioned, I could not find the other article with the wrong date.)):

"Kenyon also taught that man is a little god 'in God's class' and therefore can use the same faith-force that God does." (Hunt referred to pages 62 and 173-176 in Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* [Kenyon, 1945] in an endnote.<sup>9</sup>) "Kenyon also taught the basic principles that make Positive Confession possible: that man is a little god 'in God's class' [Here (on page 64 of *Beyond Seduction*) Hunt referred to page 62 of *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1945 edition) in an endnote.] and therefore can utilize the same universal forces that God does [Here Hunt referred to pages 173-176 of Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* in an endnote.] and which are available to Christian and non-Christian alike."

It's true that Kenyon said that "man is in the same class with God" on page 62, and that he was speaking of man as he was created by God, not limiting his words here to born-again Christians.<sup>10</sup> His next words were: "He is an eternal being [he will exist forever]. He is a spirit being. He was so created that he could become a partaker of God's nature." Kenyon didn't say anything on page 62 about all people (Christian or non-Christian) being "little gods" or suggest that all people can utilize the same universal forces that God does. Kenyon took the fall of man and spiritual death very seriously. Most of his page 62 is devoted to speaking of the sacrifice of Jesus, the Lamb of God, which opened the door for us to be born again. I'll quote a sentence from page 14 of this same book (1945 and 1998 editions): "Now [now that the Son of God has been sacrificed for us] God can give to men [to those who submit to Him, His Son, and the gospel in faith] eternal life, His own nature."

I'll quote two sentences from page 65 and then one sentence from page 82 of *Two Kinds of Life* (1971), where Kenyon greatly overstates (as he frequently did) what it means for born-again Christians to become partakers of God's nature: "When we accept Jesus Christ we receive the same Nature and Life that Jesus did. We become partakers of the Nature of God" and "They were to become partakers of the Divine Nature, THE VERY ESSENCE AND SUBSTANCE OF DEITY [my emphasis]." With statements like this, it isn't all too surprising that Kenyon sometimes spoke of our "sense of equality" with God and that "The believer is as much an Incarnation as was Jesus of Nazareth" (and similar expressions; see below). Kenyon greatly overstated what Adam had before the

---

<sup>9</sup> I had purchased a 1998 edition of this book. I was able to borrow a 1945 edition of this book through the Inter-Library Loan. There wasn't any substantial difference between the 1945 and 1998 editions of this book for these pages.

<sup>10</sup> "It would be well to note this fact: that when God created man, He created him in His Own Image and likeness. Man belongs to the same class of being" (*The Two Kinds of Life* [Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1971], page 37).

fall, and he greatly overstated what born-again Christians have. I'll comment on both of these points later in this paper.

Everything that Kenyon says on pages 173-176 is limited to born-again Christians being able to do great things through being united with Christ, being empowered with His power, having the authority that Adam lost in the fall, etc. He speaks of those who have received eternal life in Christ having God's nature (page 173). It is important to observe (and obvious to observe) that everything Kenyon says on pages 173-176, which were referred to by Hunt, applies only to born-again Christians, so they do not back up Hunt's point at all about non-Christians being able to "utilize the same universal forces that God does and which are available to Christian and non-Christian alike."

Kenyon often (wrongly) speaks of the creative faith (creative power) available to born-again Christians. (But my quotations from Kenyon's *Two Kinds of Faith* on page 31 of this paper help bring some balance to this topic.) As I have mentioned, I believe it is a mistake to speak of Christians having creative faith like God has creative faith (for one thing, the Bible doesn't speak of God's having faith/creative faith). The more we think we can do things ourselves, by virtue of who we are and what we have in ourselves (as born-again supermen [Kenyon uses that word of Christians], who can dwell in the presence of God on terms of equality with Him [and Kenyon sometimes makes statements like this]), the more we are missing what Christian faith (faith in God) is all about.

First I'll give some examples from Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* to demonstrate that Kenyon goes pretty far with ascribing creative power to the spirits of born again Christians. I have already mentioned (earlier in this paper) that Kenyon taught that the fruit mentioned in Gal. 5:22, 23 is the "fruit of the recreated spirit," "not the fruit of the Holy Spirit" (*Two Kinds of Life*, page 95). I'm totally sure Kenyon misunderstood the apostle Paul. Paul was emphasizing the point that the fruit we bear comes by the continuous enablement of the indwelling Spirit of God; he was speaking of the fruit of "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control." Kenyon did mention that we are united with Christ the vine, but it seems clear to me he speaks far too highly of the recreated spirit of man. We'll see more on this point as we continue. As I demonstrated earlier in this paper, Kenyon also insisted that Paul taught that we are to walk by our recreated human spirit, not by the Spirit of God in Gal. 5:16, 25; and Rom. 8:4, for example, which is, I believe, a serious mistake at a foundational level.

We are continuously dependent on all the work of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Apart from a living contact with Him, the Spirit of life, there is no eternal life; apart from a living contact with Him, there is no fruit of the Spirit; apart from a living contact with the Righteous, Holy Spirit, there is no partaking of the desperately needed Righteousness and Holiness of God; apart from living contact with Him, there are no gifts of the Spirit; etc. Sometimes Kenyon speaks of the all-important work of the Holy Spirit in the life of born-again Christians, but he seriously confuses the issue with his inconsistencies.

I'll quote several sentences from Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1945 and 1998 editions), page 97. "What we have to recognize is,

that it is man's Spirit that is recreated. [The New Testament speaks of us being born-again/recreated, not just our spirits. See under John 3:6 in my paper on John 1:19-4:54. I also recommend reading my paper, *Some Things We Should Know about the Meaning of the Words "Spirit" and "Soul."*] The Spirit is the real man. This Spirit [Kenyon is referring to the recreated human spirit] gives birth to all creative ability. Whether it be in the inventive, literary, artistic, or musical line, the ability comes from the same source. You might say they are born of one womb, the Recreated Spirit [referring to the recreated human spirit of the born-again Christian]. That is not all that is born from this marvelous mother of science and art, but love and joy are also her offspring [Keep in mind that for Kenyon "love and joy" are fruit of the recreated human spirit]. ... (page 97). "It was the creative ability of God that came into the spirit of man." Kenyon didn't mention the creative-faith of the recreated human spirit in the likeness of God's supposed creative-faith of Heb. 11:3 here, but I assume he believed that he could have mentioned that here.

However, when you read more of what Kenyon says in this book, you can see that he didn't intend to leave the impression that Christians can accomplish these things in isolation from God's direct involvement. ((This doesn't take away Kenyon's very serious overstatements regarding the recreated spirits of born-again Christians. We'll see more regarding these serious overstatements as we continue with this paper. Kenyon doesn't seem to be interested in tying his different statements together. He seems to be more interested in dealing with one train of thought at a time, which leads to serious inconsistencies. His strong emphasis on his *revelation* knowledge undoubtedly contributes to this problem. I'll say more about Kenyon's serious inconsistencies when we discuss the book by Dale Simmons later in this paper.)) I'll include some excerpts to demonstrate this (and I could have included more such excerpts): "The Holy Spirit is your ability" (page 128). "If we confess our freedom, that the Son has made us free, God makes that confession a reality. ... When we confess His Word, He watches over it to make it good... (page 157)." "Hebrews 11:1: 'Now faith is giving substance to things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen.' ... FAITH IS COUNTING PRAYER ANSWERED BEFORE THE FATHER HAS ACTED [my emphasis]" (page 165). "Grace reaches down and takes us by the hand and lifts us up into the Spirit realm of His fullness" (page 171). "Paul recognized that it was God who was at work within him. Phil. 2:13, 'For it is God who is at work within me, willing and working his own good pleasure.' That was a thrilling, beautiful reality. Your heart now reaches out and grasps it in all its sweet simplicity" (page 172). "He said, 'Lo, I am with you always.' He is there to bless you, strengthen, to empower, to give wisdom until our whole being swings in rhythm with His will. He has not left us without authority. ... Our call is to go empowered with His power, filled with Himself, our lips with His words upon them" (page 173). And "It makes no difference how difficult the problem may look to us we have One seated at the Right Hand of the Father who ever lives to make intercession for us" (page 189).

2 Peter 1:3, 4 speak of born-again Christians becoming "partakers of *the* divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world by lust." We don't want



to overstate what this means. It clearly doesn't mean, for example, that we become deity in any sense (or partake of the essence or substance of what deity means), and it doesn't mean that we can stand in the presence of God in terms of equality, or that we have creative faith, etc. We will worship God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit forever, but we will have the great privilege of reigning with God forever from the time we are glorified (cf., e.g., Rev. 2:26, 27; 3:21; 5:10; 12:5; 20:6; and 22:5). Significantly, Rev. 22:3, 5 show that we will be reigning forever in the eternal state that follows the millennial kingdom as "bond-servants" of God (not as "little gods," and not on terms of equality with God, not even after we are glorified).

Based on what I have read of Kenyon, typically he was speaking to, and about, born-again Christians, but as I'll demonstrate in the following section, Kenyon did leave room for a non-Christian to "develop his spirit until it becomes a force in him." In context he was apparently speaking of a creative force (faith) that could be cultivated to produce miraculous results in "Christian Science, Unity, Spiritualism and other psychological religions." Kenyon seems to demonstrate here (as he often did) that he didn't have an adequate understanding of faith, including a Christian's faith in God. THE FORCE IS IN GOD (INCLUDING THE INFINITE SPIRIT OF GOD), NOT IN OUR SPIRITS!

**9. I'll include another brief excerpt from page 64 of Hunt's *Beyond Seduction* ((This excerpt is important in that it seems to demonstrate that Kenyon, even though he didn't emphasize this point (based on my limited knowledge of Kenyon, his entire emphasis was to teach, encourage, and exhort Christians to walk in the full salvation provided for them in Christ Jesus by walking in obedience to God's Word), he believed that non-Christians can develop their spirits to bring about miraculous results. If I understand what Kenyon said, he didn't see the miraculous things that happen there being caused by the intervention or power of God, or of demons (although he acknowledged that demons could be involved some of the time), but by the human spirit.<sup>11</sup>)):**

---

<sup>11</sup> I'll quote a few sentences from Dale Simmon's *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty* (The Scarecrow Press, 1997). (I'll quote further from this book in a separate section later in this paper.) "Kenyon readily acknowledged the presence of the miraculous in Spiritualism, New Thought, Christian Science, and Theosophy. ... Kenyon had always maintained that the greatest forces in the universe were spiritual. For this reason, he could accept that the 'miracles' performed by Christian Scientists, and others, were the result of the development of their unregenerate human spirits.... [Simmons had a footnote: "E. W. Kenyon, *Advanced Bible Course*, page 183. Kenyon did not discount the possibility that other spirits could assist individuals in performing 'prodigious and miraculous things.' In[d]eed, he especially suspected the Spiritualists' miracles of being the product of a demon-possessed and controlled human spirit' (293)."] This human spirit, thought Kenyon, was capable of tremendous development both before and after it was re-created [Kenyon put all the emphasis on the recreated human spirit of born-again Christians], and, thus, mind over matter (or, perhaps, human spirit over matter) was possible. ..." (pages 243, 244).

To further demonstrate that Kenyon sometimes spoke (in an inconsistent way) of the enablement of the indwelling Spirit of God, later on this page Simmons quoted from Kenyon's

"Kenyon even acknowledged that Mind Science cults could utilize these 'spiritual laws' [[I should point out that Kenyon doesn't mention "spiritual laws" in these references, but these references suffice to demonstrate that Kenyon did acknowledge that non-Christians could "cultivate" their spirits to accomplish results that could be called creative-faith results. I believe Kenyon was making a serious mistake here and seriously confuses the issue.]] 'Natural man can develop his spirit until it becomes a force in him. We see this in Christian Science, Unity, Spiritualism and other psychological religions. This is the natural, unregenerated human spirit being cultivated. (I supplied the last sentence of Kenyon's paragraph, which Hunt had not included; taken from Kenyon's *The Hidden Man: An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind* [Kenyon, Hunt referred to the 1970 edition; I used the 1998 edition], page 26.)

I'll quote the next three short paragraphs that Kenyon has here. "The human spirit is naturally very religious, because it is God-hungry. It is the mother of all human religions.

Christianity is God's answer to the hunger of the human heart.

Every human religion attempts to answer this hunger and fails."

Of first importance, we must understand that any creative faith that a person who is associated with the religions Kenyon mentioned here have nothing to do with Bible faith (faith that is based on the God of the Bible, salvation through repentance and faith in God's new-covenant plan of salvation through the atoning death of His Son, etc.) The religions Kenyon mentioned don't believe (have faith) in the God of the Bible or His plan of salvation. Christian Science, for example, doesn't believe that sin, evil, the devil, or heaven and hell really exist. They are illusions. And they certainly don't believe in salvation through the atoning death of the Lord Jesus Christ, or in the deity of Christ. Christian Science and the Unity Church, for example, do use the Bible selectively, but with their own interpretations

These religions, which Kenyon called "human religions," have strong demonic inputs, very much including doctrines of demons. "Spiritualism," for example, centers in communing with the spirits of the dead, a practice forbidden in the Word of God. You cannot commune with demons spirits (who are part of the kingdom of Satan) impersonating those who have died and also commune with God. Kenyon understands that demons are involved in spiritualism, as footnote 10 and a later excerpt will show, but the primary point I want to make here (in agreement with Hunt) is that I believe Kenyon is making a serious mistake to say that the human spirit has the potential to "become a force in him," a creative force that can heal or bring about other miracles apart from active involvement of God or the devil and his hosts. (Psychosomatic healings, for example, are not miracles.) And, of course, Christians cannot be open to receive miracles from the kingdom of the devil. God considers that to be spiritual adultery, and full scale rebellion.

I suppose Kenyon's error about the potential for the human spirit to "become a force" builds on his very much exaggerated understanding of God's creation of

---

"Success," *Reality I* (September 1903), page 66. He included the words, "utter dependence on the Holy Spirit."

Adam to begin with. (I dealt with this error in my paper *Did Jesus Die Spiritually?*) I'll quote a few sentences from Kenyon's *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption* (Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1969) ((This book and *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* are two of the primary places where Kenyon taught the very wrong doctrine that Jesus died spiritually, that He took on the nature of the devil, suffered in hell for three days, and was then justified and born again, as we are, but that topic frequently comes up in his other writings and is foundational in his presentation of the gospel. Kenyon's view of Christ (at least Kenyon's view of Christ that Kenyon sometimes presented), the Son of God, was too low (which, for one thing, led to his having room to see Jesus die spiritually, to take on the nature of the devil, etc), and his view of Adam (before the fall) was way too high.)): "We conclude that man [Kenyon was speaking of man as he was created by God] is primarily a spirit being, CREATED TO WALK WITH THE FATHER-GOD ON HIS LEVEL [my emphasis]" (page 19). "MAN WAS CREATED AS NEARLY LIKE THE FATHER-GOD AS WAS POSSIBLE. Man was to be God's companion and under-ruler. [The fact that the Bible speaks of man's being created in the image of God doesn't mean that "man was created as nearly like the Father-God as was possible." Not at all! And we don't want to forget the cherubim, seraphim, Michael, Gabriel, etc.] HIS DOMINION REACHED TO THE UTMOST STAR AND PLANET. HIS DOMINION WAS AS FAR-REACHING AS CHRIST'S RULE SHALL BE WHEN HE SHALL TAKE OVER THE DOMINION OF THE UNIVERSE. [What!] HEBREWS 2:5-8 IS A REVELATION OF ADAM'S DOMINION. ... HEBREWS 2:9 SHOWS THAT THE LOST DOMINION OF ADAM HAS BEEN GIVEN TO CHRIST [This says far too much for Adam and far too little for Christ.], BY VIRTUE OF HIS SACRIFICE ON MAN'S BEHALF. HEBREWS 1:3 GIVES TO US A SUGGESTION AS TO THE WAY ADAM RULED GOD'S CREATION. [What! For Kenyon to refer to Heb. 1:3, WHICH SPEAKS OF THE DEITY OF CHRIST, to give us a suggestion as to the way Adam ruled God's creation is quite inappropriate, to say the least. I'll quote the first part of Heb. 1:3: "And He [the Lord Jesus] is the radiance of His [God the Father's] glory and the exact representation of His nature, and upholds all things by the word of His power. ...."] ADAM RULED CREATION BY HIS WORD. HIS VOICE WAS LIKE THE VOICE OF HIS CREATOR IN ITS DOMINION OVER CREATION" [What!] (pages 20, 21). (I put much of this quotation in capital letters for emphasis.) The Bible doesn't back up what Kenyon says here! This is serious error! I believe Hagin would reject much of what Kenyon says here. Would that he had rejected, totally rejected, the very wrong idea that Jesus died spiritually, took on the nature of the devil, etc.

Now back to page 26 of *The Hidden Man*. Having informed us that the natural man can cultivate his spirit to accomplish miraculous things, Kenyon (who certainly takes the fall of man through Adam very seriously) says, "Natural man's spirit is dominated largely by evil. Men have used it to gain the mastery over others for their own ends.

Then there are demonized spirits, men who are controlled by evil spirits. Oftentimes they perform prodigies, miracles, it seems.

The scriptures speak of this type: 'Necromancy, spiritualists, and mediums.' They are all demonized spirits. [[I'm thankful that Kenyon acknowledges that these things are demonic, but I don't know why he listed spiritualism above as a place where a non-Christian "can develop his spirit until it becomes a force in him." The primary point I want to make here, and I'm confident that Hunt and Hagin would agree, is that none of the miraculous things (miracles) that take place in non-Christian religions are caused by the cultivated human spirit, but by demon spirits. God could work an occasional miracle there for His own purposes as He deals with people, calling them to salvation.]]

Often their minds have no part in what they say. Demons speak through their lips independent of Sense Knowledge.

These men can become deeply spiritual and become deep in the things of Satan."

Kenyon then goes on to discuss "the third kind of Spirituality," dealing, as he almost always did, with born again Christians. I'll quote the first two short paragraphs that Kenyon has here: "The third kind of spirituality is that of the New Creation spirit, for a man becomes a New Creation by receiving the Life and nature of God.

The Holy Spirit makes His home in the physical body and dominates the human spirit that has been recreated. As this is cultured and developed through the Word, there is no limit to its possibilities." Sometimes, like here, Kenyon included the all-important role of the Holy Spirit in the life of born-again Christians. Other places (frequently it seems) he puts all the emphasis on the born-again Christians themselves, who dwell in the presence of God "on terms equal [of equality] to God," "on His level," "without any sense of inferiority," and who create by faith like God does. I don't believe that teaching lines up with the Bible at all, and it certainly doesn't promote a necessary attitude of humility before God.

**10. Hunt has another important quotation from Hagin on pages 344 of *Occult Invasion*, under the heading "Ye Shall Be as Gods," in the chapter "Playing God: The Lust for Power." The quotation is from Hagin's 63 page book, *Zoe: The God Kind of Life* (Rhema Bible Church, first printed 1981 and still in print now, July 2013, pages 35, 36). For some reason chapter 4 (pages 35-53), "Ruling and Reigning in Union with God," of this book is different than what Hagin typically says, even as chapter 1 of *Having Faith in Your Faith* is different. It is quite possible (or highly probable) that some of the material in chapter 4 was transcribed from an audio recording of a teaching where Hagin was quoting, or heavily borrowing, from someone else (or something like that).**

First I'll include the excerpt from Hagin that Hunt has on page 344: "God has made us...in the same class of being that He is Himself. ... God took something of Himself...and put it into man. Man was master. Man lived on terms equal to [of equality with] God.... This is the end of the weakness message!" (The ellipses are Hunts.)

I'll comment on these words as we continue, but it will be helpful to quote quite a bit more from pages 34-36 than Hunt quoted. Hagin (or whoever he was quoting, or borrowing heavily from; even if he was quoting someone else Hagin is responsible for what was published under his name) started this chapter by quoting Rom. 5:17 (KJV). I'll start there, and I will be making comments in brackets as we continue. (Romans chapter 5, a very important chapter, is discussed verse-by-verse in my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin: Full Salvation Through the Atoning Death of the Lord Jesus Christ*.)

" 'For if by one man's offense [Adam's offense/transgression] death reigned by one [Adam]; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.' What does this verse mean? It means that every one of us who has been born again and has received the life of God has come into a kingly state. [Note that Hagin is speaking only of born-again Christians here.] We are accepted by God to reign as kings in the realm of life. [[Hagin interpreted this verse to say that we reign as kings now. (I have heard him emphasize this point in audio recordings.) I don't believe that the apostle Paul included that idea here. The New Testament frequently mentions that we will begin to reign with Christ when we are glorified, but we don't reign now. And although the Lord Jesus has all authority on the earth now, He is waiting for the Father's time for Him to return and begin to reign on the earth. Then He will bring divine order to the earth through judgment.

Paul's point here was that, now that we are born-again Christians, we are no longer reigned over by sin, spiritual death, and Satan's kingdom of darkness. Those enemies have lost the authority they have had over us since the fall of man in Adam and Eve, which is a really big deal. We have the authority and power (by grace) to be what God wants us to be, and to do the things He has called us to do, including walking with the victory over sin in the righteousness and holiness of God, casting out demons, and taking the gospel to the world.]] ...

[Man] was made to reign as a king under God. That kingly being was created in the image and likeness of God. HE WAS CREATED ON TERMS OF EQUALITY WITH GOD, AND HE COULD STAND IN GOD'S PRESENCE WITHOUT ANY CONSCIOUSNESS OF INFERIORITY [my emphasis]. [[I strongly disagree with much of what Hagin says here and in what follows. (But I want to emphasize the point that, based on what I know of Hagin, this doesn't sound like him.) Being created in the image of God is one thing; speaking of being "on terms of equality with God" is something else. And it surely goes too far to speak of standing in God's presence without any consciousness of inferiority. We stand in awe of God and we worship Him, now and forever. He gives us the right to dwell in His presence, but we are very much inferior (subordinate) to God). Some of the quotations I have given from Kenyon earlier in this paper, and some I will include as we continue, demonstrate that Hagin could have been quoting, or borrowing heavily from, Kenyon here.]] ...

He made us in the same class of being that He is Himself. [He goes on to mention that Adam had an intellect capable of naming the animals, etc. As far as I can see that leaves a super-gigantic (we could say infinite) gap between God and man, which will continue forever.] ... He lived on terms of equality with God.

[[As I mentioned, I believe this is a serious error. If you go very far with statements like this you might wonder if we are dependent on God and whether it would be proper to seriously worship Him. I believe Hagin clearly understood his serious subordination to God the Father and the Lord Jesus, and he put an emphasis on worship.]]

God is a faith God. All He had to do was simply say, 'Let there be light' (Gen. 1:3), and there was light. God created everything except man by speaking it into existence. He's a faith God. [We have already discussed the fact that the Bible, including Heb. 11:3, doesn't speak of God being a "faith God."]

Now, God made man a faith man, because man belongs to God's class. A faith man lives in the creative realm of God. [[As we have discussed, we are missing the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches if we speak of our creating (healing, moving mountains, etc.) by faith, but it is Biblical to speak of God creating (healing, moving mountains, etc.) in response to our prayers of faith that are consistent with His Word and will. And the same principle applies when we speak (in faith) to a mountain (or a demon) that needs to be moved (as in Mark 11:23) in the name of Jesus. God (one way, or another) moves mountains (and demons) that need to be moved in response to our words/commands of faith (we never command God). If we start thinking in terms of us moving mountains (or demons) based on who (and what) we are (even if we give God the glory for giving us the ability to move mountains etc.), we are missing what the Bible teaches in a serious way, and we may well end up with an occult faith. Man never did, and we do not, and we never will, live "on terms of equality with God," for one thing!]] This is the end of the weakness message!" Hagin (or whoever he was quoting, or borrowing heavily from) applied these words to born-again Christians, because even though Adam fell, "through the new birth [God] has bestowed upon us the lost authority we had in the Garden of Eden" (page 40 of *Zoe*). As I point out in this paper, Kenyon greatly overstated the authority and status that Adam had before the fall.

I'll quote two paragraphs from page 40 of Hagin's book, *Zoe: The God Kind of Life*: "Even many in the great body of Full Gospel people do not know that the new birth is a real incarnation. [It is clear, I believe, that Hagin got this very wrong idea from Kenyon, but thankfully it was not a foundational idea for Hagin's overall teaching.] They do not know they are as much sons and daughters of God as Jesus. [It is true that we become sons of God, but in a totally different sense than Jesus, who always was the Son of God, which included His being deity (God) with God the Father and God the Spirit.] ... *Jesus was first divine, and then He was human. So He was in the flesh a divine-human being. I was first human and so were you, but I was born of God, and so I became a human-divine being!* [No, being born again does not make us "divine"!] God is living in us!" Yes, but that doesn't make us "divine." For one thing, and I'm confident that Hagin would agree, we will worship the Lord Jesus forever (along with God the Father and God the Spirit), but we will not be worshipped.

From everything I know about Kenneth Hagin, his life, and essentially all of his teaching, demonstrate that he clearly understood his serious subordination to God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. The relationship and experiences he had with the Lord Jesus (including his being seriously chastened and corrected many times) were sufficient, in themselves, to convince Hagin of his serious subordination. (I really don't know about Kenyon. He says some things that indicate he understood his subordination, but he frequently seriously overstates Adam's status before the fall and the status of born-again Christians. It is necessary to understand, and to emphasize, that we will always be very much subordinate to God [God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit].) Being born-again Christians who are destined to be glorified and even to reign with Christ is very different than becoming deity (divine) in any sense, or being on terms of equality with God, or being able to create (with our creative faith/force of faith) like God does, etc.

I also disagree with much that Hagin (or the person he was quoting, or borrowing heavily from) says as he continues with this long chapter. I'll give two examples. (This book, *Zoe: The God-Kind of Life* [1981 edition, is still in print now, July 2013].) Both of these examples fit the idea that Hagin was quoting, or borrowing heavily, from somebody. At the bottom of page 36, and on page 37, Hagin mentions that man lost his dominion in the fall and that man has yearned to regain his lost dominion. "This...desire to gain the lost dominion is seen in his offering, IN HIS DRINKING BLOOD [my emphasis] and in the priesthoods he has appointed. ...

They would take an animal or another man, and make a sacrifice upon the altar of their god or gods. And when they did, they believed that the offering became identified with God. [There is a gigantic difference between their offering becoming identified with their god or gods (to the extent that happened) and becoming identified with the God of the Bible. It certainly wasn't true that the old covenant sacrificial offerings became identified with God.] They said, 'If we drink the blood of the man or the animal, we drink the blood of God. And if we drink enough of it, we'll be God.' [[No person who believes in the God of the Bible would think in terms of drinking His blood, and they certainly wouldn't think of becoming God through drinking enough of His blood. It's true that some who worship in Satanic/demonic/occult religions drink the blood of the sacrificed victims because they are required to by their gods/controlling spirits to do it, and they are looking for occult power, but the God of the Bible forbade His worshippers even eating meat with the blood in it, not to mention drinking blood (see Gen. 9:4; Lev. 7:26; 17:11; and Deut. 12:23; cf. Psalm 16:4). The next sentence shocked me when I read it. I have a very hard time picturing Hagin saying this. Anyway, he is responsible for what is written in his book.]]

ACTUALLY, THAT'S NOT TOO FAR REMOVED FROM THE COMMUNION TABLE [my emphasis]. ...."

Chapter 1 of Kenyon's mini-book *The Blood Covenant* (Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1969) has some important similarities with what I have just quoted from Hagin's book. (It is quite possible that Hagin was quoting, or heavily

borrowing from, an earlier version of Kenyon's writings. I'll quote part of what Kenyon said in chapter 1. "For years I was convinced that there was something in the Lord's Table that I did not understand. ... 'Then, there was placed in my hands a book by Dr. H. Clay Trumbull, the old editor of the Sunday School Times, in which he showed there had been a Blood Covenant practiced by all primitive peoples from time immemorial. He proved that this Blood Covenant was the basis of all primitive religions. He gave data from all parts of the world showing that even to this day, in Africa, India, China, Borneo, and even the islands of the Seas, MEN ARE PRACTICING A BLOOD COVENANT VERY SIMILAR TO THE LORD'S TABLE [my emphasis]. It was degenerated, but never-the-less, it had the marks of an original revelation from God." Again I am shocked to hear that pagans drinking blood, etc. has anything in common with the Lord's Table, much less "is very similar to the Lord's Table."

Kenyon also discussed this topic on pages 154, 155 of *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption* (1969). He quoted four paragraphs from Trumbull's book there. I won't quote any of that, but I'll quote one sentence from what Kenyon said there: "Every primitive people have drunk the blood of sacrificial victims in seeking oneness with God."

I spent some time skimming through the 390 page book that Kenyon mentioned by H. Clay Trumbull *The Blood Covenant: A Primitive Rite and its Bearing on Scripture* (published in 1893). I cannot recommend the book. Trumbull speaks a lot about people drinking the blood of humans and animals for various reasons (typically there was no mention of a sacrificial offering that had anything to do with sin), but I fail to see any reasonable similarity with the Lord's Table. Most of that drinking of blood (including cannibals) was purely pagan/demonic in origin and has nothing in common with Christianity.

The Lord's Table is all about the One Atoning Sacrifice of the Lamb of God that established the new covenant in the blood of the Lamb that saved us. Even if I believed that we actually partake of the literal blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, which I don't, I would still be offended by the idea that pagans drinking blood to make covenants, etc., has any reasonable correspondence with the Lord's Table.

I'll comment briefly on part of what Kenyon said on page 16, in his chapter 4 of *The Blood Covenant*, "Jehovah [Yahweh] Cuts the Covenant with Abraham." Kenyon seriously confuses the issue here. He says, "...God said [to Abraham], 'Take for me,' that is as God's substitute, 'an animal and slay it.' Abraham did it. Then God said, 'My substitute has been slain, and I want you to circumcise yourself,' so that his blood will mingle with God's substitute. When that was done, God and Abraham had entered the Covenant."

There was no mention in Genesis chapter 17 that the incidental shedding of blood that took place when Abraham was circumcised was mingled with the blood of "God's substitute." In fact there wasn't any animal sacrificed at the time Abraham's circumcision took place. It is possible that Kenyon was referring to the sacrificed animals and birds of Gen. 15:9 (Gen. 15:9 mentions God's saying, "Take me an heifer..."), but that wouldn't fit at all in any way. For one thing, those sacrifices took place before Ishmael was conceived, and Abraham, Ishmael, etc.



were not circumcised until Ishmael was thirteen years old. Also, it isn't reasonable to say that the blood of the animals and birds that were sacrificed in Gen. 15:9 was considered to be the blood of "God's substitute."

On pages 40-42 Hagin (or whoever he was quoting, or heavily borrowing from; Kenyon would fit well here), in his book *Zoe*, speaks of the new birth being "a real incarnation." It's true that we "come into a vital union with God" in the new birth, but that is quite different than being an incarnation. I'll quote a paragraph (I'll split it into two paragraphs here) from page 4 of my paper *Did Jesus Die Spiritually?* "On page 151 [of *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption*]...Kenyon demonstrates that he doesn't adequately understand the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Kenneth Hagin has followed Kenyon in this error in a few of his writings.) Kenyon says, 'Every man who has been born again is an Incarnation. The believer is as much an Incarnation as was Jesus of Nazareth.' This teaching is very wrong. The incarnation of Jesus Christ meant that the eternal Son of God, the One who was with the Father in the beginning (before creation began), through whom all things were created (John 1:1-3), took a body/flesh (John 1:14) and became the unique God-man. We are born again through union with Him, through His atoning death and resurrection, by the indwelling Spirit of God, but we don't become deity, as the Son of God always was and always will be—WE DON'T BECOME INCARNATIONS.

The fact that the Spirit of God dwells in us as temples doesn't at all make us incarnations. The Lord Jesus Christ always was God (God the Son) and always will be God, and He will be worshiped as God the Son forever. He, with God the Father, will be the temple and the light of new Jerusalem (Rev. 21:22, 23; 22:5). We will be glorified and reign with Christ, but there will be a gigantic difference between Christ and us—He is God the Son! There was an even greater difference between Adam before the fall and the Lord Jesus Christ [God the Son]. After we are glorified, we will be in a much higher state than Adam was before the fall (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. 15:44-50). For one thing, Adam had a natural, flesh and blood body before the fall."

**11. A few pages back I briefly quoted from Kenyon's *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption* to demonstrate that Kenyon's view of Adam before the fall was far too high and His view of the Lord Jesus was too low. (However, as I have mentioned, sometimes Kenyon presented an orthodox view of God the Son and the Trinity.) Here I'm going to include some excerpts from Kenyon's *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1945) to demonstrate that Kenyon's view of born-again Christians is far too high in comparison with/in relation to God. For one thing Kenyon probably was the source for Hagin's infrequent similar statements. As I mentioned, these two books by Kenyon are two of the primary places where he taught that Jesus died spiritually, took on the nature of the devil, etc.**

"He [speaking of those who are united with Christ as new creations] is SO

NEARLY LIKE CHRIST [my emphasis], so utterly one with Him, that Christ can say, 'I am the vine, and ye are the branches' " (page 64). The fact that we are totally dependent on the vine for our life doesn't mean that we are "so nearly like Christ."

"This new kind of life [the life of born-again Christians] gives to man the ability to stand in the presence of God without the sense of guilt, condemnation OR INFERIORITY [my emphasis]" (page 71; cf., e.g., pages 63, 99, 110, 112, 113, 152). In a quotation I will give below, Kenyon also says, "Righteousness gives him the SENSE OF EQUALITY [my emphasis] and of relationship with the Father." These statements show a likely source for Hagin's saying that man "was created on terms of equality with God, and he could stand in God's presence without any consciousness of inferiority" in his book *Zoe* (quoted above in this paper).

"He [Satan] saw men and women become New Creations.

These New Creations became Jesus men and women.

THEY COUNTED THE THINGS THAT WERE NOT AS THOUGH THEY WERE, AND THEY LEAPED INTO BEING.

AND THEY COUNTED THE THINGS THAT WERE, AS THOUGH THEY WERE NOT, AND THEY CEASED BEING [my emphasis]. ... [We have already discussed the fact that words like these, which are quite appropriate for God, are not appropriate for us.]

He saw selfishness curtailed.

He saw Righteousness become a reality.

The strangest phenomenon was to see men and women stand in the presence of God without the sense of guilt, INFERIORITY [my emphasis], or condemnation. ... He saw men reign as Kings in this New Realm of Life. ..." (page 90).

It is helpful that on page 128 Kenyon mentioned that "God is our ability" and "The Holy Spirit is your ability." Kenyon frequently said things like that, but they don't begin to take away the serious errors that remain.

"The spiritual man knows that he is the Righteousness of God.

He knows that Righteousness means the ability to stand in the Father's presence as though sin had never been.

Righteousness gives him the SENSE OF EQUALITY [my emphasis] and of relationship with the Father.

He is a son, and He has a son's place.

He takes a son's privileges and enjoys them.

He assumes a son's responsibilities and rises to the level of his opportunities" (page 129). On page 151 of *The Hidden man* (1996) Kenyon says, "Can you imagine what it would mean to have an open, fresh, sweet fellowship with [Father God] daily, so that you could meet Him ON TERMS OF EQUALITY, AS LOVERS MEET EACH OTHER [my emphasis]?" On page 101 of *Two Kinds of Faith*

(1942), Kenyon says, "If He had sons and daughters with whom He could not fellowship ON TERMS OF EQUALITY [my emphasis], there would be no satisfaction in it; the work He wrought in Christ would be an utter failure [What!]."

"We reign in life with Him [Jesus].

We actually belong to royalty.

WE ARE AS MUCH A PART OF JESUS AS HE AND THE FATHER ARE PART OF EACH OTHER.

HIS VERY SUBSTANCE AND BEING IS IN US [my emphasis]." We are born of God, and His Spirit dwells in us, but Kenyon goes too far here, as when he said we are as much incarnations of God as Jesus is. On page 37 of *The Hidden Man* (1996) Kenyon also speaks of God's imparting "His very substance and being" to us. God's Spirit dwells in us, but the Spirit is a Person distinct from us.

I'll quote a few sentences from Kenyon's *Two Kinds of Life* (1971, page 25), "The New Creation of a God-man [This terminology, "God-man," which is quite appropriate for the Lord Jesus, is NOT appropriate for Christians.], born of heaven. [We are born of heaven, but quite unlike the Lord Jesus who always was, and always will be, deity. We never will become deity in any sense, or exist on terms of equality with God, etc.] He is like the sample, Jesus. [It is Biblical to say that we are like Jesus, but there are gigantic differences.] He [referring to born-again Christians] is God's superman. He is to walk in the realm of the supernatural. He is to be ruled by the Lord. [This sentence brings some balance, but it doesn't take away of the extreme overstatements regarding the status of born-again Christians.] He had been ruled by Satan. ...."

**12. *Mind, Might, and Mastery: Human Potential in Metaphysical Religion and E. W. Kenyon*, A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Liberty University Graduate School of Religion in Candidacy for the Master of Arts in Christian Thought (Apologetics), by Kevin Scott Smith, 1995.** This thesis covers this topic in some depth; it covers 183 double-spaced pages, with extensive footnotes (not double spaced).

I'll quote part of what the author says in his Abstract: "Through original research, this thesis overviews Kenyon's teachings (chapter 1 [32 pages]), explains the basis concepts behind metaphysical religion (chapter 2 [45 pages]), documents new evidence for Kenyon's historical links to New Thought (chapter 3 [46 pages]), and directly compares the teaching of both religious systems (chapter 4 [46 pages]). ...."

And, I'll quote part of a footnote from page 2. "Mind-cure began in America as an outgrowth of Transcendentalism; its chief aim was the mastery of physical conditions through understanding and applying mental or spiritual laws. Adherents viewed mind as a causative force over the secondary realm of matter, and on that basis attempted to heal the body solely through changing states of consciousness."

I don't agree with everything that Kenneth Smith says in this thesis, but it is packed with a lot of detailed information. Originally I planned to quote quite a bit from this thesis, but in the course of doing the research for my paper, I finally decided that it is beyond the scope of this paper to get into the details regarding where Kenyon picked up his new ideas that are discussed in this paper. The details get complicated and controversial.

The important thing is to see that some of Kenyon's new ideas are wrong, some of them seriously wrong, regardless of where they came from. I am confident that Kenyon was influenced to some extent by some of the things taught by the metaphysical religions, but I am also confident that Kenyon believed that he was staying faithful to Bible-centered Christianity. Smith would agree with this. Kenyon made it clear that he believed those metaphysical religions were false, but that didn't mean that he couldn't learn anything helpful from them. He knew that they seemed to be meeting some of the needs of people better than most of Christianity was, and that they were gaining many converts from Christianity.

After reading the books by Joe McIntyre, Dale Simmons, and by Robert Bowman that are discussed in this paper and spending some more time reading some of Kenyon's books, I believe Kevin Smith probably overstates the extent to which Kenyon was influenced by metaphysical religion, but I agree with him that the errors in Kenyon's teachings are serious (wherever they came from). Smith was aware that the three authors I just mentioned (though they all agree that Kenyon was influenced by the metaphysical religions), didn't agree that Kenyon was influenced to the extent that he (Smith) thought they were. He also understood that he and D. R. McConnell had much in common.

**13. *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum [which means after the Civil War] Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty* by Dale H. Simmons** (The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1997, 351 pages).

"...a thorough investigation of Kenyon's writings makes it clear that both the teaching of the Higher Christian Life movement [with an emphasis on holiness, which I appreciate] and New Thought played a central role in the development of his own thought" (page xii). Dale Simmons spends a lot of space in this book documenting the great influence that the Higher Christian Life movement had on Kenyon; he was part of that movement. He went on to point out that Kenyon often mentioned that he disagreed with New Thought and Christian Science: "In fact, in the last two decades of his life Kenyon became even more convinced than ever that [they] represented the greatest threat to authentic Christianity." But "Like other soldiers in this battle, Kenyon no doubt reasoned that since the cults had 'stolen' their grains of truth in the first place, he was justified in fortifying his messages with similar cereals while spewing forth the husks in which these truths were encased" (page xii). As I have mentioned, it doesn't really make much difference where Kenyon picked up his wrong ideas; but it is necessary for us to see that they are wrong. One of his biggest errors, if not the biggest, was

that Jesus died spiritually, took on the nature of Satan, was tormented in hell for three days, and then needed to be justified and born again, like we do. The metaphysical religions were not teaching any of that (that I know of), but some of the things they did teach may have contributed to Kenyon's coming up with that teaching.

"In thrashing out his own teachings, Kenyon displayed an independent streak and an overwhelming need to come up with teachings that no one else had ever discovered. [This fit Kenyon's idea that the very special teaching that he came up with (by what he would call *revelation* knowledge) was different enough and powerful enough to greatly bless the Christian church if his teachings were followed.] ... As this study will show Kenyon was also very eclectic, borrowing bits and pieces of doctrine from a wide variety of sources. [Simmons had a footnote: "Overwhelmingly, these sources were still within the broader evangelical tradition."] Unfortunately, Kenyon was not possessed of a keen intellect, leaving him unable to synthesize these disparate teachings into a coherent and logically consistent system" (xii, xiii). It might be more accurate to say that Kenyon didn't put a priority on tying the different things he taught together, but that he lectured and wrote with the assumption that what he was saying at that time was important truth (truth that came by *revelation* knowledge), and that he wanted to say it with rhetorical skill. He studied and taught effective speaking. I have already pointed out several serious inconsistencies in Kenyon's teaching. I'll comment further on his inconsistencies as we continue.

Joe McIntyre points out (*The True Story* [see the next section of this paper, section 14], page 1) that Kenyon, "the fourth son in a family of ten" "left school at the age of ten" because of poverty. "At twelve he went to work at one of the local carpet mills, where he typically worked from 6 A.M. to 6 P.M. six days a week." Kenyon didn't receive much formal education, but he was highly motivated to study on his own and to become an educator.

Sometimes Kenyon speaks of the recreated human spirit in such exalted terms and the power of its creative faith, etc. that you would think that we hardly need God. In other places he seems to put a proper emphasis on the grace of God and the powerful enablement of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Simmons points out that Kenyon is quite inconsistent in the things he says about the Holy Spirit. (See Simmons's pages 169, 170 with the footnotes.<sup>12</sup>) Kenyon was inconsistent, and

---

<sup>12</sup> I'll include one of the quotations from Kenyon that Simmons included on page 169 (taken from "Notes from Sermon on the Name," *Reality* 1 [July 1903], page 59.). "The Holy Spirit illuminates our minds to understand the power in the Name of Jesus. There is no power in the Holy Spirit Himself, except as He is the Unveiler of the Father, of the Son, and of the Name which Christ left." The Bible often speaks of the power of the Holy Spirit. I'll quote another sentence from Simmons on page 170, "Thus the Holy Spirit's primary role is to provide us with Revelation Knowledge of what Christ has done for us...and who we are now through our relationship to him...." In endnote 139 Simmons says, "Once again, Kenyon is inconsistent...he writes: '... He [the Holy Spirit] is Omnipotence. You have Omnipotence abiding in you' (Kenyon, *Advanced Bible Course* [1970]. page 188)." Also see, for example, "When we link up that spirit [our spirit] with God's Spirit, and you have a spirit dominated by God, you can conquer all the forces opposed to you" (Kenyon, *The Hidden Man* [1970], page 146).

confusing, in what he said on quite a few topics.<sup>13</sup> It is beyond the scope of this study to try to determine if those editing Kenyon's books (especially after he died) caused any of these inconsistencies.

As I have emphasized in this paper, we must understand that we are totally dependent on a continuous supply of the grace of God in Christ and by the indwelling Holy Spirit (we must walk by the Holy Spirit on a continuous basis through faith, a faith based on the Word of God), and that God is the One who moves mountains, etc. (not our faith), and that He must receive all of the glory. We must be humble before God, recognizing (for one thing) our total, continual dependence on Him and His saving grace. We were not created, or born-again, to be independent of God, or to exist on terms of equality with Him. These things are at the heart of what Christianity is all about, and keep in mind that pride is at the root of sin.

(I'm quoting Simmons) "...New Thought (also known as Mind Cure, Mental Healing, Harmonialism) is committed to the position that the Spirit (Mind) is primary and that the material...is merely secondary and resultant. Thus the remedy for all ills, both physical and social, is to be found in the realm of causes, which are mental and spiritual. Furthermore, New Thought teaches that human beings, in their essential or 'higher' selves, are divine. Consequently, if

---

<sup>13</sup> Sometimes Kenyon seemed to accurately teach about the Trinity. However, on page 250 of *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption* (1969), he presented a oneness (modalistic) view of God, where there are three modes of being, not three Persons: "God is Three in One. Each One of the Three is God, and EACH ONE IS THE WHOLE OF GOD. The three are represented as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; THREE MODES OF BEINGS WHICH GOD IS. It is not primarily three ways in which God acts, BUT THREE MODES OF BEING [my capitalizations for emphasis]. In the modalistic view of God, the one Person of God appears in the modes of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and there is no Trinity. On the Trinity see my papers: *Who Do We Worship?*; *Who Do We Pray To?*; *More on the Trinity*; and *The Name Yahweh and God the Father and God the Son*.

I'll give an example of a few confusing (and wrong) things Kenyon said about faith on pages 99 of *In His Presence* (1944). Faith is one of the most important words that we need to understand. "... I'll need wisdom. I'll need His ability to face every contingency. This is something I possess. I need no faith to obtain it. Prayer is not necessary, for it is mine. ...faith is not needed, for 'He has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in Christ.' " In one sense we can say that wisdom is ours, but we must continually appropriate these things BY FAITH, even as we must walk by the Holy Spirit on a continuous basis BY FAITH. These things are not automatic. And it is clear that it is appropriate to pray for wisdom, IN FAITH; see James 1:5-8.

Kenyon says something similar on pages 105, 106: "It isn't a problem then of faith with the believer, for all things belong to him. Eph. 1:3: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenlies in Christ.' ...it is not a problem of faith with us as sons and daughters of God. It is merely a problem of our taking our place, enjoying our rights." We take our place BY FAITH. These things, though available to us, are far from being automatically ours: The old man still wants to live, and it is supported by the world and the devil and his innumerable hosts.

On page 110 of *The Hidden Man* (1996) Kenyon says something similar, " 'Claiming the promises' is not faith. Faith already has it. 'Claiming' proves that one does not have it yet. It is unbelief attempting to act like faith." On page 148 of that book he confuses the issue substantially by saying that "Faith is the product of acting intelligently upon [the Bible]." (We act intelligently upon the Bible by faith.) Then he says, "Jesus has been made Wisdom unto us, and we claim it and enjoy it by Faith." Earlier in this footnote Kenyon informed us that we don't need faith to obtain wisdom and that we don't need to claim it by faith. Kenyon has many such inconsistencies.

individuals live in conscious awareness of their essential oneness with the Infinite, they can think God's thoughts after Him and thus reorder their lives according to the divine pattern" (xiv).

On page 28, under the heading "Fundamental Doctrine," Simmons deals with "the center of Kenyon's teaching" that deals with the "Finished Work of Christ." The problem is that for Kenyon this teaching centered in his very wrong ideas about Jesus dying spiritually, taking on the nature of the devil, being tormented in hell for three days, and being justified and born again like we are. Then He could be resurrected. Simmons speaks of Kenyon's "RADICAL THEORY [my emphasis] of the substitutionary atonement of Christ." Simmons says, "Curiously...Kenyon maintains that it was necessary for Jesus to become exactly as we are by Himself dying spiritually."

Jesus did have to become a man (the God-man) and to die in our place as the all-important Lamb of God, but it was impossible for Him "to become exactly as we are." For one super-important difference, when Jesus was separated from God the Father on the cross in some ways (for the first and only time), through taking all of our sins with the guilt and the penalties on Himself, He wasn't spiritually dead. (Jesus wasn't just a man who had a special relationship with God the Father and who had received the Holy Spirit.) He still was God the Son (deity) who had condescended to become the God-man to save us (e.g., Phil. 2:5-7), and in no way did He sin, or become a sinner, or did He take on the sinful nature of the devil. This is very important foundational Christian teaching!

Kenyon said that Jesus died spiritually at the time He cried out "My God! My God! Why have You forsaken Me [Matt. 27:46]?" Simmons commented that in Kenyon's mind Jesus suffering in hell was absolutely necessary, because "Christ had to endure the same penalty that we would or else He would not truly 'pay the penalty' owed to divine justice." "One gigantic problem with Kenyon's view is that he didn't see that Jesus had fully accomplished His all-important atoning work on the cross. His atoning work was finished then, like He said it was (John 19:30).

Everything that Jesus said from the cross confirms that his nature did not change. I'll quote Luke 23:46, "And Jesus, crying out with a loud voice, said, 'Father, into your hands I commit My spirit.' Having said this, He breathed His last." Who can say that Jesus didn't suffer enough on the cross to pay the penalty? We are talking about an infinite price that was paid in His atoning death (not to mention the infinite price that was paid when He condescended to become a man, the God-man), which included those awesome revealing words that He cried from the cross about being forsaken by God the Father! Furthermore, if you want to (wrongly) insist that Jesus had to go to hell to take our place to satisfy justice, why limit it to three days?

It is necessary to understand that Jesus did not, and could not, become everything that we are in that He was deity (God the Son; a worthy, totally Righteous Sacrifice, Who was the only One who could save us), and that we cannot become everything that He is. We will be glorified with Him at the end of this age, and we will reign with Him, and we are called sons of God, and He is called the "firstborn among many brethren" in Rom. 8:29, but there will always be

a gigantic difference between The Son of God and us. During this present age we have the great privilege of being able to live in the center of God's will, being what He wants us to be and doing the things He wants us to do, through His imputed and imparted Righteousness, and through the indwelling Holy Spirit. All of this is in accordance with God's will and Word, by His sufficient grace provided to us through the Lord Jesus and His atoning death and resurrection, and for His glory! We are united with the Lord Jesus in His death, burial, resurrection, and ascension.

Kenyon's first wife Evva died in 1914, and shortly thereafter he met and married Alice Whitney of Nova Scotia. He had some marriage problems with Evva,<sup>14</sup> but he ended up having some gigantic marriage problems with Alice. In 1930 in Los Angeles she filed for divorce, and there was a "barrage of negative press." Her charges against him that were mentioned by Simmons were mostly sexual in nature (pages 43, 44). After that Kenyon left Los Angeles for the state of Washington, "eventually settling in the Seattle area."

Joe McIntyre (his book is discussed after Simmon's book) says (on page 154) that it difficult to say how much truth there was in the accusations against Kenyon. (For one thing, accusations aren't always true, even if the accuser thinks they are.) He points out (on page 155) that Alice "soon followed him to Washington." And "he spent the last three months of his life at the home of his ex-wife and daughter Ruth" (Ruth took over his ministry after his death at his request). The three of them dined together regularly until the day he went home to be with the Lord."

On page 81 Simmons points out that according to New Thought "the *universal spirit* in each human being" is the real self. A primary problem with the lower self is that "it is too dependent on the five physical senses for its information." On page 83 Simmons points out that, even though New Thought did not respect the Bible as God's Word (for one thing, they believed that they had available to them a continual contact with their idea of the immanent "God," not the God of the Bible), they would typically cite passages from the Bible to back up their teachings; however, they would typically interpret those passages with their own special "spiritual" meaning.

On page 146 Simmons deals with a key feature of New Thought; I'll briefly summarize: Our thoughts will manifest themselves in the material world. The thoughts cause the effect. People can "exercise the same creative power as God...." On page 149 Simmons shows that, not surprisingly, New Thought also put a strong emphasis on saying the right things along with thinking the right things. New Thought thought in terms of the things they needed (like health) having already been given, and that these things would be made manifest through their confessions, etc., not through prayer.

---

<sup>14</sup> Based on what I have read most of the problems probably stemmed from Kenyon's zeal to be a faithful Christian, without adequately considering his wife.



As I have been trying to emphasize throughout this paper, God, through salvation in Christ Jesus, is the One who (one way, or another) gives us everything we need, and He must receive all the glory. We don't create (or cause to manifest) the things that we need by our thoughts, by our words/confessions, by our faith, etc. *Faith* (in New Thought) is a "confident assurance...that everything is *already* provided through the operation of certain immutable laws" (page 150).

**14. E. W. Kenyon and His Message on Faith: the True Story by Joe McIntyre** (Charisma House, 1997, 362 pages). Joe McIntyre, a pastor and teacher, read some of Kenyon's books in the early 1970s and was strongly influenced by them. When several books that attacked Kenyon were published in the 1980s (especially the book by D. R. McConnell), McIntyre began to write a response. McIntyre was helped in his endeavor when the Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society shared "five boxes full of old materials" with him.

I don't always agree with McIntyre, but I found this book to be informative. I believe he effectively demonstrates that some of the accusations that have been made against Kenyon are wrong. For one thing, he demonstrates that Kenyon learned about faith, confession, and healing from solid evangelical Christians (including A. J. Gordon, R. A. Torrey, Charles Cullis, and A. B. Simpson), not from metaphysical religions.<sup>15</sup> And he clearly learned the basics of Christianity, with a strong emphasis on faith and victory over sin, from solid evangelical Christians. For one important thing, Kenyon always insisted that the Word of God must be given top priority, not experiences. That doesn't mean, of course, that Kenyon always rightly interpreted the Scriptures. I have tried to demonstrate in this paper that he made some serious mistakes, including his interpretation of many key passages of Scripture. But I have no doubt that he was highly motivated to be faithful to God, to His Word, and to the Body of Christ. Some, or most, of those who criticize Kenyon will admit that.

I'll quote a little from what McIntyre says on pages 89, 90 and comment on this very important topic. For one thing, it will help us understand Kenyon. "R. A. Torrey was a close associate of D. L. Moody. [[The fact that Kenyon was substantially influenced by solid evangelical teachers like Torrey, A. J. Gordon, and A. T. Pierson (McIntyre discusses all three of them in this book), and many

---

<sup>15</sup> See his chapter 20, "The Metaphysical Cults," for one place. On page 231, McIntyre quotes from A. J. Gordon (a solid evangelical Christian), who was contrasting Christian, Biblical healing with Christian Science healing. For one thing, he said that Christian, Biblical healings "are the result of God's direct and supernatural action upon the body of the sufferer." One point that I have emphasized in this paper is that God must be the One moving the mountain and doing the healing and getting all the glory (not our faith, etc.). McIntyre (on page 234) mentioned that many Christians back in those days were making the point that the lack of Biblical teaching on divine healing among Christians had opened the door for Christian Science, etc., and he went on to quote from R. A. Torrey. McIntyre's book is loaded with important and interesting information about those solid evangelical Christians who lived in the latter half of the 1800's and early part of the 1900s. I already knew quite a bit about many of those brothers and sisters.

other solid evangelical teachers, is significant. Kenyon rededicated his backsliden life to the Lord in A. J. Gordon's church in 1893, about a month after he had finished his year of study at Emerson College of Oratory (from September 1892 to May 1893).]] Torrey pointed Kenyon away from the second-work-of-grace teaching and helped Kenyon see the finished work of Christ. [[The second-work-of-grace viewpoint of the early Methodists and most holiness churches teaches that the sinful nature is eradicated in a definite crisis experience that typically takes places at a time after becoming a (born-again) Christian. The finished work of Christ is taught by the Keswick movement, for example, and Charles Finney's teaching on holiness and victory over sin (which I appreciate) fits here; so too the teaching of William Durham, who strongly influenced many Pentecostals in that direction.

I don't believe the New Testament teaches a second work of grace, where the sinful nature is eradicated, but (based on what I have observed) those who teach a second-work-of-grace often put a higher priority on living a life of holiness with the victory over all sin than many of those from the finished work of Christ viewpoint, and I very often appreciate their interpretation of the Scriptures. See my book, *Holiness and Victory Over Sin: Full Salvation Through the Atoning Death of the Lord Jesus Christ* and my paper *Twenty-Eight Articles on Holiness and Victory Over Sin*, which serves as a good introduction for the book.]] The Keswick teachers held that the believer continued to have a sin nature as well as the new nature received in regeneration. The sin nature was subdued rather than eradicated as the second work of grace advocates avowed. [[The New Testament puts all the emphasis on the need for us to be united with Christ through faith in His death, burial, and resurrection; walking in the Holy Spirit on a continuous basis (thereby keeping the flesh/old man from manifesting itself in sinful attitudes, motives, or works), by grace through faith; appropriating the imputed and imparted righteousness of God; all in accordance with the gospel spelled out in the New Testament.

There is no new nature, or new creation, for Christians that manifests itself apart from our continually abiding in Christ by the indwelling Holy Spirit, by grace through faith. We are totally dependent on the grace of God in Christ on a continuous basis! We were created to be dependent on God (not independent beings)! That is a good dependency! And it solves the serious pride problem!]]

Kenyon eventually parted ways with the Keswick teachers' view of sanctification as well. He came to believe that the scriptures taught man's sin nature was removed in the new birth. Unconditional surrender to the Lordship of Christ, and renewing of the mind were the missing ingredients for living a victorious life. ...." I don't doubt Kenyon's desire to base his view on the Bible, but I believe he missed it here in a rather serious way. This error goes along with his serious misinterpretation of key verses like Gal. 5:16, and of his way overstated view of the status of the recreated spirits born-again Christians, who are able to dwell in the presence of God on terms of equality, etc.

I'll mention several important points that I picked up while reading this book (with some input from other writings): Kenyon put a strong emphasis on the Word of

God (including the Word over experiences); he put a strong emphasis on fellowship with God and on doing His will in every area; he put a strong emphasis on soul winning and on trying to ground young believers in the faith; he put a strong emphasis on walking and living by faith, including for finances (which he also applied to schools he started, and churches; sometimes this made life more difficult for him, for his family, and for others, and some reacted against this); he put a strong emphasis on walking in love ((some testified of his gentleness, compassion, being generous [for one thing, he opened his home to others in need, who sometimes abused the privilege; I'm confident that this caused big problems for his first wife, who died young, and for his second wife], encouraging; he learned the names of people; and he didn't speak critically of others)); he was intelligent in some ways (but apparently he wasn't a systematic thinker, and it is shocking to me how often he was inconsistent in what he taught) and a voracious reader; he was a hard worker (including getting up at 4 or 5 in the morning and working into the evening).

McIntyre's chapter 16 is titled "The Sufferings of Christ"; chapter 17 is titled "Concurring Voices on the Sufferings of Christ"; and chapter 18 is titled "The Finished Work of Christ." I need to respond to much that McIntyre says in these chapters that deal, in large part, with Kenyon's teaching that Jesus died spiritually, took on the nature of the devil, that He then needed to be justified and born again (like we do), and that much, or most, of His atoning work was accomplished when He was tormented in hell for three days. I am going to spend a lot of time on this topic because I believe it is extremely important for us to get this right. Millions have followed Kenyon in this serious error. We desperately need the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches on this topic.

One thing that motivated Kenyon to teach his extreme view of the sufferings of Christ was that it proved to be effective in soul winning. It also proved effective in exhorting (some) Christians to commit themselves to God and His call to be faithful disciples. We desperately need to believe and live in line with the balanced truth of what the Bible teaches. We don't need to mix in errors to accomplish God's purposes! (I'm not suggesting, of course, that Kenyon thought he was mixing in errors, quite the contrary; he believed that he was rightly interpreting the Scriptures through *revelation* knowledge.) We need the truth!

I'll quote the first sentence of McIntyre's chapter 16 and then comment on this sentence for a start. "The idea of Christ having experienced spiritual sufferings (as well as physical) in the work of the atonement is not an invention of Kenyon." For me, and for many others, the spiritual suffering of Christ is not an issue at all. I have always believed that the Bible teaches that Jesus suffered intensely in the spiritual dimension when He was separated from God the Father in some ways through bearing our sins with the guilt and the penalties (cf., e.g., Psalm 22:1 with Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34; Isa. 53:10, 11 [Isaiah 53:11 and other key verses of Isaiah chapter 53 are discussed in my book *Holiness and Victory Over Sin*.]). It would probably be difficult to overstate the suffering (especially the

spiritual suffering) that He bore for us ON THE CROSS. We shouldn't minimize the suffering (spiritual and physical) that preceded the cross either.

Some Christians have used the words "Jesus died spiritually" to mean only that Jesus was separated from God the Father in His atoning death. I agree that He was separated from God the Father in some very real way, but it causes significant confusion to say that "Jesus died spiritually," because when we speak of spiritual death, we include the idea of having a sinful nature. Jesus was a man, but He was much more than just a man; He was the eternal Son of God who condescended to become the God-man (cf., e.g., John 1:1-3; Phil. 2:6-8; and Heb. 1:1-3). Kenyon (wrongly) believed that Jesus took on the nature of the devil in His atoning death.

When Jesus was separated from God the Father in some ways in His atoning death, He still was God the Son, not at all in the category of what we mean when we speak of people being spiritually dead sinners. Jesus did NOT take on the nature of the devil. Bearing our sins with the guilt and penalties was very different than taking on the nature of the devil or becoming a sinner. He bore the penalties of spiritual death and bondage to sin and Satan's kingdom (so we could be born again and live with the victory over sin and Satan's kingdom, with all the demons), but He did not die spiritually (at least not in the sense that Kenyon defined what it meant for Jesus to die spiritually)! He was the Perfect Lamb of God! He paid an infinite price to save us!

One of my primary purposes for writing this paper (along with my paper, *Did Jesus Die Spiritually?*) is to try to convince those who have followed Kenyon's teaching on Jesus dying spiritually that he was wrong, seriously wrong, on this topic. As far as I know, he was the first Christian to come up with what he taught on this super-important topic.

I'll include an excerpt (still in McIntyre's chapter 16, page 179) from what McIntyre calls Kenyon's "first article on the spiritual sufferings of Christ," that was written in 1900. "Jesus died twice on the cross [spiritually and physically]. I knew this for many years, but I had no scriptural evidence. One day I discovered Isaiah 53:9, the answer to my long search: 'And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.' The word death is plural in the Hebrew. Many of you who have Bibles with marginal renderings will notice it. That is, Jesus died two deaths on the cross: he died spiritually before He died physically."

Quite a few commentators on the book of Isaiah make the point that an intensive Hebrew plural was used here, which fits the violent, unique nature of Christ's death. Those of us who speak English are often surprised when the Hebrew uses a plural for various reasons (like a plural of majesty, plural of extension, or plural of amplification) where no plurality was intended, and where we would use the singular in English. The NASB, NIV, KJV, and NKJV all translated the plural as a singular in Isa. 53:9 because the translators (who were experts in Hebrew, but not infallible) didn't believe a plurality was intended. I'm totally confident that a plurality of deaths was not intended.

In endnote 9 (still on page 179), McIntyre mentions "that A. W. Pink was in agreement with Kenyon's interpretation of Isaiah 53:9 [and he quoted from Pink]:

'The margin of Isaiah 53:9 tells us that Christ was "with the wicked in his *deaths*" for in His soul He tasted of the second death, and in His body He suffered natural death; thus He experienced both a spiritual and natural Resurrection.' (*Gleanings From Paul: Studies in the Prayers of the Apostle* (Moody Press, 1967), page 137.)

I was able to get a copy of Pink's book through the Inter-Library Loan, published by The Banner of Truth Trust in 2006. The book seems to be exactly the same as the book quoted by McIntyre, except for the page numbers. (A. W. Pink, 1886-1952, was an evangelist from England. Based on what little I know about him, he was considered to be a solid evangelical; it is quite possible though that he didn't know Hebrew.) It is quite significant that Pink wouldn't agree with hardly anything that Kenyon taught about Jesus dying spiritually. I'll include several excerpts from Pink (pages 174, 175) to demonstrate this important point.

"The 'pains of death' [referring to Acts 2:24] refer to what Christ endured UPON THE CROSS [my emphasis]: not only, and not primarily, the bodily pains of natural death (acute and many though they were) but the soul anguish of spiritual death. John Calvin stated, 'If Christ had merely died a corporal death, no end would have been accomplished by it: it was requisite also that He should feel the smart of the divine vengeance in order to appease the wrath of God [He had to bear the penalty of our sin ON THE CROSS] and satisfy His justice. Hence it was necessary for Him to contend with the power of hell and the horror of eternal death.' The pains of that 'death' came upon Him when He exclaimed, 'Now is my soul troubled' (John 12:27). Those pains increased in intensity in Gethsemane, and were experienced in their fullness during the three hours of darkness [ON THE CROSS, from noon to three in the afternoon (Luke 23:44)], when God then 'loosed' them, so that Christ experienced a resurrection of soul. [As I pointed out in my paper *Did Jesus Die Spiritually?*, Calvin didn't teach that Jesus literally went to hell, but that he experienced hell for us ON THE CROSS.]

... Before His church could be vitally brought forth, Christ had to endure in His soul the pangs of labour, and He *died* under the same pangs spiritually, when He was separated from God, THOUGH THREE HOURS LATER HE WAS LOOSED FROM THEM [my emphasis; when He died at about 3 in the afternoon] ... His 'It is finished' [[His atoning work was finished ON THE CROSS, and, significantly, Pink doesn't speak in terms of Jesus nature changing (taking on the nature of the devil), or of His needing to be justified and born again (like we sinners do), or of His being tormented in hell after He died.]] announced that full payment had been made, yet His body was not 'loosed' from the grave till three days later...."

Now I'll turn to McIntyre's chapter 17, "Concurring Voices on the Sufferings of Christ." Actually, as with A. W. Pink, I don't believe any of these "concurring voices" agree with hardly anything Kenyon taught about Jesus dying spiritually. One reason I found this study interesting is that I want to understand the all-important atoning death of Christ as well as I possibly can. It is good to think about the details. McIntyre starts out this chapter with a quotation from Billy Graham that states that the primary "suffering of Jesus Christ was his spiritual death." I'm confident that Graham didn't mean anything more than that Jesus

was separated from God the Father and bore the penalty for our sin ON THE CROSS.

McIntyre discussed J. N. Darby on pages 184-186. He mentioned that "Kenyon acknowledged his debt to Darby and other Brethren authors in 1902." They were (and are) considered to be respected evangelical Christians. I have known quite a few of them. McIntyre's excerpts from Darby don't demonstrate anything beyond the fact that Jesus suffered spiritually in His atoning death ON THE CROSS. As I mentioned, the same thing applies to John Calvin, who he discussed on pages 186, 187. And the same thing applies to Charles Spurgeon, who he discussed on pages 188-190.

I'll include a brief excerpt from one of the excerpts McIntyre has from Spurgeon. "...God treated Him as if He had been a sinner, which He never was, and never could be. God left Him as He would have left a sinner, till He cried out [while still ON THE CROSS], 'My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' God smote Him as He would have smitten a sinner...." On pages 190-192 McIntyre discusses R. W. Dale, "1829-1895, a respected British theologian and Congregationalist pastor and preacher...." McIntyre made an important statement about Kenyon's viewpoint in this section, "Kenyon never suggested that one's salvation depended on accepting his understanding of the atonement." (I have to say though that I have had Christians question whether I was really a Christian, much less a Bible teacher, since I don't believe what Kenyon taught on this topic.) I'll quote part of the excerpt that McIntyre has from Dale here that deals with the "spiritual sufferings of Christ." "The light of God's presence is lost, He is left in awful isolation, and He cries, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' In the 'hour of great darkness' which had fallen upon Him He still clings to the Father with an invincible trust and an immeasurable love [He didn't take on the nature of the devil], and the agony of being deserted of God is more than He can bear. ... (*The Atonement* (The Congregational Union Lecture of 1875), 24 edit. (Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1905), pages 119, 121, 123-124." I believe McIntyre would agree that the Christians he has dealt with so far in this chapter don't support any of Kenyon's ideas beyond the fact that Jesus suffered greatly spiritually, including His being separated from God the Father in some ways in His atoning death. There is nothing about His taking on the nature of the devil, of His need to be justified and born-again (like we do) because He had taken on the nature of the devil, or that he went to hell for three days to be tormented.

McIntyre listed Henry C. Mabie next, but I'm going to discuss several others before I come back to Mabie. Now we come to G. Campbell Morgan (1863-1945) "who was another favorite Bible teacher of Kenyon's. Morgan, who eventually became the pastor of the famous Westminster Chapel in London (from 1904-1917), was a popular and respected Bible expositor. Like E. W. Kenyon, he was without academic training...."

I'll quote part of the excerpt that McIntyre (page 195) quoted from Morgan (*Crises of the Cross* [Fleming H. Revell, 1936], page 358). (I was able to find the Hodder and Stoughton edition of this book on the internet. The page number is

the same.) "In the deep and unfathomable mystery of the cross, His spirit was separated from God, and that Spirit separated from the body passed down into hades. ... One who...[[has obtained a double victory over sin.... These words which McIntyre didn't quote are quite important in that Morgan was saying (as the preceding pages show) that Jesus did not sin in the sense of originating evil, without being tempted (like Satan did), or when He was tempted to do evil; that's what Morgan meant by a "double victory over sin." To further demonstrate the important point that Morgan made it clear that Jesus did not take on the nature of Satan or literally become a sinner, he (earlier on this page) asked the question, "Why did this Holy One [my emphasis] pass into Hades?" So Morgan didn't teach that Jesus took on the nature of Satan or needed to be justified or born again (like we do). Now I'll continue to quote the part that McIntyre quoted]] has taken upon Himself the responsibility of the sin of a race, and in those solemn hours between the passing of the Spirit of Christ on the Cross, and the resurrection morning, the holy body of the Man lies in the tomb. His Spirit has passed into hell, the place of lost spirits. Now hear His words, 'Thou wilt not leave My soul unto hades' [Acts 2:27].<sup>16</sup> Even though Morgan switched to the word "hell" and further specified "the place of lost spirits," he made it clear that Jesus finished His all-important suffering and atoning work ON THE CROSS. (Also see his page 266.) It is reasonable to speak of Jesus taking our place in hell while He was ON THE CROSS, but that's not what Kenyon taught.

I'll quote a few more sentences from what Morgan said here on page 358 (that McIntyre didn't quote): "In the mystery of the Cross, all the penalty of sin has been borne. IN THE PLACE OF FIRE [undoubtedly meaning hell] THERE IS NO PAIN FOR THE HOLY ONE [(my capitalization for emphasis) because ON THE CROSS all the penalty of sin has been borne," and Jesus wasn't a sinner with the nature of Satan who needed to be justified and born again, like Kenyon taught.], Who exhausted all the fierceness in the terrible experience of His Passion [ON THE CROSS]. In His body [ON THE CROSS] has He borne man's sin, and that work having been as He said finished [ON THE CROSS], the corruption which means the disintegration of the body, cannot touch Him. 'Thou wilt not give Thy Holy One to see corruption' [Acts 2:27]."

---

<sup>16</sup> The Greek has the noun *hades* in Acts 2:27. The KJV typically translates *hades* as "hell," which has caused considerable confusion.

It has always been clear to me and to very many others that Jesus went to the righteous compartment of Hades, which is sometimes called "Paradise." Back on page 258 Morgan had mentioned what Jesus said to the repentant man on the cross, "Today shalt thou be with Me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43). See "A Discussion on the Meaning of the word *Hades* in Acts 2:27, 31; the Meaning of the word *Paradise* in Luke 23:43; and the Meaning of *Abraham's Bosom* in Luke 16:22" in my paper on Ephesians chapter 4.

On page 60 of his *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne*, Kenyon said that Jesus didn't say to the repentant man on the cross that he would be with Him that day in Paradise. He wrongly said that Luke 23:43 "should be read like this: 'I say to you Today, thou shalt be with me in Paradise.'" I don't believe that there is any possibility that Kenyon's interpretation of Luke 23:43 is correct. We don't need to tell people that we are speaking to them today, but the man on the cross was very concerned about where he was going when he died (that day), and where he was going to spend eternity.

So, what McIntyre said about Morgan near the beginning of this section wasn't accurate. He said, "As mentioned earlier, Kenyon believed that Jesus suffered in hades [Kenyon spoke of Jesus being tormented in hell in a very intense way for three days] on until the time of the resurrection. Morgan also believed and taught this." Morgan did not teach that Jesus suffered in hell [or hades] between His death and His resurrection. His suffering was completed ON THE CROSS.

McIntyre discussed Charles Cuthbert Hall next (on his pages 196, 197). McIntyre included excerpts from Hall's book, *Does God Send Trouble?* (Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1895), pages 49-50, 54. I downloaded (from the internet) chapter 3, "The Historic Atonement and the Punishment of Sin," which covers pages 39-54 of Hall's book. (The entire book was available on the internet.)

I'll include the first and second excerpts of the four excerpts that McIntyre includes from Hall: "There is but one place on earth where man obtains a glimpse of what the punishment of sin is as a crime against God. That place is the Hill of Calvary, where stands the Cross of Jesus Christ. When we can look into the secret anguish of that sacred heart; when we can comprehend the horror and misery that rent His soul; when we can understand the hideous sense of alienation from all good which surged over Him in that frightful darkness, wringing from His lips the shriek, 'Forsaken' [referring to the words, "My God, My God, Why have you forsaken Me?"]; when we can rise to the point of grasping that,— then, and not until then, may we think that we comprehend what the *punishment of sin* is" (page 49). Hall, like every Christian writer we have looked at so far, is speaking of the suffering that Jesus did ON THE CROSS, and there is no idea whatsoever of His taking on the nature of Satan, being tormented in hell for three days after He died, etc.

"And when I think of the nameless horror of His punishment, the only uninspired language which approaches a description of it is that clause in the creed [the Apostle's Creed] (which some tell us we ought to reject as unscriptural), 'He descended into hell [or, hades].' I cannot reject these words from the creed. Ah! When that shriek, 'Forsaken,' burst from the pallid lips of Jesus Christ, was He not descending into hell?" (page 50). It is necessary to understand that Hall is saying, like Calvin did, that Jesus bore hell when He took our sins (with the guilt and penalties) ON THE CROSS. I'll include two more excerpts from this chapter (excerpts that McIntyre did not include) that confirm that Hall believed Christ's atoning work was finished ON THE CROSS. It was finished when He said "It is finished" in John 19:30.

"But FROM THE HOUR THAT CRY SOUNDED [my emphasis; referring to the cry, "My God, My God, Why Have You forsaken Me?" Hall had just mentioned "that cry of His, 'Forsaken,' " in the preceding sentence.], the world was redeemed.... Before that suffering there was nothing in store for the world but that nameless horror [of our being forsaken by God in the full and final sense of the lake of fire]; but by that suffering the horror is lifted from Humanity for all save those who finally and forever reject Christ. Let us not confuse the revelation of God's love by attempting to pronounce on the destiny of those who have entered



and have left the world in ignorance of Christ and of His Sacrifice. We may safely trust Him with them and trust them to Him. ..." (pages 51, 52).

"I believe that sin has been judged, condemned, and punished in this world, once for all, in the awful sacrifice of Jesus Christ. I believe that that sacrifice OF THE CROSS [my emphasis] is the one divine event toward which the whole creation moves" (pages 52, 53).

So, McIntyre has misunderstood what Hall meant when he spoke of Jesus descending into hell. It is easy to misunderstand writings like these.

In chapter 18 McIntyre deals with A. J. Gordon, and then A. T. Pierson (both recognized as solid evangelical Christians), both mentors for Kenyon, to try to demonstrate that their views on the atoning death of Christ had a lot in common with Kenyon's view. After spending some time reading what those brothers had to say on this topic, I am confident that neither one would agree that Jesus took on the nature of Satan and needed to be justified and born again like we do, or that He still had to suffer the torment of hell for three days after He died. I believe McIntyre misunderstood what these brothers said.

McIntyre discussed A. J. Gordon's view under the heading "A. J. Gordon and Identification" on pages 201-203. He quoted from Gordon's *In Christ: The Believer's Union with His Lord* (Gould and Lincoln, 1872), pages 9-10, 50, 55. I was able to find this book on the internet. I downloaded the first 60 pages of the book.

I'll include an excerpt from Gordon's pages 40, 41, "... How gratefully we turn to Christ crucified as our only true resting place for comfort! 'Let me know that I have repented enough and suffered enough,' is the voice of a faith that is still in bondage to law. The voice of faith that is free is, 'Let me hear that Christ died in the stead of sinners, of whom I am chief, that He was forsaken of God, during these fearful agonies, because He had taken my place; *that ON HIS CROSS I paid the penalty of my guilt* [Gordon had these words in italics. I added the Caps for emphasis. Significantly Gordon believed that the suffering of Christ was finished ON THE ALL IMPORTANT CROSS.]. Let me hear too that his blood cleanseth from all sin, and that I may now appear before the bar of God, not only pardoned, but innocent. ...."

I'll include an excerpt from page 46 that further demonstrates that Gordon believed Christ's suffering was finished ON THE CROSS. "Standing by the cross now, we discern in the gloom and power of darkness that gather round it, that 'outer darkness' which had been ours forever out of Christ. In that plaintive 'Eloi, Eloi' ["My God, My God"], we hear what had been our cry of despair unanswered forever, except we had been found in Him. In that dreadful rending cry which delivers up the spirit, we own the due reward of our deeds, while confessing that this man hath done nothing amiss. But now all these things are passed forever both for Him and for us, as soon as the '*It is finished*' has been spoken [ON THE CROSS]. And lo! the foregleams of the resurrection break upon us. The light of a certain and triumphant hope enters our heart. Remembering that we are joined to Him who said, 'I lay down my life that I may take it again,' we cease from tears

and follow Him, saying as we hasten onward, 'Now if we be dead with Him, we believe that we shall also live with Him.' " He had to die, but He had told us that He would be raised on the third day. He was!

On his page 202 McIntyre quoted the following words from Gordon (page 49 in the book I have; McIntyre says page 50), "[Jesus] joined to His people, that He might carry them with Him through the pains and penalties of death, He now in the same gracious partnership of being brings them up again from the dead. And so 'He spreads the mighty miracle of his own regeneration from the dead, along the whole line of history. He repeats it in every true believer.'" Then McIntyre says, "Gordon here spoke of the 'regeneration' of Christ and the believers' participation in it. Kenyon's critics have mercilessly rebuked him for suggesting that after having been made sin with our sin, Jesus experience a regeneration—or was 'born again.' A. J. Gordon apparently—in seeking to understand Paul's teaching on the believer's identification with Christ—came to the same conclusion."

When Gordon spoke of Jesus' "regeneration from the dead," he was referring to His resurrection (not of His being born again like we sinners are); Gordon goes on for more than a page speaking of the fact that we have been raised (resurrected spiritually) with Christ. He was the first man (though He was much more than just a man) who left death behind and was born into (resurrected into) the glory of new creation life. In Col. 1:18 and Rev. 1:5 Jesus was called the "firstborn from the dead," referring to His resurrection. Because of His resurrection, all of us who are united with Him through faith are resurrected spiritually (born-again), and at the end of this age we will be resurrected and born into the fullness of eternal life with Him. In Romans chapter 6, and Col. 2:12; 3:1, for example, the apostle Paul shows how we die with Christ and are buried with Him, and how we are resurrected with Him in a spiritual (new birth) sense when we become Christians. In other passages he shows how we will be resurrected and glorified with Him in the ultimate sense at the end of this age (cf., e.g., Rom. 8:11; Phil. 3:21; and Col. 3:4).

The really important point for the purpose of this paper is that Gordon was not saying, like Kenyon did, that Jesus took on the nature of the devil and needed to be justified and born again spiritually like us sinners do, or that He suffered the torments of hell for three days after He died. Gordon has already informed us that the sufferings of Christ were completed ON THE CROSS.

On his page 202, McIntyre quoted several sentences from page 55 of Gordon's book. I'll just quote the last sentence he quoted, "Opener of the prison doors to them that are bound, He yet waits till the last demand of justice has been satisfied before He comes through the gate of the grave to lead them out." And I'll quote a key sentence from what McIntyre says here: "Observe that Gordon saw Christ continuing to suffer under the punishment of our sins until the resurrection."

McIntyre has misunderstood what Gordon was saying. Gordon has already informed us that Christ's sufferings have been completed ON THE CROSS. It's true that Gordon spoke in terms of Jesus remaining among the dead for three days to fully satisfy justice (in accordance with God's plan of salvation, and in

accordance with the fact that Jesus had said that He would be raised on the third day), but, significantly, he didn't speak of Jesus suffering during those three days (when He was with the believers in the Paradise compartment of Hades). Gordon knows nothing of Jesus being tormented in hell after He died, which is where Kenyon saw most of Jesus' atoning work taking place.

I'll quote some more from Gordon to further confirm this important point. "...forgiveness was fully accomplished when He had pronounced the 'It is finished' ON THE CROSS [my emphasis]. For then He had blotted out the dark score of disobedience that was against us, having nailed it to the cross. ... But the pardon thus written in his blood waited to be sealed and attested by his resurrection. For though He had spoiled principalities and powers by his death, only by bursting the bars of the grave could He 'make a show of them, openly triumphing over them in Himself.' And so, while in the blood of the dying Christ we see the title of our pardon, we wait for a luminous glance from the risen Christ to bring it out into full distinctiveness and significance. ..." (pages 51, 52).

"Opener of the prison doors to them that are bound, He yet waits till the last demand of justice has been satisfied [in Jesus' remaining among the dead for three days], before He comes through the gate of the grave to lead them out [speaking of His leading us out of our spiritual death and bondage to sin through new-covenant salvation; He also led the spirits of the believers from Old Testament days to heaven at that time, including the man on the cross beside Jesus]. The members [the believers who become united with the Lord Jesus Christ in His death, burial, and resurrection] must be with their Head. They are his fullness, and without them He cannot be made perfect. He waits till the weary hours of their prison service [He is taking our place during those weary hours among the dead; this is very different than Jesus being tormented in hell for three days] are completed in their Surety [in Christ, Who makes our salvation sure]. He cannot accept deliverance while they are under condemnation. But when the full acquittal has been secured, the glorious promise is fulfilled, '*The third day I shall be perfected.*' Aye, thou mighty Captain of our salvation, thou first Begotten from the dead, because thou wilt then have '*perfected forever them that are sanctified.*'

I am aware of a certain holy jealousy for the honor of the cross, that restrains some from ascribing justifying efficacy to the resurrection of Christ. But let it be marked that it is not atoning justification which we attribute to it, but '*manifesting justification,*' as Edwards so exactly names it. ..." (pages 55, 56).

And McIntyre dealt with A. T. Pierson on page 203. "A good friend of Gordon's and a respected mentor for Kenyon, A. T. Pierson also wrote along these lines. While the interim pastor for Charles H. Spurgeon in London, Pierson preached a sermon titled *The Attestation of the Son of God; or, Hope Through the Resurrection*. Commenting on Acts 13:33, he said, 'the reference in the second Psalm, "This day have I begotten Thee," is to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. [Yes!] ... It would be hard to deny that Gordon and Pierson understood Christ to have undergone some kind of new birth out of death in His resurrection. Acts 13:33 became a favorite of Kenyon's in showing Christ being 'born again.' "

There is nothing in McIntyre's excerpt from Pierson (I didn't include the entire excerpt here) to support Kenyon's idea that Jesus began to partake of the nature of Satan and needed to be justified and born again like we sinners must, or that He was tormented in hell for three days. Pierson rightly shows that Acts 13:33 informs us that the birth spoken of in Psalm 2:7 refers to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, where He left death behind and was born into the fullness of the eternal life of God's new creation. Jesus didn't have a need to be born again, like we do. As I mentioned Col. 1:18 and Rev. 1:5 speak of Jesus being the first born from the dead, referring to His resurrection. When we are born again, we follow Him in that birth in a spiritual sense. At the end of this age, we will follow Him in the fullness of that birth into the fullness of eternal life and glory (cf., e.g., Rom. 8:29; Rev. 12:5 [Rev. 12:5, which is one of the most important eschatological verses in the Bible, is discussed in detail, along with all of Revelation chapters 11-13 in my book *The Mid-Week Rapture*]; also see on Psalm 2:7 in the chapter on Psalm 2 in that book; Psalm 2 is a very important eschatological psalm).

Lastly, we'll discuss the view of Henry C. Mabie, which McIntyre discussed on pages 192-195 in his book. Mabie, who was a close personal friend of A. J. Gordon, spoke regularly for D. L. Moody. He wrote three books on the atonement. McIntyre quoted from one of these books *The Meaning and Message of the Cross* (1906); Kenyon commented in one of his sermons that Mabie "was considered one of the greatest teachers of the Bible in America," and he acknowledged reading *How Does the Death of Christ Save Us?*, which was another of Mabie's three books on the atonement (published in 1908).

Having read the entire chapter of Mabie's book *The Meaning and Message of the Cross*, from which all of McIntyre's (and my) excerpts were taken, and several other chapters, I'll say, for a start, that Mabie does not agree with Kenyon that Jesus was tormented in hell for three days after His suffering on the cross, or that Jesus, having taken on the nature of the devil, needed to be justified and born again like we do.

The reason I wanted to discuss Mabie last is because he greatly emphasized the depths of the suffering experienced by Christ as He took our place. I'll include some excerpts from Mabie along this line: "That Christ experienced a spiritual anguish altogether unparalleled is found in His cry on the cross: 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' This was the high-water mark of His sorrow. ... That Christ was for the time sympathetically at least, in the place of an outcast world and partook of the sense of the abandoned before a judicial tribunal when He could say only 'My God, My God'—not 'My Father, My Father,' is most evident"; "His baptism of sorrow ON THE CROSS [my emphasis]"; "the depth of the gloom" and the "cry of despair mingled with trust"; and Mabie spoke of "the cloud [of sorrow, etc.]" that Jesus was under. However, significantly, Mabie makes it clear that Jesus came out of that cloud before He died ON THE CROSS. Notice that he spoke of the "cry of despair MINGLED WITH TRUST." Mabie made it clear that Jesus did not forsake the Father, even though He was forsaken. We'll get into the details as we continue.

When we hear the things Jesus said on the cross (including asking the Father to forgive those who crucified Him [Luke 23:34]; what He said to the repentant man who was crucified next to Him, telling him that he would be with Him in Paradise that day [Luke 23:39-43]; what He said to His mother and to the apostle John [John 19:26, 27], and the fact that He committed His spirit to God the Father just before He died, we can see that Jesus was in control of the situation and fully in His Right, Godly, mind.

I have already made it clear that I believe (in agreement with a very large number of Christians) that Jesus was separated from God the Father in a very real sense, but I don't agree with the idea (an idea that you essentially never hear) that there was any change in the nature of Christ, the Son of God, the God-man.

As I mentioned, Mabie would not agree that Christ took on the nature of Satan or that He needed to be justified and born again like we do (as Kenyon taught). I'll quote a few sentences from Mabie's pages 112-115 that make it clear that he did not believe that Jesus took on the nature of Satan, or became a sinner: "The cross of Christ's achievement expresses an aspect of judgment in a further sense, that by the moral attitude which Christ maintained up to the last moment on His cross; He entirely set at nought the world-principle, or the Satanic philosophy devised and personalized by the devil. ... But there is a third matter with which the mediating work of Christ needed also to deal; namely, the entire realm of moral evil and with Satan its head. ... Of course, AT THE CROSS, THE FIERCENESS OF THE TEMPTATION CULMINATED [my emphasis]. To the last Jesus resisted. In no single instance, in no particular, did He yield to His adversary's enticement. ... In our Lord's uttermost crisis, though He was Himself forsaken of God, YET CHRIST FORSOOK HIM NOT [my emphasis]...."

I'll quote the first excerpt that McIntyre has on page 193 (from Mabie's pages 66, 67): "The term 'death' as applied to the nature of Christ's vicarious sufferings for man constituting Him the redeemer, has a meaning in the New Testament altogether unique. That death was more than mortal dying, although mortal dying was linked with it. This would seem to be morally requisite, if a man is to be saved from his real woes. The sentence which was pronounced upon the race at its fall in Eden, was something more than mere physical death. ... The death which our first parents in the garden died involved more than mere mortal dissolution, the separation of soul and body. Such a separation indeed was entailed, but sin in itself effects spiritual death, soul-death; not annihilation but a perversion of the functions normal to personality, eventuating in moral unlikeness to God and separation from Him. Such a separation in fellowship between the soul and its God, *itself is death* in the profoundest sense: it is the destruction of the very possibility of God-likeness resulting in malformation and reprobacy of spiritual being. All this and vastly more, is involved in spiritual death."

Mabie had a footnote here, which I'll quote; McIntyre quoted most of the footnote. Mabie was quoting Alexander MacLaren. "We are not to set the physical sufferings of Christ in separation from, or contrast with, the spiritual agonies, but let us not suppose that the physical death was the atonement, apart from the spiritual death of separation from the Father [We must not deny the

separation of the Lamb of God from the Father, which was a big part of the agony He bore for us in His atoning death.], which is witnessed by that cry of despair mingled with trust, that broke the darkness. It shows us, as if by one lightning flash, the depth of the gloom. It is like one breaker crashing on a rock-bound coast, the fringe of a dark and tossing sea that can neither be sailed over nor fathomed by us."

On page 68 Mabie mentioned "His baptism of sorrow ON THE CROSS [my emphasis]." I'll quote part of what Mabie went on to say on pages 68, 69. "That Christ experienced a spiritual anguish altogether unparalleled is found in His cry on the cross: 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' This was the high-water mark of His sorrow. ... That Christ was for the time sympathetically at least, in the place of an outcast world and partook of the sense of the abandoned before a judicial tribunal when He could say only 'My God, My God'—not 'My Father, My Father,' is most evident. In what contrast to this consciousness was Christ's cry when He EMERGED FROM THE CLOUD [my emphasis; HE EMERGED FROM THE CLOUD WHILE HE WAS STILL ON THE CROSS], and said,—'*Father* into thy hands I commit My spirit...."

I need to include one more excerpt that McIntyre included from Mabie and comment on this excerpt. McIntyre left the impression (I don't believe he did this intentionally) that this excerpt continued right after his first excerpt from Mabie. He said, "Mabie then continued" and gave this second excerpt. It caused me some confusion when I thought this second excerpt directly followed the first excerpt. For one thing, McIntyre didn't use ellipses on his page 194.

This second excerpt is from page 74 of Mabie's book. "The death for which Christ came into the world, that in its elements He might taste it, and then by resurrection be saved out of it, was chiefly a profound non-physical, psychical experience, inseparably connected with the sin principle: a death of which the crucifiers of Jesus had no conception, whatever." McIntyre commented that the death that Mabie saw Christ suffering continued until He was saved out of it *by resurrection*.

McIntyre misunderstood what Mabie said. I have already shown that Mabie believed THE CLOUD OF AGONY/SORROW ENDED ON THE CROSS. Of course Jesus was to remain among the dead for three days (He had prophesied that He would be raised on the third day), but that three days wasn't a time of suffering. He was saved out of the realm of death (specifically out of Paradise, where the believers from the days of the Old Testament were waiting, along with the repentant man who was crucified with Jesus) on the third day by resurrection. He wasn't saved out of three days of suffering in hell on the third day by the resurrection (as Kenyon believed).

I'll include a few more excerpts from Mabie to further demonstrate that he believed Christ's suffering was finished ON THE CROSS. "The expression recorded of Him, in which it is said He 'cried with a loud voice and yielded up His Spirit,' had been rendered by Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll, 'He *sent away* His spirit.' He 'dismissed it,' by an action wholly within His own power, when the point was

reached that this could be done consistently with the redemptive purpose of that hour. ... In harmony with this were the words just previously uttered, 'Father into Thy hands I commend My spirit, and the yet deeper utterance, 'It is finished' (pages 76, 77). And "It was for this reason [the reason being that His atoning death on the cross had to result in His resurrection, and ours, according to Word of God] the intervening period of those three days between His dying and His resurrection, in principle, WAS A MERE TRANSITION [my emphasis]" (page 80).

I won't get into all the details here, but McIntyre discussed the last few years of Kenyon's life on pages 167-174 in some detail. It is clear that Kenyon seriously hurt his back in a fall in March, 1947. At that time his daughter in law insisted he see a doctor. The doctor told her that he had found a tumor, but "no tests or x-rays were performed." Kenyon, or his daughter, was not informed of the tumor, and Kenyon always stood in faith for total healing. His back was healed (at least to some significant extent), and he continued to minister. The last three months of his life, he went to live with his ex-wife and daughter; he was having back problems and was weak. He died at the age of 81, March 19, 1948. His daughter says he died of old age. Some say he died of cancer. The doctor (the same doctor Kenyon saw when he fell and injured his back) listed "the probable cause of death as 'lymphoid malignancy' " (see Simmons, page 242, 243). McIntyre (page 171) says, "No surgery or autopsy was performed so there is no way to state positively one way or another if the tumor was actually there when he died."

**15. *The Word-Faith Controversy* by Robert M. Bowman Jr.** (Baker Books, 2001). According to a bio in the book, he is "president of the Institute for the Development of Evangelical Apologetics (IDEA). Previously he served as a researcher for the Christian Research Institute [he worked under Walter Martin, then under his successor, Hank Hanegraaff], the Atlanta Christian Apologetics Project, and Watchman Fellowship. For five years he taught apologetics, cult studies, theology, and biblical studies at Luther Rice Seminary. ...."

On page 11 Bowman informs us that one of the conclusions he has come to is that "The roots of the Word-Faith movement are in evangelical and Pentecostal Christianity, not in the mind-science or metaphysical cults." He does believe though that E. W. Kenyon was influenced to some extent by those cults, even though he was strongly against them.

On page 12 Bowman informs us that "This book is the culmination of about fifteen years of research, study, and dialogue. ...."

I'll quote part of an important paragraph from pages 13, 14. "If any of us are to learn anything in this controversy, we must decide to stop fighting each other with words. By that I do *not* mean that we should not criticize one another's doctrines or actions when we are honestly convinced that they are wrong. I mean that we

must deal honestly and calmly with the issues and avoid inflammatory and exaggerated statements about those with whom we disagree. ...."

I'll quote part of what Bowman says about the rhetoric of some of the critics of the Word-Faith movement. "Daniel R. McConnell argues that the Word-Faith movement is both 'cultic' and 'heretical,' Dave Hunt views the Word-Faith movement, along with the New Age movement and other occult trends, as 'part of the delusion that is preparing us' for the coming Antichrist. ... ..Hank Hanegraaff denounces the Word-Faith teachers in the strongest possible language. In his book *Christianity in Crisis* he warns that 'the church is in horrifying danger' as 'multitudes are being duped by a gospel of greed and are embracing doctrines straight from the metaphysical cults,' throwing Christianity 'into a crisis of unparalleled proportions.' (He then assures us that he is 'no alarmist!') He goes on to assert, 'The faith movement is *every bit as cultic* as the teachings of the Mormons, the Jehovah's witnesses and Christian Science' (emphasis added). The Word-Faith teaching is 'a monstrous lie,' 'frightening,' 'madness,' and 'blasphemous,' and its teachers are 'spiritual charlatans.' Although Hanegraaff claims 'it is truly difficult to overstate the horrifying implications of this worldview.' One suspects that in fact he has done just that." (Bowman included the references to the quotations in endnotes.)

((I'll comment rather briefly on Hank Hanegraaff's *Christianity in Crisis* after I finish with Bowman's book. Once Hanegraaff has written somebody off, and that seems to include Kenneth E. Hagin, E. W. Kenyon, and many others in the faith movement, he seems to delight in trying to ridicule them. (I assume he considers this to be righteous indignation.) He doesn't deal much with Kenyon in the book and he doesn't deal all that much with Hagin. Hanegraaff is able to point out many teachings and "prophecies" of faith teachers that were about as far wrong as you can get, and these things need to be pointed out, but I believe he has written off some Christians that God hasn't written off.

Hanegraaff's chapter 1 is titled, "The Cast of Characters," which includes Kenneth E. Hagin, Essek William Kenyon, Kenneth Copeland, and quite a few others." I'll quote his ungenerous "Conclusion" at the end of this chapter: "Tragically, these purveyors of error have become adept at misleading their followers with a message that sounds authentic but is in reality a counterfeit. They point to Scripture, produce 'miracles,' and operate under the banner 'Jesus is Lord.'

But think of the words of Jesus Himself when He proclaimed, 'Many will say to me on that day, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and in your name drive out demons and perform many miracles?" Then I will tell them plainly, "I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoers!" (Matthew 7:22, 23).' ")

On page 64 Bowman says, "McConnell's quick dismissal of the idea that Kenyon should be placed in the non-Pentecostal evangelical healing tradition is perhaps the greatest weakness of his book [*A Different Gospel*]."



I'll include an excerpt from pages 85, 86 where Bowman deals with Kenyon. "In the preceding three chapters I have focused on the teachings of E. W. Kenyon. We have seen that he formulated many of the distinctive ideas of the modern Word-Faith movement. And we have seen that while he was influenced to some extent by the metaphysical cults, overall his ministry and teachings were developed in the context of the evangelical faith-healing tradition and the early Pentecostal movements. Kenyon was not, however, a Pentecostal and in some important respects his teachings differed from those of most Pentecostals."

In chapter 7 (pages 105-114) Bowman disagrees with the unbiblical idea that God has faith and with the Word-Faith interpretations of Mark 11:22 and Heb. 11:3, as I have done in this paper. On page 197 he says, "Faith is never spoken of in Scripture as a 'force' or other power. The idea in Word-faith teaching that human beings can, by using faith, make the unreal become real or the spiritual become physically manifest is contrary to Scripture." He goes on say that "the Word-Faith teachers often cite Romans 4:17 and [wrongly] claim that Christians should seek to imitate God's creative word." This verse speaks of things that only God can do. Abraham had faith in God and received the promised blessings; he didn't create anything by faith (including the birth of Isaac, which was promised by God), and we don't create anything by faith either. As I have mentioned, we (in faith) may command a mountain that needs to be moved to move, in accordance with the will of God, but one way, or another, it is God who moves the mountains, and He must be given the glory for moving the mountains. It is easy to get into pride, for one thing.

I believe that this book should be read by those interested in this topic, but I certainly don't agree with everything Bowman says. I don't believe he would write off Hagin or Kenyon as being cultic or heretical, but he strongly disagrees with many things that were taught by them, and he mentions that some things that have been taught in the Word-Faith camp should be classified as heretical. (See his pages 225-228, for example.) I agree. I don't agree, however, with his comment on page 225 that "Kenneth Hagin takes matters to a more extreme point than E. W. Kenyon did...."

**16. *Christianity in Crisis* by Hank Hanegraaff** (Harvest House Publishers, 1993). (I commented briefly on this book under the book by Robert Bowman.) I had read this book back about 1995, but I reread much of it to see what I need to include in this paper. I'm going to limit my comments to things that Hanegraaff said regarding Kenneth Hagin. He didn't say all that much about Hagin, and he said less about E. W. Kenyon.

On pages 74-77 Hanegraaff deals with Hagin's "How to Write your Own Ticket with God" in his chapter, "The Formula of Faith." Hanegraaff is using the 1979 booklet *How to Write Your Own Ticket with God*. I don't have that booklet, but I have that article in Hagin's 1984 *Bible Faith Study Course*, and I have the tape

series by that name. (I briefly dealt with this article earlier in this paper when discussing several articles from Hagin's *Bible Faith Study Course*.) I believe Hanegraaff's critique of this message leaves several serious wrong impressions. He makes it clear that he doesn't think it is possible for us to consider this to be a genuine revelation from the Lord Jesus to Hagin. He says, "Any Christian with an open mind who reads Hagin's booklet must conclude that Jesus Christ of Nazareth did *not* appear to Kenneth Hagin. Nor did He say the things Hagin claims He did. Either Hagin is dreadfully deluded or else he had a conversation with another Jesus who presented him with another gospel (2 Corinthians 11:3, 4)." That's a serious charge, and wrong, I believe.

If I didn't know any more about what happened that Friday evening in December 1953 than what Hanegraaff says here, and if I didn't have any respect for Hagin and his ministry (along with Hanegraaff), it would be rather easy to reject what Hagin said in this article. Hanegraaff says "Hagin claims that Jesus Christ Himself appeared to him and personally gave him THE FORMULA FOR FAITH [my emphasis]." It is important to understand that Jesus was actually just giving Hagin the four points of a sermon outline for a sermon that would complement two other sermons that Hagin preached on a regular basis that deal with the woman with the issue of blood of Mark 5:25-34. That makes quite a difference! He had also received the sermon outlines for the two other sermons by revelation.

I don't especially like the title, "How to Write your Own Ticket with God." Hagin picked that title; it wasn't given to him. I'll give a few more details about the context in which Hagin received this sermon outline. He was holding a meeting in an Assembly of God church in Phoenix, Arizona. After a Friday evening service, in the home in which he was staying (the home of a couple who were members of that church), Hagin, the couple, and a few others were gathered for fellowship and refreshments.

Hagin had a strong urge to pray, and to pray then. The others joined him. He was caught up in the Spirit for about forty-five minutes, interceding for someone who was lost. (Thanks be to God for His concern for lost souls! We were all there! And thanks be to God for such intercessory prayer! I know one man who is very thankful for that particular intercessory prayer.) When the burden of prayer lifted, he had a vision of the coming Sunday evening service. He saw the people; he saw himself preach; he saw himself giving the altar call and saw himself speaking to a man on the second row of seats from the front. He told the man he didn't believe in hell, but he already had one foot in hell and the other foot was slipping in. He saw the man come forward, kneel at the altar, and be saved. It came to pass just that way on Sunday evening. Later the seventy-two year old man informed them that he had been taught that there is no hell and that he had serious heart problems. Hagin had told the people that Friday evening what he had seen, and they were all excited to see the man seated where Hagin had seen him sitting, dressed as he had seen him dressed, etc.

Hanegraaff didn't mention any of that. But he did mention that Hagin said that Jesus appeared to him. He appeared to him right after that time of effective intercessory prayer. Jesus spoke to Hagin about his ministry and his finances;

He also spoke to him about our country, including the fact that He had been involved in Eisenhower's becoming president (he was elected president in 1952). When Jesus had finished speaking with him and started to leave, Hagin made a request of Him. He told Jesus that he believed that there was a third sermon to complement the two sermons he was preaching about the woman with the issue of blood, and he asked that if he was right that Jesus would give him the outline. Jesus said he was right and gave the four points of the outline with some explanation. The four steps that Jesus gave Hagin must be kept in the context that Hagin explains in this article. Hagin didn't claim that that Jesus gave him THE FORMULA FOR FAITH.

I want to comment on what Hanegraaff says on page 335. He is quoting from Hagin's *I Believe in Visions* (Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 1981), page 51. I have the 1972 edition of the book by Fleming H. Revell, page 50. He says, "Hagin claims that Jesus appeared to him in 1950 and gave him a special anointing to minister to the sick." I believe it is true; Hanegraaff clearly doesn't. During this encounter Hagin was able to see Jesus' hands. Hagin says, "I saw in the palms of his hands the wounds of the crucifixion—three-cornered, jagged holes. Each hole was large enough so that I could put my finger in it. I could see light on the other side of the hole." I know that the Romans sometimes used four-sided nails (with four corners); I don't know about three-sided.

Hanegraaff says "...Jesus could never have shown Hagin the alleged holes in His palms. As any student of Scripture and history knows, the nails were driven through Christ's *wrists* as opposed to His palms." I have always wondered about this. I wouldn't expect Hagin to miss it on a detail like this, but it's possible. In his endnote 33 Hanegraaff shows that the Greek noun (*cheir*) that is translated "hand" can include the arm, and therefore can include the wrist.

I'll quote part of Hanegraaff's endnote 34. "Dr. Pierre Barbet was the chief surgeon at St. Joseph's Hospital in Paris. He performed experiments on cadavers in the 1930s which showed that crucifixion by nails through the palms would not have supported the weight of the body on the cross. The nails would have ripped through the flesh. See Pierre Barbet, *A Doctor at Calvary*, Eng. transl. (P. J. Kennedy and Doubleday, 1953 [French orig. 1950]) cited in Ian Wilson, *The Mysterious Shroud* (Doubleday, 1986), 17, 20; and Frank C. Tribbe, *Portrait of Jesus?* (Stein & Day, 1983), 80, 99-104.

Interestingly, an actual crucifixion victim of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, named Yohanon ben ha-Galgol, was excavated by Israel archeologists in a New Testament-era cemetery just outside Jerusalem in 1968. Johanan was crucified with a nail through the radius and ulna bones of the forearm, as evidenced by grinding found on the inside of the radius bone at the wrist end (Wilson, 32, 33; and Tribbe, 86-87).

Barbet's experiments with cadavers have recently been repeated and confirmed by Paris orthopedic surgeon Dr. Pierre Merat ('Critical Study: Anatomy and Physiology of the Shroud,' *The Catholic Counter-Reformation in the XXth Century*, no. 218 [April 1989], 3-4)."

I have always believed that the Shroud of Turin could be the actual burial cloth of the Lord Jesus Christ. One strong argument against the shroud has been the carbon-14 dating in 1988, where three labs all dated the shroud between 1260 and 1390, far too late for the shroud to be genuine if the dates are accurate. Everyone agrees that if the samples are contaminated in any way it can affect the dating of the samples.<sup>17</sup> There are many articles on the internet, starting in March, 2013, discussing new scientific evidence, using a different method of dating that dates the shroud in the days of Christ plus or minus a few hundred years.

I'm quoting from the internet article "Science Shines New Light on Shroud of Turin's Age" by Shafer Parker in the *National Catholic Register*; the printed version is dated July 28, 2013. "A new book written in Italian...("The Mystery of the Shroud"), by Giulio Fanti, professor of mechanical and thermal measurement at the University of Padua's Engineering Faculty, and journalist Saverio Gaeta, states that by measuring the degradation of cellulose in linen fibers from the shroud, two separate approaches show the cloth is at least 2,000 years old. And while Fanti's methodology has been questioned by others, the book also states that another series of mechanical tests, designed to measure the compressibility and breaking strength of the fibers, corroborated these findings. ...the three separate tests, when averaged, showed the linen fibers of the shroud to have been woven into cloth around 33 B.C., give or take 250 years, thus nicely bracketing the year [AD] 30, when most historians say Jesus died on the cross." [I believe the evidence best fits AD 30 as the year Jesus was crucified, AND RESURRECTED.]

...Fanti explained that he used a pair of established techniques, infrared light (Fourier Transform Infrared, or FTIR) and Raman spectroscopy, to measure the amount of cellulose in shroud fibers.... Because cellulose degrades over time, he said, 'it is therefore possible to determine a correlation with the age of the fabric. ....'

Doug Stanglin in a *USA Today* article, "New test dates Shroud of Turin to era of Christ," dated March 30, 2013, mentions that "The new test, by scientists at the University of Padua in Northern Italy, used the same fibers from the 1988 [carbon-14] tests but disputes the findings. ... It determined that the earlier results may have been skewed by contamination from fibers used to repair the cloth when it was damaged by fire in the Middle Ages...." The article I quoted from above showed that Fanti was able to determine which individual fibers were from the original shroud before testing them. It also mentioned that his results are the outcome of 15 years of research.

---

<sup>17</sup> Frederick T. Zugibe's book, *The Crucifixion of Jesus* (M. Evans and Company, 2005), is packed with information about the Shroud of Turin. I'll say more about Dr. Zugibe as we continue. In chapter 19 of the book, Zugibe dealt with the strong possibility that the small sample of cloth that was taken toward the edge of the shroud and divided into three parts for the carbon-14 dating of 1988 was not representative of the original cloth of the shroud, because of later repairs to the shroud, and that this could be sufficient to explain the late dates (AD1260-1390) that were obtained by the carbon-14 testing. It is quite possible that carbon-14 tests using samples of the original cloth will verify the cloth to be about two-thousand years old.

I also found an interesting, and apparently quite important, 15 page article on the internet that deals with the question whether the person who was wrapped in the Shroud of Turin was nailed through the palms or the wrists. The article, "Pierre Barbet Revisited," was written in 1995 by Frederick T. Zugibe, M.D., Ph.D., Adjunct Associate Professor of Pathology, Columbia University, College of Physicians and Surgeons; Chief Medical Examiner, Rockland County, N.Y. (Retired). The article makes it clear that Zugibe has done his homework on this topic, including doing laboratory experimentation. He published his book *The Crucifixion of Jesus: A Forensic Inquiry* in January, 2005 (M. Evans and Company, Inc.).

I remind you that Hanegraaff referred to Pierre Barbet, as many others have done, to prove that Jesus was nailed to the cross through the wrists, not the palms. Zugibe argues, rather convincingly, that Barbet was wrong on the location of the nails in the hands of the person who was wrapped in the Shroud of Turin, and on the widely accepted idea that Jesus died of asphyxiation (which has been promoted by Barbet).

I'll just be dealing with the location of the nails in the hands/wrists. For one thing, Zugibe seems to effectively demonstrate that the location of the exit wound on the outside (not the palm side) of the left wrist of the person who was wrapped in the Shroud of Turin (which is the only hand wound visible on the shroud; no wounds are visible for the palm side of either hand) doesn't fit Barbet's viewpoint, in that, for one thing, the wound on the shroud is toward the thumb side of the hand and Barbet's viewpoint was that the wound was toward the small finger side of the hand. That's important information, but not the primary thing that I (and many of my readers) am interested in.

Zugibe argues that there are only two possible entrance points for the nails in the hands of the person who was wrapped in the shroud. It is possible that the nail entered on the lower part of the hand, on the wrist, but toward the thumb side of the hand, instead of (with Barbet) toward the little finger side of the left hand. However, and this is why we are discussing Zugibe's work, he clearly favors the viewpoint that the nail entered "the upper part [the part toward the wrist] of the PALM OF THE HAND [my emphasis] not the middle of the palm." This locates the wound near the middle of the palm but some three-quarters of an inch toward the wrist from the middle of the palm. It is clearly still in the palm of the hand. The nail would not have gone straight through the hand but would have been angled/slanted toward the wrist. With either one of these two possible entrance points, the nail would exit where the wound appears on the shroud, unlike with Barbet's viewpoint.

Zugibe listed seven reasons why the palm (toward the wrist) is the most plausible location for the nail(s) to enter. I'll list four of his reasons: 1. The palm region is the location most Christians across the centuries perceived the wound to be. 2. The path through the upper palm [the palm toward the wrist] is very strong and anatomically sound. 3. The path ends exactly where the shroud shows the wound image. ... 5. Fifth, it assures that no bones are broken in accord with Ex. 12:46 and Num. 9:12 [and John 19:36]."

**17. I'll quote a few sentences from *Occult Invasion* by Dave Hunt from the Chapter on " 'Christian' Psychology" under the heading "Occultism and Selfism."** "By turning the focus inward, the Freudian/Jungian obsession with the unconscious spawned a menagerie of selfisms that invaded not only the world but the church: self-love, self-acceptance, self-improvement, self-worth, self-confidence, self-esteem, self ad nauseam. [I remember being taught self-actualization in a psychology class.] Selfism is at the heart of the occult. ... It is self and pride that seeks psychic power. ... Only 40 years ago, self-centeredness was considered a human failing, and an ugly one. Today self is the center of most psychotherapies, the god at whose altar one bows to beg favors. ..." (page 467). The more the devil is in control, the more he, not self, becomes the center of attention, but for now if he can get us centered in self, he can keep us from being centered in God, which we were created for (and what new-covenant salvation is all about).

I'll quote a few more sentences from this chapter on " 'Christian' Psychology." "We dealt with hypnosis in the previous chapter. It has been part of the stock-in-trade of witch doctors for thousands of years. [[In the last few years before I became a born-again Christian, I got involved in a class led by a professional hypnotist, and I followed up studying and trying to practice self-hypnosis. I was trying to find the power to solve my problems. I believe that I opened myself up to demonic influences through my involvement with hypnotism and that those influences worked against my becoming a born-again Christian. Anyway, thanks be to God, I became a born-again Christian in the spring of 1964 and I dropped all involvement with self-hypnosis. I repented and destroyed all of my books on the subject.]] ... An equally deadly form of shamanism now part of the occult invasion through 'Christian' psychology is visualization. In fact, it is the most powerful occult technique known and is the method used by most shamans for acquiring spirit guides" (pages 474, 475). Hunt goes on discuss the fact that many Christian psychologists [and it's not just Christian *psychologists* doing this; many Christian leaders/ministers use these techniques], are leading people to visualize Jesus. The scary part is that very often they begin to see Jesus, and often "He" will begin to interact with them, including speaking with them, and things happen. Some healings (especially inner healings) take place. What's scary about that? I agree with Hunt that (typically) this will be a demon impersonating Jesus. (With Roman Catholics they often visualize Mary.) When you use occult techniques don't be surprised if you get occult results, results that may look good for a while, but which will never work for true good and are designed to work evil for you, AND WHICH ARE FORBIDDEN BY GOD.

I won't quote any more from Hunt, but I want to mention an important section he has in *Occult Invasion* under the name "Inner Healing" (on pages 502-505). Also see chapters 9-13 of *The Seduction of Christianity*. I am not endorsing everything that Hunt says in those pages/chapters, but I believe that we need to hear much that he says. I knew some Christians back in the late 60s and early 70s who

were involved in this ministry. For one thing, inner healing techniques often involve having the person(s) visualize Jesus and suggest that He may start a conversation with you. I wouldn't touch a technique that involves visualizing Jesus (or Mary or any other being), whether it involves supposed inner healing or not, with a hundred foot pole. What an open door for demons to do what they have been doing for thousands of years in the world of the occult. They don't mind impersonating Jesus, or even singing songs about the blood of Jesus, in order to deceive.

I wasn't too shocked when I met one of the leaders of the inner healing movement back about 1970 who told me she didn't believe in demons. What a combination, using techniques that are an open door for demons and you don't believe in demons. And it seems that oftentimes most Christians have fallen asleep. Many Christians from a more liberal Christian background, which includes quite a few charismatics, don't believe in the devil or demons. What Hunt quotes (at length) from, and says about, some of the leaders who brought inner healing into Christianity, including to some extent evangelical and charismatic Christianity, is shocking. And, as Hunt shows, sometimes charismatic leaders strongly endorse such leaders without checking out where they are coming from. If you get results (like healing) that's all that matters. Right? Wrong! The occult has often produced results, including in the Old Testament. But everything occult was forbidden to God's people. Of course God cannot have His people looking to the devil for what they need. Such activity is at the heart of rebellion against God.

May the will of God be fully accomplished through this paper and His people be edified to the fullest extent possible! In Jesus' name!

© Copyright by Karl Kemp