
Subject: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 04:28:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Greetings all!

Michael Gibson is my name. Some of you may know of me from Paltalk. I want to weigh in on my own attraction to Faith Assembly and then hopefully have some doctrinal discussions with you.

My Faith Assembly story will be different than most certainly not more intimate in knowledge of the Church or Hobart Freeman.

In 1981 I was in transition in my walk. I had considered myself a Pentecostal/Charismatic for 7 years. I had been having fellowship with an international Church at that time known as "The Ceylon Pentecostal Mission". They had hundreds of Churches worldwide and I was meeting with a small satellite group of theirs in the Dayton Ohio area.

Their group taught some similar things as FA. They taught faith healing and it was sin to go to doctors. They taught the Manchild (overcomers doctrine) and practiced head covering for women. They taught the doctrine that Christians could be demon possessed.

They had worship meetings that were wonderful. A nice blend of Charismatic praise and Pentecostal emotion! I had great respect for this group but I saw the truth of baptism in Jesus name. They opposed this strongly.

After being rebaptized I taught a message on this and was quickly censored. I had left the group and was having some fellowship with the small group where I was baptized in Jesus name.

Several times when I would comment on the word the Pastor would say "Hobart Freeman says that same thing". When I asked about Bro. Freeman this Pastor had visited Faith Assembly when it was in the Barn. He had many tapes by HF.

I did not stay long with that group but my interest was sparked in FA. The main reason why was they baptized in Jesus name. I got a few tapes by HF and was impressed enough that I hardly slept that night. The teaching of discipleship and the challenge of the faith message stirred my soul. Part one

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 04:48:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In time I started a Church in my House. I tried to find out where Faith Assembly was located but just met with dead ends. I called a Church in Warsaw In. just to see if they could give me directions to FA but the Minister refused.

After a while I was talking to an old friend and mentioned HF. She said she knew a woman whose son attended the Church. It turned out it was a man I had went to school with in Junior High!

Anyone know Henry and Debbie Carandante? After getting his phone number I called him and was given an invite to his house and to FA. It was interesting because at that time I found later you had to know someone to attend because of the media infiltration.

When I got talking to Henry I was stunned. I had figured FA to be about 200-300 people. I had never been in a Church of 2000! Anyway we went that night and it was wonderful. The worship was every bit as Heavenly as at the Ceylon Pentecostal Mission which I never dared hope could be true.

Many people up testifying of the great things God had done for them even including baptism in Jesus name. The high part of the meeting was when Stan Hill got up to teach. At first I was disappointed that HF was away that night.

However as Bro. Hill taught there was no way anyone could have been any more exciting to hear. This was the beginning of my Faith Assembly testimony.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 05:08:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Over the next 3 years I accumulated well over a hundred of Bro. Freemans tapes. I went and visited probably 8 or 10 times. I was always thrilled with the worship. I think it was my biggest attraction to FA.! Just the worship was enough to keep me for weeks.

I had admiration for HF. He taught discipleship very strong which was and still is very important to me. The teaching of discipleship was a tremendous attraction for me to FA. Of all its doctrine that probably blessed me most.

The testimonies of trusting God alone for healing were also riveting as they had also been with Ceylon Pentecostal Mission. Seeing the Sisters with veils was also an attraction since very few groups I knew of practiced it.

I loved the way HF would exalt truth. As if it were life and death! His intense manner had a real

influence in my life. I will share more on my own perspective of FA hopefully tomorrow.

Until then two things. I have not talked with Henry Carandante since about 1985-86. At that time he had been doing some travelling with Jim Brenemen doing some ministry. Anyone know anything about him?

Also I did visit the Faith Assembly that now is back in the early 90's when Sis Freeman was still living and they were still in the Warehouse building.

Many times I set in the praise and worship segment of Faith Assembly on Paltalk and am truly blessed. Question? Does Bro. Joe teach ANYTHING different than HF did? Is there full agreement in the teaching of the two?

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 11:08:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello Michael,

Great to have you aboard!

Thanks so much for giving us such a well rounded testimony, I feel like I've known you for years.

I think that a lot of us were drawn to the excitement generated by the worship at Faith Assembly... it was truly an awesome experience.

Concerning your questions about Joe Brenneman, I don't have an answer. The last meeting we attended was in the 80s, very shortly after Bill Garner was removed as pastor. I've listened to Joe on the paltalk thing and he seems much slower and deliberate in his delivery style than Jim!<grin>

Feel free to jump into any of the discussions, or start a new one.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Thu, 13 Sep 2007 16:09:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well I said my testimony would be a little different. I really appreciated HF but there were reasons why I did not do as some did in moving to Warsaw or having Word Ministers come to my house.

Many have said they feel HF taught sound doctrine and just mis applied it. As I mentioned one of the important attractions of FA for me was Apostolic baptism in Jesus name. I wonder how many of you all still hold this?

Well I believe the Lord used that to bring me into something more radical than HF saw. If indeed the NAME of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is Jesus to me that meant there was no trinity but rather one God.

Although Bro Freeman seemed like he was way out there on the cutting edge to the Faith Assembly members he actually did not teach much different than Protestants concerning foundation doctrines.

He tried to keep such a close balance between Trinity and the actual truth. I heard him say the word "Trinity" is not in the Bible. There is not 3 Gods there is one! Yet then he turned and tried to say it was Oneness who were in error. I believe his theology failed there.

Same thing concerning salvation/new birth. I heard him teach you can be saved and not be baptized. Yet also he would say you cannot be a DISCIPLE unless you are baptized in Jesus name. Yet at other times he would teach a Christian and a disciple are the same thing.

He taught the same about the baptism in the Holy Spirit. You can be saved without it. At times he would contradict himself on these issues. He once said the Lord gave him "as the body without the spirit is dead" and then stopped. There were several other foundation issues where I felt HF was teaching error.

When I suggested this to my friend there he claimed HF was teaching men to come out of Babylon fearlessly. Yet it seemed to me he was not willing to go all the way with the truth.

So I did love the fellowship there and felt they DID go farther than 99 percent of Charismatic groups I am aware of. But to be part of the group you had to accept the 10 point statement of faith. As you know the last point was that you had to agree with all the other points and you could not be perceived as criticising Faith Assembly doctrine.

So that was the bottom line of why HF did not hold the very strong sway to me than to some. When he taught on discipleship, going all the way in commitment to Jesus there was very few I would rather hear. But on several key issues he could not get beyond the Protestant faith.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Thu, 16 Oct 2008 17:36:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Out of time at the moment. Will get back with you tonight or tomorrow.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Fri, 17 Oct 2008 15:55:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It was not my intention that this thread would turn into a debating type thread. When I came here it was first and foremost to find a connection with Faith Assembly something that was very important to my life.

In my first post I did say I was also hoping to discuss Gods word. I am always interested in doing that especially concerning foundation doctrine.

So just for the record I did not come here just to teach Oneness altho it certainly is a part of who I am.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Fri, 17 Oct 2008 16:43:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Michael

You stated that oneness is a part of who you are. I`m Trinitarian. I know why I believe in the trinity but I don't know why you believe in oneness.

Could you answer a couple of questions for me to help me out.

In Gen 1:26 God said let us make man in our image after our likeness.. Who was He speaking to in the plural?

If God is only one person, Why did Jesus say in Jn 14:23 If a man love me, he will keep my

words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him. If God is only one person why did Jesus say we?

Hopefully you will see I`m not being contentious, I`m just trying to understand scriptually where your coming from.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Fri, 17 Oct 2008 18:07:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael

Thanks for referring me to those previous posts. I see this has been beat to death seven different ways from Sunday as we used to say up north. So as Duncan said any further discussion would be fruitless.

You keep saying there is only one God and there isnt a Trinitarian any where that will disagree with that.

Oneness theology teaches that God was in the mode of the Father in the old Testament. God was seen in the OT (not as a vision or a dream or an angel in the following versus Ex: 6:2-3; Gen 19:24,). But Jesus said no one has seen the Father, Jn 6:46. If they were seeing Almighty God, but it wasn't the Father, Then who was it?

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [JWBTL](#) on Sat, 18 Oct 2008 15:59:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre, I think this will help, so I posted in both areas.

Good Morning Brothers,
Just thought I'd share a little of what Bro Freeman has to say ref the subject.

Exploring Biblical Theology:
Dr Hobart Freeman
Pg 70-71-72
The Doctrine of God:

God's Nature----His Triunity

The doctrine of the Triunity of God logically follows the study of the unity or oneness of the Godhead.

The Scriptures show that in the nature of the one God there are three distinct personalities revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The doctrine of the triunity or the triune nature of God is a revelation from His Word and cannot be conceived by observing the created order or general revelation.

The tripersonality of God is not tritheism, that is, three separate gods. There are three eternal personalities-----Father, Son, and Holy Spirit----but only one divine essence called God.

According to

Scripture, the three personalities are equal and eternal. There are no earthly analogies to express adequately the truth of the triunity of God. While there have been many attempts to do this, none are adequate. Therefore, it is advisable to take Scriptures for what they say. God is what He reveals

Himself to be in His Word----not what men say He is, not what the Unitarians or the liberals say He is.

He is one Divine Spirit, eternally manifested as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It should be obvious that if God is not what He reveals Himself to be in His Word, then He is yet unrevealed, and man does not know what He is like.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Sat, 18 Oct 2008 20:55:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael

Would you explain Mat 28:19 to me. I believe this is a command from Jesus. Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Ghost

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [soaringeagle](#) on Sat, 18 Oct 2008 22:46:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree on only 1 God, manifested as Father, Son (Jesus Christ) and Holy Spirit.

soaringeagle
www.soaringeagles.ca

www.youtube.com/watch?v=yX_7j32zgNw

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [JWBTI](#) on Sat, 18 Oct 2008 23:51:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alanbook wrote:

Like I said somewhere earlier these individuals are stuck on two doctrines; Water baptism in Jesus name, when they know you've been baptized in this manner then its Jesus is the father their second pet peeve doctrine.

Alan is there a problem with Water baptism in Jesus Name ?

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 01:14:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

soaringeagle wrote on Sat, 18 October 2008 17:46 I agree on only 1 God, manifested as Father, Son (Jesus Christ) and Holy Spirit.

soaringeagle
www.soaringeagles.ca

www.youtube.com/watch?v=yX_7j32zgNw

Hi Friend,

Welcome to this thread!

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [soaringeagle](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 01:48:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In regards of the baptism....

I am baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ

see... father, son and holy spirit are more or less titles

everywhere in the world even in the bank they require
signatures

as christians whatever we do - we should do in the name of Jesus Christ - there is the authority

enjoy God's blessings

soaringeagles.ca

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 02:11:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As I wrote early in my introduction baptism in Jesus name was the main link I had with Faith Assembly and Hobart Freeman.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [JWB TI](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 02:25:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael The Disciple wrote:

Faith Assembly people were baptized in the name of Jesus. Does it seem unusual to you all that there are almost NO Trinitarian groups baptize the way you do?

Your baptism is in agreement with Oneness and dis agreement with them.

If baptism in Jesus name is true then do Oneness Churches get credit for being almost the sole witness of it in the Earth?

Michael,

We at Faith Assembly were accused of being Oneness because of this and our stand On Colossians 3:17 whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ !

The Trinitarians hated us, and because we didn't go to the other extreme the Oneness People rejected us also ! We had an unique way of uniting people.
Michael you bring some good thoughts to the table, and I thank you for the kind and Loving spirit you used to explain your thinking.

But I am settled an steadfast in His Triunity.

Alan,

Thanks for the clarification on baptism in Jesus Name.

soaringeagle:

Welcome to the board !

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [soaringeagle](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 03:13:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thank you for welcoming me

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 11:35:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael..

You seem to be obsessed in your doctrine of the Father and the Son. If you have ever mentioned the Holy Spirit I missed it . In any case I want to thank you for bringing your oneness error to the forum. Some of us,maybe all have been praying and seeking God on how to bring unity to the brethren and you have accomplished that. It has caused us to look into our Trinitarian believe,and united us because all of us have settled this matter eons ago. Praise Father, Son, And Holy Spirit.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [NBF56](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 15:25:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Seems to me that someone (Michael) has a really hard time accepting that we do not buy the Oneness doctrine he's pushing so hard. And that's what he's doing, pushing way too hard. Sorry, Michael, you're not helping yourself.

Overemphasizing ANY doctrine is dangerous. It is unbalanced. It looks as though it is being made a litmus test for fellowship. Oneness is not the historic, orthodox view of the Godhead. Yes, God is One, but what is being forgotten here is that while He created man in His image, we cannot turn around and view God as just a bigger, more perfect, more powerful version of ourselves. He is totally other than what we are. He is Eternal. We are not. There are aspects to His Being that no finite being can possess. One of those aspects is His ability to be manifest and active in more than one way simultaneously. The closest we can come to it is to see Him as 3 manifestations, which we imperfectly call "persons" because of their distinctions, in the One God.

The alternative to the orthodox historic understanding of the Triune Godhead is Modalism. I do believe that Modalism was condemned as a heresy. Actually, Modalism is a form of Monarchianism, and early heresy condemned by the Church.

Anyway, Michael, I know you are passionate about this, but you're pushing way too hard.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 15:34:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote title=Alanbook wrote on Sat, 18 October 2008 19:32]JWBTL wrote on Sat, 18 October 2008 18:51Alanbook wrote:

Like I said somewhere earlier these individuals are stuck on two doctrines; Water baptism in Jesus name, when they know you've been baptized in this manner then its Jesus is the father their second pet peeve doctrine.

Gary

As I have researched this oneness error I have found exactly the same things you have found in dealing with ex or current oneness people. I have found over the years is that when a person is in error on the Godhead then their whole theology is skewed. I know that they are very legalistic. They as you have said believe that if you arent baptized in Jesus name you are going to hell. I was under the impression that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins but apparently you can be baptized in Jesus name and be saved. In other words proper baptism = salvation. I guess it`s salvation by works and not by grace.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [soaringeagle](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 16:42:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good morning.

Michael - well done! I read all the comments of your friends.
I believe the same way then you! At least you are not alone
in the forum believing in one God.

Important is - not to argue with the others who can't see it; we
are all saved by grace, by the blood of Jesus Christ.
We should follow Jesus the way we can see it and love all brothers and sisters.

Have a wonderful sunday!

www.soaringeagles.ca

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [soaringeagle](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 16:55:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,

I am new with this forum and I just thought to give a comment on your writing.

I am also convinced that God is only one, that means not that I would say that someone is not saved if the person thinks differently. I wouldn't say that you are saved by the way you got baptized, for me the scripture says in Romans 10 V 9+10:

IF YOU CONFESS WITH YOUR MOUTH THE LORD JESUS AND BELIEVE IN YOUR HEART THAT GOD HAS RAISED HIM FROM THE DEAD, YOU WILL BE SAVED. FOR WITH THE HEART ONE BELIEVES UNTO RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND WITH THE MOUTH CONFESSION IS MADE UNTO SALVATION.

Enjoy God's blessings and have a peaceful heart!

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [NBF56](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 17:09:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

soaringeagle wrote on Sun, 19 October 2008 12:42 Good morning.

Michael - well done! I read all the comments of your friends. I believe the same way then you! At least you are not alone in the forum believing in one God.

Important is - not to argue with the others who can't see it; we are all saved by grace, by the blood of Jesus Christ. We should follow Jesus the way we can see it and love all brothers and sisters.

Have a wonderful sunday!

www.soaringeagles.ca

Let's not divide with subtle words. We ALL believe in one God here. I don't think anyone on this forum believes in 3 Gods. The Oneness crowd makes that accusation as a way to stir things up, but it is untrue. Let's stop that subtle dig, and focus on important questions.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Sun, 19 Oct 2008 22:09:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

soaringeagle wrote on Sun, 19 October 2008 11:42 Good morning.

Michael - well done! I read all the comments of your friends.
I believe the same way then you! At least you are not alone
in the forum believing in one God.

Important is - not to argue with the others who can't see it; we
are all saved by grace, by the blood of Jesus Christ.
We should follow Jesus the way we can see it and love all brothers and sisters.

Have a wonderful sunday!

www.soaringeagles.ca

Thanks Bro! Good to know you are out there.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 02:31:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Alanbook wrote:

I think this is just the tip of the iceberg. I have been reading comments by this michael in other posts throughout this board and hes been sharing a lot of doctrinal error and heresay in very subtle ways. Why has know one noticed this?

Well, first of all there isn't anything "subtle" about Michael's position. Secondly, we've already been round and round with him over this... we've definitely "noticed". Thirdly, he brought this up in response to your post about "twisting" the Hebrew and Greek Scripture (the person you seem to have been directing the post toward apparently wasn't interested in arguing a baseless charge) and fourthly, the loose application of the term "heresay" (I assume you mean "heresy") needs to be more specifically defined before leveling the term at someone with whom you have a disagreement, especially since the term can also be used to describe one who has departed from the doctrine of Christ. This last definition is apparently the one you have chosen. I'm sure I cannot do the term justice but I will say that the word generally means one who doesn't hold to the same beliefs as the "orthodox" members of his/her group. So using the definition in its less specific form would mean that most of us are FA heretics since we don't hold strictly to FA orthodoxy. As Christians, we too may well be considered heretics by others who hail by the same name, and who are clearly the majority.

Most of us would take the word in its more restrictive sense and apply it only to those who do not hold to the substitutionary atonement or to those who would deny the incarnation and resurrection of Jesus.

You then quote HEF:

Quote:Alanbook wrote :

Then I ran across a teaching in Exploring Biblical Theology it says: The Scriptures also deal with discipline regarding heretics and their heretical doctrines. Heretics are actually deceivers who, in the guise of being Christians or ministers of the gospel, intentionally deny or pervert the doctrine of Christ, especially with regard to his incarnation, His deity, or the substitutionary atonement. Paul treated denial of the resurrection with severity; in fact, The Bible treats any denial of such essential truths with the same severity.

Whenever a person tampers with the doctrine of Christ, in ignorance or willingly, he is in grave danger. He is not to be dealt with in the same manner as someone who has been disfellowshipped or even excommunicated, but he is to be treated in an entirely different way because he is perverting the one thing that can save mankind_the doctrine of Christ.

The deceiver described in II John 7-11 is a false teacher, an apostate, and an antichrist by virtue of his denial or perversion of the doctrine of Christ. He is called a deceiver in this passage because he professes to be a Christian or a minister of the gospel. John's command to deny a normal greeting to a known deceiver, or admittance into a Christian home, should not be applied to unbelievers. It was not the Apostles intent for Christians to treat the lost in such manner, or none would be reached with the gospel; but he was obviously speaking of one who would use the occasion to pervert the believer and lead him astray from the truth. An unbeliever is dealt with in an entirely different manner.

The form of treatment for a deceiver is clearly set forth in II John 10. He is to be denied any form

of hospitality in a Christian home or any conventional form of greeting. The force of the Greek shows that one should not even say hello because that would be partaking of his evil deeds. The separation of the Christian and the antichristian must be absolute because any hospitality or greeting is tantamount to recognition and endorsement of the heresy. Page 246-247

So from this I have concluded; that what we have here is an individual that is so obsessed with heresy that he has opened his mind up to possession and he is compelled to proclaim his heretical doctrines. Any type of sharing or reasoning will not win this type of individual back to Christ. We are dealing with a deceiving entity, that will not let his victim comprehend the truth.

While I have no problem with someone coming to the conclusion you've set forth, it is problematic that you would use HEF's teachings to give validity to those conclusions. He made it clear that those who held to the "oneness" position did not fall into the category of heresy (defined in the more restrictive sense).

Mixed up? Yes. Heretical in the 2-John sense? No.

There have been many throughout history that have held to the "oneness" position, men like William Branham, for instance.

I can't change what you believe about Michael, or the others that are in the "oneness" camp, but I can say that you go way over the line when you yoke his position with those who are anti-christian.

There is something about Michael that I like... (Certainly not his incessant defense of the oneness doctrine!)

... perhaps praying for him would be the best step at this stage... you think?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 13:55:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: This is beyond an obsession. Once the subject comes up with these individuals they will not stop as evident in these posts. I have witnessed to oneness "fanatics", their mind is set and there is no turning back they see us as the ones deluded.

I don't disagree... If you read the last go-round on this issue you'll find the pattern is exactly the same.

Quote:Also, I apologize for the typos, like I said earlier I am not able to type as well as some. But from your note I think you knew what I was trying to say and it appeared you were trying to belittle me for this fault.

Look, I don't belittle you or anyone else for typos, I'm sorry it came off that way. I had to look up the word to find out how it was spelled after quoting you and wanted to make sure you weren't meaning something different. (There is a different concept expressed by the term "heretick"™ in Tit 3:10 A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject" which was the reason I even brought it up in the first place.)

Besides, I had to edit my note three times before achieving perfection <grin> so I'm certainly not going to belittle you for this kind of stuff.

I'm not immune from a little jab now and again (due mainly to uncrucified flesh) but I did not intend to belittle you for typos or any other grammatical error... I know full well my limitations in this area.

Quote:If someone is doctrinally off and is able to influence Christians that are not well grounded in the Word then you end up making disciples that keep reproducing the same errors and they in turn convey them to others. There are a lot of people I like out there as well as in the world I speak of, and I have to tell them like it is because the possibility of their souls being lost. If this man's error is no big deal then why make a big deal out of any error as long as it is not considered serious, but by whom will this decision be made. Let's put up a tree and eat, drink, and be merry. We could say at xmas this is a time to get together and be a witness to others.

I take all error seriously. I'm certainly not suggesting we ignore anything... I took exception only to the fact that you misapplied HEF's teachings. Are you suggesting that it was wrong for me to point this out, and that I should have ignored it?

Quote:Why would you tear into JisAmazed because of his stand on the bible and single him out with the different types of ridicule that I have seen on this board. I am amazed at how many people have been mocked and put down because they see things totally different now. But this man who is obsessed it's like well we knew about it. But we like him!!!!!!!!!

Yep, I like him. I'm sorry he is mixed up on the oneness issue, but yes, there is something about the guy that I appreciate (again, it isn't his obsession with oneness!). Read his other notes, the ones that have nothing to do with oneness, you'll find a very likeable person. Yes, he's obsessed

with this doctrine (I believe you earlier used the term 'possessed' which is pretty strong language, btw) but it doesn't seem likely to me that anyone is buying what he is selling (unless they are already in the oneness camp.)

What can I say about Jae... I'm guilty as charged. He was obsessed with an overwhelming dismay that there were those still holding to the foundational truths of HEF. He started an immediate campaign to remove this one blot from an otherwise spotless humanity. With rifle-like precision every note advanced his agenda... but alas, we were using shotguns! Jae should have learned the meaning behind the old proverb: "don't take a knife to a gun fight".

Quote:Could you at least show me where Dr Freeman made this statement that oneness was not considered heretical?

Nope, but I'm sure others heard it as well... perhaps someone will give us cassette-tape number!<grin>

Quote:Anyone that rises up now that tries to minister in any different fashion than what we accept is immediately put down because of all the different things that go on in these meetings. Would we even recognize a real revival that came along because some individuals in the meetings would do something fanatical and we would see the individuals and then write off the whole meeting and including the leadership involved in this.(This can apply to everything).

Tell me about it!

Quote:I hope you did not get your feelings hurt. But do we set by and let certain doctrines that are wrong be proclaimed and others we attack because they do not line up with some view we might have. Where do we draw a line even with HEF, some say that he got off and into legalism. But do we all do whatever is right in our own eyes and make these distinctions. One area you mentioned in your list of legalistic things you were delivered from was TV. But is this really legalism. To tell people that something is filthy and promotes immorality is just fine now.

I don't allow myself to get my feelings hurt... especially by people I've never met. That isn't to say I'm not touchy about certain things, but no more than the next guy (you, for instance).

Concerning TV, I only said I have one now... I didn't get 'delivered' from anything, and I never mentioned my viewing habits or how much I watch it. Presumably you have exactly the same attitude about this matter as I do, since you have a computer and are on the internet (not exactly a bastion of purity)... I'm sure you are discriminating as to your viewing choices.

Quote:Yes I have heard all the arguments for the trashy vision. People say they just watch the news, or educational programs, or sports. But its all the filth they advertise inbetween these shows. Plus your at the least promoting the stations that show their garbage at a later date. Plus

all the time that is wasted

are we really seeking first the kingdom of God, or have we all reduced everything down to our different forms of entertainment, and its a casual seeking first the kingdom.

Preach it bro! (The same can be said about the internet, btw...) I'm all for you preaching about this evil as long as it doesn't become an obsession with you.

Quote:I am surprised you laid into me and Hombre makes a statement about this being a heretical doctrine and you make light of the things he says, about this and about others. I will look into this further about the heresy(I spelt it rite there), and see if this is just some minor doctrine we all over look because we like someones qualitys. By the way I like Michael also and as I wrote whitney a pm, that I was saddened over this delusion. It is serious!!!!!!

Didn't see Hombre's reference, but you should know by now that I don't play favorite's with Hombre!!!! (although I like him too!)

Quote:People that use flattery have another agenda, I hope you don't see flattery as charity.

Yes, and people who use other people to promote ideas foreign to the original intent may have other agendas as well... it may be a lack of flattery to point that out but it isn't a lack of charity.

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 14:13:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

First of all I would like to agree with most every one that Michael is a most likeable chap.

Secondly I am probably going to shock everyone even Gary in that I agree with him.

When Gary first came on board I felt that he was irreverent. Everything to him was a joke. Well guess what he was trying to fit in with the rest of us irreverent condemning, mocking people. Now as time has past I realize I was wrong in my assessment of him as most often happens when quick judgements are made. I will hasten to add that a lot of times Gary is like a bull in a China

shop as the saying goes, but I have seen that in myself and others as well.

There are some who feel they are prolific writers, and I suppose they are but they are also quick to let us know they are. I feel an affinity to Gary because like me we have difficulty some times putting our thoughts into words and are thought the less of because of that. I wont go into pointing out typos and grammatical errors as Gary did a good job of that.

I am going to attempt to prove that Gary was correct in assessing oneness as a heresy in subsequent posts.

May I add that in accordance with Jude 1:3 Gary earnestly contended for the faith in spite of what he knew would bring reproach upon him, as well I will also for defending him but I would rather defend a brother who is right then some one in error.

Further posts coming on the heresy of oneness.

By the way. Looks like I need to relinquish watchman duties to Gary. He`s doing a better job then I.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 14:39:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Oneness Doctrine" (Jesus Only) vs. Trinitarianism
The Early Church Fathers Declared "Oneness" (Sabellianism) Heresy

The Oneness Doctrine Defined

The Oneness Doctrine appears to be biblical because only Scripture is used, though wrongfully, to support its tenets, declaring that Jesus is not only the Son but also the Father and the Holy Spirit, that is, he is the only person in the Godhead. But, it is a fairly new movement (1913), built on heresies of the past. The basic definitions of Oneness vs. Trinitarianism is as follows:

1. Oneness - God is One, but not a plurality of three persons, and that the one God is Jesus Christ. In other words, God is absolutely one with no distinction of persons (Deut. 6:4; Gal. 3:20) because Jesus Christ is all the fullness of the Godhead incarnate (John 20:28; Colossians 2:9). The Father, the Son (Word) and the Holy Spirit are only three manifestations or modes or titles that Jesus manifests Himself as. I have read elsewhere that Oneness believers do not believe God is limited to these three manifestaions, though.

2. Trinitarianism - The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God. But, the Father is not the Son or the Holy Spirit, the Son is not the Father or the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is not the Father and the Son. These three in the Godhead are not three Gods, but are One, of one substance, power, and eternity.

The word "Trinity" is not found in Scripture and has been defined as a mystery. For the finite mind to fully understand He who is infinite is really an impossibility. God is beyond anything we can comprehend, but upon close examination, the Scriptures do indicate that God is three in One, not three Gods. In other words, the Scriptures speak of God as the Father, but also as the Son and the Holy Spirit. Yet, the three are One. So, the word Trinity is not in Scripture, but the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are a reality in the word. It is interpreting these terms and how they relate to the One God that confusion arises causing false doctrines concerning the Trinity to be taught.

Reviving Heresies Of The Past

In the middle of the third century, Sabellius was excommunicated and declared a heretic because of proposing the idea that there was only one "person" in the Godhead manifesting himself in different offices: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. This heresy was named Sabellianism (and later modalism) after him, though the heretical doctrine did not last for very long.

Gregory the Wonder-worker was one who spoke out against Sabellianism:

"But some treat the Holy Trinity in an awful manner, when they confidently assert that there are not three persons, and introduce (the idea of) a person devoid of subsistence. Wherefore we clear ourselves of Sabellius, who says that the Father and the Son are the same [Person] . . . We forswear this, because we believe that three persons--namely, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit--are declared to possess the one Godhead: for the one divinity showing itself forth according to nature in the Trinity establishes the oneness of the nature" (A Sectional Confession of Faith 8 [A.D. 262]).

"But if they say, 'How can there be three Persons, and how but one Divinity?' we shall make this reply: That there are indeed three persons, inasmuch as there is one person of God the Father, and one of the Lord the Son, and one of the Holy Spirit; and yet that there is but one divinity, inasmuch as . . . There is one substance in the Trinity" (ibid., 14).

Others also spoke out against Sabellius:

Council of Rome

"We anathematize those also who follow the error of Sabellius in saying that the same one is both Father and Son" (Tome of Pope Damasus, canon 2 [A.D. 382]).

Fulgence of Ruspe

"See, in short you have it that the Father is one, the Son another, and the Holy Spirit another; in person, each is other, but in nature they are not other. In this regard he [Christ] says, 'The Father and I, we are one' [John 10:30]. He teaches us that 'one' refers to their nature and 'we are' to their persons. In like manner it is said, 'There are three who bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one' [1John 5:7]. Let Sabellius hear 'we are,' let him hear 'three,' and let him believe that there are three Persons" (The Trinity 4:1 [A.D. 513]).

Novatian

". . . And thus by such as these, as we have said, the sacrilegious heresy of Sabellius is embodied. Since Christ is believed to be not the Son, but the Father; since by them He is asserted to be in strictness a bare man, in a new manner, by those, again, Christ is proved to be God the Father Almighty" (A Treatise Of Novatian Concerning The Trinity, Chapter 12).

Modalism Resurfaced In 1913

Modalism resurfaced in the twentieth century in the American Holiness movement, later infiltrating Pentecostal Trinitarian believers. In a revival meeting in Arroyo Seco, California (Los Angeles) on April 15, 1913, R.E. McAlister began baptizing converts in the name of Jesus, rather than by the command in Matthew 28:19:

Mat 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

He did so saying that Acts 2:38 was the fulfilling of the command given in Matthew 28 because Jesus was not the unique Son of God, distinct from the Father, but the final expression of God, who was one "person" manifesting in three different offices.

Also at this meeting was evangelist Frank Ewart (among hundreds of preachers attending), who would begin preaching the same message a few years later. From here, the message moved into Pentecostal churches, the Assemblies of God included. But, it was here that the message was rejected and the orthodox teaching on the Trinity upheld. This stand, however, did not stop the Oneness doctrine to continue its advancement through Pentecostal circles.

The Early Church Fathers In Support Of The Triunity of God

Justin Martyr Justin was a writer around the end of the first century. His first volumous work (Justin's First Apology) was a massive defense of Christianity written to the pagan Romans, in an attempt to explain Christianity and distinguish it from the pagan religions and Judiasm. Here are a

couple of interesting quotes. Justin also wrote a second Apology, as well as a lengthy dialogue with a Jew named Trypho.

The second quote below is very revealing, since Justin clearly distinguishes Jesus from the Father, and indicates that it was the Son who appeared to Moses in the burning bush.

Furthermore, he condemns the Jews for NOT distinguishing between the Father and the Son! Hardly appropriate if Justin believed "oneness" (Warner):

"...Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ, who also was born for this purpose, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judaea, in the times of Tiberius Caesar; and that we reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in the second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third, we will prove. For they proclaim our madness to consist in this, that we give to a crucified man a place second to the unchangeable and eternal God, the Creator of all; for they do not discern the mystery that is herein, to which, as we make it plain to you, we pray you to give heed" (First Apology 13:5-6, Christians Serve God Rationally [A.D. 151]).

And all the Jews even now teach that the nameless God spake to Moses; whence the Spirit of prophecy, accusing them by Isaiah the prophet mentioned above, said "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know Me, and My people do not understand." And Jesus the Christ, because the Jews knew not what the Father was, and what the Son, in like manner accused them; and Himself said, "No one knoweth the Father, but the Son; nor the Son, but the Father, and they to whom the Son revealeth Him." Now the Word of God is His Son, as we have before said. And He is called Angel and Apostle; for He declares whatever we ought to know, and is sent forth to declare whatever is revealed; as our Lord Himself says, "He that heareth Me, heareth Him that sent Me." From the writings of Moses also this will be manifest; for thus it is written in them, "And the Angel of God spake to Moses, in a flame of fire out of the bush, and said, I am that I am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of thy fathers; go down into Egypt, and bring forth My people." And if you wish to learn what follows, you can do so from the same writings; for it is impossible to relate the whole here. But so much is written for the sake of proving that Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and His Apostle, being of old the Word, and appearing sometimes in the form of fire, and sometimes in the likeness of angels; but now, by the will of God, having become man for the human race, He endured all the sufferings which the devils instigated the senseless Jews to inflict upon Him; who, though they have it expressly affirmed in the writings of Moses, "And the angel of God spake to Moses in a flame of fire in a bush, and said, I am that I am, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," yet maintain that He who said this was the Father and Creator of the universe. Whence also the Spirit of prophecy rebukes them, and says, "Israel doth not know Me, my people have not understood Me." And again, Jesus, as we have already shown, while He was with them, said, "No one knoweth the Father, but the Son; nor the Son but the Father, and those to whom the Son will reveal Him." The Jews, accordingly, being throughout of opinion that it was the Father of the universe who spake to Moses, though He who spake to him was indeed the Son of God, who is called both Angel and

Apostle, are justly charged, both by the Spirit of prophecy and by Christ Himself, with knowing neither the Father nor the Son. For they who affirm that the Son is the Father, are proved neither to have become acquainted with the Father, nor to know that the Father of the universe has a Son; who also, being the first-begotten Word of God, is even God. And of old He appeared in the shape of fire and in the likeness of an angel to Moses and to the other prophets; but now in the times of your reign, having, as we before said, become Man by a virgin, according to the counsel of the Father, for the salvation of those who believe on Him, He endured both to be set at nought and to suffer, that by dying and rising again He might conquer death. And that which was said out of the bush to Moses, "I am that I am, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and the God of your fathers," this signified that they, even though dead, are let in existence, and are men belonging to Christ Himself. For they were the first of all men to busy themselves in the search after God; Abraham being the father of Isaac, and Isaac of Jacob, as Moses wrote" (Chapter 63, How God Appeared To Moses).

Tertullian

"We do indeed believe that there is only one God, but we believe that under this dispensation, or, as we say, *oikonomia*, there is also a Son of this one only God, his Word, who proceeded from him and through whom all things were made and without whom nothing was made. . . . We believe he was sent down by the Father, in accord with his own promise, the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the Sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father and the Son, and in the Holy Spirit. . . . this rule of faith has been present since the beginning of the Gospel, before even the earlier heretics" (Against Praxeas 2 [A.D. 216]).

Tertullian

"Keep always in mind the rule of faith which I profess and by which I bear witness that the Father and the Son and the Spirit are inseparable from each other, and then you will understand what is meant by it. Observe now that I say the Father is other [distinct], the Son is other, and the Spirit is other. This statement is wrongly understood by every uneducated or perversely disposed individual, as if it meant diversity and implied by that diversity a separation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" (ibid., 9).

"Thus the connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, produces three coherent Persons, who are yet distinct One from Another. These Three are, one essence, not one Person, as it is said, 'I and my Father are One' [John 10:30], in respect of unity of Being not singularity of number" (ibid., 25).

Origen

"For we do not hold that which the heretics imagine: that some part of the Being of God was converted into the Son, or that the Son was procreated by the Father from non-existent

substances, that is, from a Being outside himself, so that there were a time when he [the Son] did not exist" (The Fundamental Doctrines 4:4:1 [A.D. 225]).

"No, rejecting every suggestion of corporeality, we hold that the Word and the Wisdom was begotten out of the invisible and incorporeal God, without anything corporal being acted upon . . . the expression which we employ, however that there was never a time when he did not exist is to be taken with a certain allowance. For these very words `when' and `never' are terms of temporal significance, while whatever is said of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is to be understood as transcending all time, all ages, and all eternity" (ibid.)

Novatian

"For Scripture as much announces Christ as also God, as it announces God Himself as man. It has as much described Jesus Christ to be man, as moreover it has also described Christ the Lord to be God. Because it does not set forth Him to be the Son of God only, but also the Son of man; nor does it only say, the Son of man, but it has also been accustomed to speak of Him as the Son of God. So that being of both, He is both, lest if He should be one only, He could not be the other. For as nature itself has prescribed that he must be believed to be a man who is of man, so the same nature prescribes also that He must be believed to be God who is of God . . . Let them, therefore, who read that Jesus Christ the Son of man is man, read also that this same Jesus is called also God and the Son of God" (Treatise on the Trinity 11 [A.D. 235]).

Pope Dionysius

"Next, then, I may properly turn to those who divide and cut apart and destroy the most sacred proclamation of the Church of God, making of it [the Trinity], as it were, three powers, distinct substances, and three godheads. . . . [Some heretics] proclaim that there are in some way three gods, when they divide the sacred unity into three substances foreign to each other and completely separate" (Letter to Dionysius of Alexandria 1 [A.D. 262]).

Gregory the Wonderworker

"There is one God . . . There is a perfect Trinity, in glory and eternity and sovereignty, neither divided nor estranged. Wherefore there is nothing either created or in servitude in the Trinity; nor anything superinduced, as if at some former period it was non-existent, and at some later period it was introduced. And thus neither was the Son ever wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son; but without variation and without change, the same Trinity abides ever" (Declaration of Faith [A.D. 265]).

Ignatius

Here is an excerpt from Ignatius' Epistle to the Trallians you might find interesting, where he is

describing some of the heretics.

"For they speak of Christ, not that they may preach Christ, but that they may reject Christ; and they speak of the law, not that they may establish the law, but that they may proclaim things contrary to it. For they alienate Christ from the Father, and the law from Christ. They also calumniate His being born of the Virgin; they are ashamed of His cross; they deny His passion; and they do not believe His resurrection. They introduce God as a Being unknown; they suppose Christ to be unbegotten; and as to the Spirit, they do not admit that He exists. Some of them say that the Son is a mere man, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are but the same person, and that the creation is the work of God, not by Christ, but by some other strange power." (Epistle to the Trallians, Ch. VI).

Ignatius is giving a quick summary of some of the heresies about Christ. Notice the trinitarian formula, "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." In the underlined section above, he gives three separate heresies. First, those who say Jesus was just a man. Second, those who say the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the same person. (like Noetus, Praxeas, Saballus). And thirdly, the Gnostics (like Marcion, Valentinus, Ptolemaus) who claimed that the creator god (YHVH) of the Old Testament was not the same God as the "Father" in the NT.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 15:40:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Grandom,

Let me see if I understand you here...

1. You believe 'oneness' to be heresy.
2. You are supporting this belief by selectively quoting early Church fathers and later popes.
3. Therefore those who believe 'oneness' doctrine are anti-christian. (You said you supported Gary's proposition.)

Or, is it:

1. You believe 'oneness' to be heresy.
2. You base this on the Scriptures, without regard as to what others in Church history taught.
3. Those that do not have an understanding about this doctrine are not just mixed up in their understanding, but are literally, by definition, not Christian.

This of course would mean that there were a lot of folks who thought they were Christians but

were in fact heretics assuming they didn't have a clear understanding concerning the Godhead before a definitive answer was handed down by the councils.

Or is it something else?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 15:44:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Mon, 20 October 2008 10:16grandom wrote on Sun, 19 October 2008 10:34..... They as you have said believe that if you arent baptized in Jesus name you are going to hell. I was under the impression that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins but apparently you can be baptized in Jesus name and be saved. In other words proper baptism = salvation.I guess it`s salvation by works and not by grace.

...if I'm not mistaken, there are Baptists who support that idea as well, based upon Mark 16:16:

'....He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned....'

....interestingly enough, to them, the rest of Mark 16 is 'uninspired'.

As do Lutherans except they baptize infants as do the Catholics.

What that leads to is baptized heathens in later life which poses another question..

Is sprinkling actual baptism in view of the way the apostles did it?

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 16:03:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

William

In answer to your questions Ahem.

1) I do believe oneness to be a heresy

2) My belief is based on scripture (same ones Michael quotes to support oneness) not discounting what early church leaders taught based on scripture.

3) Question 3 I have to quote Gal5:20-21 Idolatry,witchcraft,hated, variance,emulations,wrath, strife,seditions (and finally) heresies
Shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Not my call. But Jesus did say few make it.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 16:29:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Couldn't have said it better myself, Hombre...

That isn't to say that we would allow just anything to be posted (JDS'ers take note!) but for the most part we are all adults here, and part of being an adult is being able to discriminate between right and wrong-- the good and the bad. Our stay at FA taught us that being too inwardly focused brings its own set of problems... it also taught us that it is not healthy when adults act like children and do not speak up when wrong attitudes are being propagated. The first time legalism reared its head, someone should have shouted "HEY, THAT IS LEGALISM!" This might have prevented the wholesale application of the term "heretic"™ to those who didn't conform to every Tom-Dick or Harry, who voiced an opinion (in non-doctrinal areas).

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [grandom](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 16:40:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One final post in regards to oneness heresy.

2Cor11:3 For I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled eve through his subtlety(I believe Gray used a similar word)so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is Christ.

V4: For if he that cometh preaches another Jesus(oneness) whom we have not preached or if ye receive another spirit ,which ye have not received, or another gospel which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him..

As a famous southern philosopher once said (Forrest Gump) That's all I have to say about that.

My irreverence for the day Hombre.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 16:53:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just thinking out loud here concerning Michael. If 'oneness' is heresy, and it appears that more and more are deciding it is, or maybe more correctly stated, are voicing their opinion that it is. What if Michael weren't propagating this doctrine/heresy, but just believed it to be true, would this be less serious than 'teaching' it. imo it would, maybe that would fit in the 'just mixed up' bag, vs someone, Michael, preaching/teaching it to others. Also another thought, or question; does teaching this mean he's demon possessed?

I haven't encounter a 'oneness' believer before, to the best of my knowledge, unless they just never expressed their beliefs.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 17:18:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Mon, 20 October 2008 11:19
I would like to agree with you that Michael is mixed-up.

What I find difficult to palate is how someone can alter the doctrine of the godhead and NOT be by definition ' a heretic'.

I am not clear as to why HEF would teach the definition of heresy as that which deviates from the

'generally accepted Christian' doctrine of God, and then make an exclusion for 'oneness' doctrine. It is abundantly clear to me, that 'oneness' doctrine brings a multitude of other issues to play, just from seeing what has been presented in this thread, without speculating what else might one might fall prey to (Branham).

Can you point me to as to why HEF would say such a thing, and why it would be prudent to follow him in this 'judgment' and yet not in others?

If 'oneness' is NOT a heresy by definition, then how much of the doctrine of the Godhead needs to be altered for one to qualify as such?

Let me see if I can explain why HEF made the distinction (my own interpretation of course...). Here is the quote from 2Jn:

2Jn 1:6 And this is love, that we walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, That, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it.

2Jn 1:7 For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.

2Jn 1:8 Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward.

2Jn 1:9 Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.

2Jn 1:10 If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed:

2Jn 1:11 For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.

The heresy that John was dealing with was Gnosticism which taught that Jesus did not really come in the 'flesh'. I don't think 'oneness' people teach this. Secondly, the doctrine of the trinity was not developed at this early stage. At the very least, if it was understood by the early Church, it wasn't formulated as clearly as later theologians would make it. As far as we know there may been a lot of people who were not clear on this particular point... this is only speculation on my part.

Thirdly, HEF stressed that it was belief in the substitutionary aspects of Jesus' work as being the standard whereby one was in or out of the faith. I don't think 'oneness' people are any more prone to error on this crucial point than 'trinitarians'. Being wrong on this issue has eternal consequences and should be viewed as heretical.

Having said that, a good discussion concerning the 'doctrine of Christ' might be in order!

Denying that Jesus was/is the eternal Son of God can have eternal ramifications. Again, it is the substitutionary aspects of the atonement that suffer when one errs on this particular point.

In summary, I think that the label (heresy), if it is to be applied to someone, it should be applied when there is a danger of perverting the atonement, which has eternal consequences. This is the way that I believe that HEF applied the term.

Clear as mud?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 21:16:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Excellent work there, El Hombre.

I agree with your analysis of the passage.

We're okay as long as someone doesn't twist the Greek on us now!

I'm now at a loss to explain HEF's reluctance to place 'oneness' in that category... I am sure I didn't imagine his words on this issue.

Simplicity makes for great theology!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [JRS](#) on Mon, 20 Oct 2008 22:16:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well put Hombre â€œ yes the simplicity!

I have been following this discourse of the â€œOnenessâ€• of the God Head. It seems as though we all agree that there is only ONE GOD. I would have to say that Michael uses a boat load of scriptures to validate his view yet I cannot fully agree with what He is saying. I have never personally encountered this before and to actually classify it and put a finger on it as being heresy,

I have been asking myself the question "What could be the ramifications of this belief?"

Michael asked the questions in response to Alan "

Michael The Disciple wrote on Sat, 18 October 2008 16:37 Alanbook wrote on Sat, 18 October 2008 15:28 Quote:

Michael The Disciple wrote

If he is the God of the Universe what about the other two? After all there are separate and distinct persons of God themselves.

Would it be more accurate to say ONE OF the persons of God came and took flesh?

In my view it was simply GOD who was manifest in flesh.

Then who in the world was speaking from heaven and said "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

"Some person was speaking about another person".

Why did not God say from heaven, Hear I am listen to me???????

Jesus said I and my Father are one, Why not say I am God the father. Its because the person Jesus was speaking about the person His Father. They were both one.

We see all through the New Testament, Jesus praying to the Father, We see the Father speaking out about His son Jesus. Its not like its an isolated case here.

Thank you for bringing this up. I have actually been addressing it all along but let me try from this angle.

The whole discussion from my side comes to how many persons are God? For you to inject the question about the Father talking to Jesus from Heaven is just where I want to go.

Was this a case of God from Heaven talking to someone who was also God on the Earth?

If so Oneness doctrine is defeated. Finished. That means there are two Gods!

I repeat. If one person who is God says anything to another person who is God that is the absolute proof there are two Gods!

Is that what happened when YHWH spoke to Yeshua?

Or was it that the one God spoke out of Heaven to his Son who WAS A MAN?

Ah now theres an idea. Yeshua was here on Earth as a MAN.

Does God need to pray?

Does God need to be baptized in water?

Does God need to have the Holy Spirit come upon him?

Does God get hungry or thirsty?

When Yeshua prayed to his Father he PRAYED BECAUSE HE WAS A MAN!

It was NOT one person of God praying to another person of God.

It was a man praying to God. And it was God speaking to a man.

That is the Father Son relationship. There is a Father. There is a Son.

Know and understand that Yeshua is both God and man.

Note what he told Nicodemus.

13: And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. John 3:13

Yeshua told Nicodemus altho I am standing here on Earth at this very moment I am existing in Heaven!

Yeshua is both God and man. This is the perfect example of how it works. This is the awesome revelation of the mystery of Christ.

While Yeshua was down here teaching, healing, loving and being our example at the same time in another realm of being he was living in Heaven!

Here he was tired, hungry and sleepy at times. There he was receiving the worship of hundreds of millions of Angels. He was in charge of everything that was happening on every Planet in the Galaxies!

And THAT again is the issue.

Then with his post today “

Michael The Disciple wrote on Mon, 20 October 2008 12:15

This is a false misleading definition. Oneness as I teach it does account for distinction of persons. The distinction being between One God and man Christ Jesus. What I deny is distinctions between three divine persons each one of them named YHWH. No such thing exists in scripture so it is easily exposed as error.

I can see why there would be an acceptance of this and rejection in earlier writings.

The term Trinity can be a misleading term and probably should be stated as the “Triune” nature of God. One God with 3 manifestations as Hombre brought forth.

The issue as I see “ The only explanation and conclusion one can draw is that when God spoke from Heaven then Jesus was 100% man and not God at these times. With this train of thought one could draw the conclusion that man has the ability to overcome sin in his own life. We know where this is headed.

1 Tim 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

And in the next verse.

1 Tim 4:1 Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;

It does go on (we know the verses that follow) yet Paul wrote this immediately following.

For any man to say he has a full understanding of the God Head with his finite understanding is to say that Paul was wrong here in speaking about a mystery and I Cor 13: 12 For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

JRS

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [JWB TI](#) on Tue, 21 Oct 2008 00:52:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Mon, 20 October 2008 16:39moulder wrote on Mon, 20 October 2008 16:16
I'm now at a loss to explain HEF's reluctance to place 'oneness' in that category... I am sure I didn't imagine his words on this issue.

I like simplicity...or as someone else puts it:

'Brevity is the soul of wit'.

I like you, find it difficult at times to place complex thoughts into an easy to understand package. Sometimes, I think we can confuse rather than enlighten through our 'much speaking'.

...with reference to HEFs reluctance, I have no idea, and I don't remember him on that topic.

William an Hombre

I dont have the tape but I got this from the Book !

Exploring Biblical Theology:
Hobart Freeman

The Works of the Holy Spirit:
Pg 150

When speaking of the works of the Holy Spirit,one should avoid the error of dividing Gods activity into dispensations to such an extreme that it borders on Sabellianism or the "Oneness error". This heresy,which confronted the early church and is still present today,

Brother Freeman seems to say: Error=Heresy

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [NBF56](#) on Sat, 25 Oct 2008 03:48:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sometimes it's just best to let those in error talk themselves out, and not dignify their error with a comment. I listened to HEF's teaching on the Oneness of God, and it's clear that Michael is wrong. God is Triune. One in essence, Triune in personality. He expresses Himself as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Not concurrently or sequentially, but simultaneously.

Some here may be reluctant to say it, but I will: Oneness Doctrine is heresy.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [NBF56](#) on Mon, 27 Oct 2008 14:53:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 08:13Michael The Disciple wrote on Fri, 24 October 2008 18:45

It would seem that no one is addressing my posts. I have put much scripture up that no one has attempted to explain.

For me personally, that is for 2 reasons.

1. You have not done the same with our posts on the subject, and according to THE BIBLE, you are:

- A. Twisting the scriptures to your own destruction by
- B. Embracing a serious error that can be defined as a heresy which
- C.makes you a heretic.

Sorry, Michael, that's just the way it is. We HAVE responded to you on this topic as well as others (sinless perfection) and all you continue to do is blather on about your pet errors.

2. The second reason is quite personal, since it was the Lord who told me not to respond to you last week. I am responding now to settle this, because that is what I have been instructed to do, by the Holy Spirit and by the Word of God.

I am admonishing you NOW to refrain from continuing to post Oneness heresy on this board. I am also going to begin removing your doctrinal posts on Oneness from this board as my schedule allows.

The NEXT time that you post Oneness doctrine on this board I will also delete it.

I will gladly add my "AMEN" to your words, bro.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 28 May 2019 20:54:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I know this is an old thread and some of the messages have been removed (based on the wishes of the authors) but there are still quotes remaining.

At issue was a statement I made concerning HEF teachings, specifically about Oneness people, and whether or not they were heretics.

I firmly trusted in my memory (not always a good choice!) and stated what I believed to be HEFs view on the matter.

I made an appeal to those who specialized in the taped archives to help me find what I believed I had remembered from brother Freeman's messages, to no avail.

Later someone quoted a passage from his book "Exploring Biblical Theology" essentially making me look like a rather forgetful old codger.

Well, since I make no claims to having fully vanquished and crucified my tendencies to justify my 'self', I now present to you The Tape (thanks to "Your Face, Lord Jesus, I will seek" a Youtuber) where the once remembered statement occurred.

He makes the statement at 4:40. (but the whole tape is good!)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMn_hDiacJQ

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Sun, 09 Jun 2019 15:05:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I listened to that tape a while ago (many thanks to the youtuber). I was happy to see that statement on there about oneness as I had the question in my mind and wasn't sure of the answer. The fellow who led me to the Lord all those many yrs ago is now oneness. There are also ministers who are very strong on Jesus but also oneness. I'm pretty sure TD Jakes falls into that category. Anyway it was nice to get an answer from a trusted source.

Subject: Re: My Attraction To Faith Assembly
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 17 Jun 2019 22:00:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Mark, I am not a TD Jakes follower or defender but I watched a show called Elephant in the Room (I think that's what it was called) with Driscoll, McDonald, and Jakes discussing his oneness background (Oneness Pentecostal) and he said he was now convinced that God is indeed one God eternally manifest as three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

He said his doctrine started not lining up with scriptures like Matthew 3:16-17 where Jesus is present in the flesh and The Holy Spirit descends on Him and God The Father speaks from heaven.

Anyway, not defending him cause he still is propagating the false prosperity gospel, but he seemed somewhat humble and open to admitting when he had been wrong, that's a good place to be.
