Dr. Louie quote of the day – “That’s not the Jesus I know.”

The Christian Gospel

1. The Gospel is the “Centerpiece” [driving force, engine] of Scripture and a Christian’s faith & life... as it is the heart of redemptive history. The Gospel is one of the things you will ‘die for’ in terms of your faith. (Refer to Gerry Breshears notion of “Learning to Distinguish Between Degrees of Certainty” in the Authentic Discipleship “Introduction to Theology” page 4.)

   a. Aspects of the Gospel – in terms of salvation some things can be dealt with quickly and briefly, others are complicated and require time and discipline. Pay attention to basic substance issues versus long term change & growth.

      i. Hope & Time:

         1. God is outside of time – past, present and future is the same for Him. Humanity lives within time – past, present and future is the context in which we live, think, and act.
         2. The Gospel maintains that the earth is not our home or our hope... our home and hope are seated in eternity in God.
         3. The eternality of God means that our Hope is also eternal.
         4. Resurrection means that we are also eternal and our hope is to be with God in His Paradise forever.

      ii. Grace:

         1. Cross and atonement are the center of the 4 literary Gospels in Scripture.
         2. Forgiveness is provided solely on God’s terms. It is applied only on the basis of confession and humility – one needs to acknowledge their fundamental need with a penitent heart.
         3. Guilt – is a personal emotional recognition of my failure to be the person I want to be in terms of who God wants/expects me to be. In honest moments, we observe that we are not the person we want to be... much less a standard than God’s.
         4. Humility – is demonstrated in my personal attitude of need and acceptance. When we come to the end of our own efforts... realizing we can never become the person I want/need to be, much less the person God wants/expects me to be... we open the door for acceptance of God’s provision.
         5. Admission of my fallen/failed condition – profession of sin is the central in the action of confession.
         6. Grace demands a positive response:

            b. Synoptic preaching – focuses on discipline.
            c. The tension between belief and discipline are actually not in conflict – they are the two sides of the same coin. This is the message of James, and Paul’s message is in concert.
   i. God’s intent is that what we know about Him must somehow change me. Though knowledge ‘about’ God alone doesn’t necessarily change me, proper knowing Him must change my thinking about everything.
   ii. The Gospel has to be understood in terms of the spiritual transformation of my nature.
   iii. It is not about ‘doing’ – legalism is a simple but dangerous focus that can undermine the faith it seeks to strengthen. My Hope has to be in God, not in my effort. It is a conundrum that the Mormonism and Islam seek to install a works based theology... returning to the pre-Christian concepts of Judaism where obedience = blessing, doing = justification.
   iv. Christian Grace is by faith alone... works do not avail to secure my justification, however Grace begs to be lived out in a positive way – faithful people are thankful and joyous will naturally do the things that add salt and light to our environment.
   v. The result of Grace is a gracious response to people around us. It is a reflection of our understanding of Grace – ‘if you understood Grace, you wouldn’t do ‘this’ – is the message of James. It is not legalism as often though, it is gracious living knowing the great extent for which we have been given in Christ.
   vi. In contrast, the Law seeks to restrain our natural human response. The problem with authoritative requirements is that they won’t promote love and Grace... and worse since the Law has no power to transform one’s spiritual life, all it can do is point out my failures and condemn me – which leads to depression and hopelessness. However, grateful obedience is a sign of Grace being lived out in a believer.

c. Social application of the Gospel – how much of the Christian High-ethic can be imposed on non-believers? This is an important question.
   i. Knowing that God has expected more from His own people throughout redemptive history, logically means that the same plays out now in Christ.
   ii. Knowing that Grace results in a transformed nature how does this play out in social and worldly contexts?
   iii. We say that God loves the sinner but hates the sin they commit. This tension is central to understanding Grace.
   iv. How does gracious action [turning the other cheek] play out in terms of grievous sin – such as 911, rape, genocide?
   v. It is much to our shame as Christian leaders that we don’t focus enough on our need and the Grace provided. I believe this is a major reason why the church does not have the impact we hope for in our society, and why people within the church seem no different to those outside in the society at large.
   vi. Grace should result in a transformation lifestyle that is observable... not meaning we are perfect, but that we are different due to the hope we live for.
2. Meta-narrative – Attributes of God are key in understanding and applying Grace – in this case God’s Justice and Righteousness is a good example for study:
   a. There is a judicial as well as transformational life application on both justice and righteousness.
   b. The ability to discern – knowing & understanding are closely tied together in Scripture.
   c. God demonstrates His ability to Judge fairly and acts righteously as a result.
   d. The Justice of God must be seen in connection with all of God’s attributes.
   e. For terms of human understanding, we tend to identify and separate God’s attributes – but God does not apply one of them out of context with all of them. Attributes may be identified individually, but are inextricably holistically connected and expressed.
   f. In order to understand God’s specific judgment presented in Scripture, you must see things in context with the “meta-narrative” or the overarching plan of God. God’s judgment typically includes God’s plan to restore in context of the meta-narrative.
      i. Genesis Judgment:
         1. Satan was marked for destruction
         2. Adam, Eve & creation were marked for restoration.
         3. Death was marked for destruction.
      ii. Suffering and oppression:
         1. Judgment is not just to punish, but to correct and restore.
         2. It is not just about the here and now, but the eternal.
         3. It is not just about me, it includes society and all personal relationships.
         4. Prophetic writings called into accountability what was and what should have been. The prophet’s condemnation was based on God’s justice:
            a. Society – one aspect of law was the civil law – how people should live together. God’s people were judged must harder because they were expected to know and act accordingly. When the Jewish leaders did the same things as their neighbor, God judged them harshly. Micah for example, railed against a wide variety of problems in Jewish society that the leaders failed to act upon.
            b. Personal – justice is seen in context of grace – a Christian knows this is not their home and looks beyond to eternity. Our focus on eternity requires us to prayerfully intercede for those who don’t have the hope of grace. In this context, my present suffering is secondary to the ultimate suffering of the lost in Hell.
      iii. Christian response to suffering & oppression:
         1. When we see oppression and suffering we have the responsibility to
intercede – certainly prayerfully, and also in terms of relieving the wrong.

2. Christian ethics necessarily moves us from the normative “personal/immediate” reaction to the “otherly/eternal” response – our response takes shape from our understanding and application of God’s meta-narrative.

3. Societal wrongs may require us to uphold justice.
   a. The more removed from the centrality of Grace in the Gospel – the decision on how much of the highest Christian ethic needs to be applied on others or other nations becomes increasingly difficult if not impossible to support. Their world-view needs to be transformed before Christian ethics can be expected or upheld.
   b. In terms of high/medium/low ethic – we may be able to impose most of the medium ethics, and certainly all of the low ethics.
   c. With regard to the role of government, the middle ethic is probably the best we can do.

iv. Application of God’s justice to other situations:
   1. Strict societies – Totalitarian & Sharia Law Regimes have much in common.
      a. Reading the prophets demonstrates how God dealt with the nations – He dealt much more severely with His people who should know better. Accountability comes as a result of knowing.
      b. OT standard would condemn the atrocities of Hitler, Stalin, genocide in Darfur, etc.
      c. Sharia Law is less clear – as it is up to a society to choose how they live. But it is not acceptable for rulers/dictators to impose harsh conditions not in the best interest or common good of their people.
      d. God will hold those accountable for the decisions they make – in this life and in the next. Those that hold out thinking that God will be pleased at the establishment of a nation at the expense of the people are going to be sadly surprised.
      e. In Daniel – the ultimate level of the fallen state is the belief in the fortress of wealth… that power and money are the ultimate good.

2. Abortion – is probably the greatest injustice in America today.
   a. The ‘un-born’ are the most vulnerable in any society, followed by infants, children, and the elderly.
   b. We would not tolerate the abuse of infants or children, nor should we tolerate un-born abuse.
   c. Joseph principle – it is the responsibility of government to
protect life, seek the common good, and to fight against oppression. Joseph is a great example of doing the right things for the right reasons in a culture that really didn’t see or understand what God was up to.

d. Abortion is as much about the financial or convenience decision than it is a ‘choice’. For someone who cannot afford a child, it is more expedient to dispose of them before bring them into the world. Sexual activity and reproductive responsibility go hand in hand. In other words – you have made your ‘choice’ when you decided to have unprotected sex.

e. US abortion rate is 20% [1 in 5 pregnancies], while China, Russia, and India lead the world with 25% [1 in 4 pregnancies].

3. Gay marriage –
   a. We need to make a moral and ethical stand on sin... not just one form of it.
   b. We need to demonstrate compassion and graciousness in who are lost and confused... responding respectfully to people.
   c. We need to do both simultaneously.
   d. It is shameful when in the name of Christ we condemn and chastise... that is not the example Jesus set, though He consistently maintained a proper moral and ethical standard at all times, he rarely condemned, but often spoke truth in love.

3. Post Modernism
   a. Post moderns tend to reject objective standards of moral and ethical conduct.
      i. They want to implement social justice and bring about a compassionate society without a baseline moral-ethical social standard. Unfortunately, this is pretty much impossibility.
      ii. The Jewish nation had a moral and ethical compass which the prophets continually called leadership back to. God spoke through these Godly men and women to restore society. Though they knew, they didn’t do.
      iii. Reforming kings sought to redirect social norms back in harmony with God’s requirements. When they were successful, the nation thrived.
   b. Pre-Modernism – before the scientific age.
      i. Social thought and control was dominated by superstition and folk culture.
      ii. Religious faith was primarily Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic.
      iii. The culture you lived within often determined the faith you followed.
      iv. The standard of your social/cultural group represented what was right and normal, those outside it were demonized and looked down upon as less than human.
c. Modernism – age of reason.
   i. Science is now the new religion.
   ii. Optimism and hope fueled by the belief that humanity can figure it out without God’s help.
   iii. The ‘God is dead’ movement was a statement of the humanist manifesto… we don’t need God, we don’t want Him, hence He doesn’t exist.

d. Post-Modernism – has a number of identifiable characteristics:
   i. That which we “know” cannot be proven to be “true.”
   ii. Judgment is not based on ‘right & wrong’ but rather for expediency for the greater community good because there is no objective right and wrong.
   iii. We are unable to know objective truth in terms of values and morality, only on personal preference.
   iv. Science has made faith obsolete.
   v. Since there is no objective standard, there are only subjective standards that individuals and like-minded groups agree to be bound by.
   vi. ‘Reality shows’ are the classic post modern event. Modern thinking expressed in western ethics and 50’s science fiction program concepts are out dated – good guy doesn’t always win. Outlaw isn’t always bad.
   vii. Moderns are typical of lineal thinking with lineal plots. Post moderns tend to be circular with multiple plots running simultaneously.
   viii. Moderns were positive and hopeful – ‘world is getting better and I can help’… it is up to me to make a difference.
   ix. Post-moderns are negative and fearful – ‘world is getting worse and there’s little I can do about it’… might as well find a place that makes me happy.
   x. Moderns were typically brand loyal – personal identity was seen in consistency to a predetermined value or norm. Gave rise to those who consistently bought Fords or Chevys.
   xi. Post-moderns have no brand loyalty – identity is constantly in flux and fluid. How something makes you ‘feel’ – the emotional evocation is crucial, more important than the rational description.
   xii. There is no absolute truth – just a myriad of options.
   xiii. Authoritative thinking is rejected.
   xiv. Community is critically important – being ‘involved’ in a group identity is foundational for individual credibility.
   xv. There is nothing sacred about the form – choice and variety are everything.

e. Post-Modern Church
   i. Emphasis on **Spirituality** – otherness is more important than mere teaching and content.
   ii. Emphasis on **Experience** – multi-media, visual dramatic content.
   iii. Emphasis on **Presentation** – Form and mood is more important than content.
   iv. Emphasis on **Interaction** – community identity is crucial and supersedes individual identity.
Dr. Louie topics of the day – Post modernism, neo-orthodoxy, liberalism, inerrancy

A. Post Modernism – Matrix Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>MODERN:</th>
<th>POST MODERN:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING:</td>
<td>Triumphant view -</td>
<td>I’m/we’re seeking like everyone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We figured it out, come</td>
<td>open to ideas, not dogmatic - more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And learn from us. Dogmatic.</td>
<td>Open minded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE:</td>
<td>Truth and meaning have an</td>
<td>Truth and meaning have a more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective experiential truth.</td>
<td>Subjective experiential truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORSHIP:</td>
<td>Liturgy and programmatic in</td>
<td>Seek a variety of approaches and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approach. Leadership is</td>
<td>experiences, more free form and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical and group</td>
<td>less top structured, and individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oriented.</td>
<td>Response oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY:</td>
<td>Modern churches tend to</td>
<td>Churches tend to be well integrated in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be more individual and</td>
<td>local community and very active in areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>isolated</td>
<td>Of social justice &amp; outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed off from community.</td>
<td>Tend to see themselves more holistically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tend to be distrustive and</td>
<td>involved as God’s ambassadors to their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see</td>
<td>Kingdom in enemy territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tend to be distrustive and</td>
<td>World and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTREACH:</td>
<td>Tend to support only</td>
<td>Tend to get involved with a variety of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ministries</td>
<td>groups even when there are areas of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That are conservative and</td>
<td>disagreement in thinking or socio-politico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resist organizations not in</td>
<td>Concert with their socio-politico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concert with their socio-politico</td>
<td>World.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a. Check Webb-site for “Theological vision for ministry” by Keller. Deals with how to respond to the epistemological approach to teaching God’s Truth in a post-modern world.
      i. **Modern approach** – a person’s word’s can properly express complex
thoughts and reality to accurately and truthfully express objective truth. God’s truth is fixed in time and space.

ii. Post-modern approach – truth is couched in terms of personal experience, relationship and community of which words cannot adequately express let alone define truth. Objective truth cannot be found, and the thought of it is arrogant and offensive. God’s truth is relative to time and space.

iii. Claims to objective truth [modern thinking] have given way to other means of individual expression, pluralism and a lack of exclusivity.

iv. Problem is how to teach Truth as a ‘Hybrid” – a combination of the strengths of both camps... the objective truth of an eternal God and the relative perception of imperfect humanity. Teaching in this manner as expressed by Keller is not so relative as to be devoid of meaning. Tim Keller does a great job of joining post modern and conservative theology – see his book The Reason for God... it really captures the heart of this problem in a theological true and defensible manner.

b. How do we respond to this cultural crisis of Truth that is prevalent in our communities? How do we teach God’s truth in a way that remains true to Scripture yet still engages our changing society?

i. We affirm that truth is correspondent to reality, and that what Scripture teaches means something specific and definitive. Hermeneutics demonstrates that Scriptural truth is necessarily refined to communicate into the changing social/cultural/historical context. We need to catch up with what the original hearers of the Scriptural message understood to render its truth in a relevant manner. Truth doesn't change, but the method of delivering it must change.

ii. The Holy Spirit indwells each believer so we can receive God’s intended message of Truth in a personally applicable and real way. The post modern commitment for personal experience is actually a good thing – God meets us individually rather than a one-size fits all approach. Until God is experienced as real, truth has little bite or resonance.

iii. Scripture is God’s stated Truth, and it corresponds to reality, even though our knowledge of it is as yet incomplete this side of Heaven. It is a good thing not to be dogmatic... dogmatics leads too easily to legalism rather than relational dependence on God.

iv. The enlightenment belief of truth made an idol out of knowledge. All too often you can hear people spouting off verses out of context in church meetings, which is intended to show their mastery of Scripture where real truth has Scripture mastering the believer. The proper result of being mastered by Scripture is humility and a broken spirit.
v. Every one of us is colored by our individual past which affects our vision of objective truth. Thus, our view of theology is colored by our experience.

vi. Hermeneutics demonstrates that the truth of Scripture is knowledge conveyed in terms of the literary mediums of poetry, story, and symbolism – which are not exclusively propositional and are subject to individual nuances of understanding.

vii. We affirm that Biblical Truth is to be both known and lived – that is to be fleshed out by God through His Spirit. Jesus’ discipleship approach was not a one size fits all approach, He approached individuals where they were in a way they could understand and then developed them to the extent they were able.

viii. Truth properly received will necessarily have a transformational impact on people’s lives in community; it is not just an information transfer. Authentic discipleship is transformational… it is more than just the sum of its parts.

ix. Although we see Truth in part, we still know it to be Truth – and worthy of our full assurance and conviction.

c. Teaching Example of Trinity

i. Scripture clearly reveals the Presence/existence of the Trinity, but it is not clearly defined or described.

ii. Evangelical theology has been so expressive of the existence of the Trinity, that we theologians see it all throughout Scripture.

iii. However, those not accepting the authority of Evangelical theology may be more challenging of this theology.

iv. The OT writers with the exception of King David and a few others did not have a Trinitarian understanding… this became clear in the NT – by whom we can see its presence through the past writings.

d. Hybrid Approach [being neither modern nor post-modern] to Scripture – presented as more balanced [again see Tim Keller’s book The Reason for God].

i. Example of Revelation as it being more cosmological and metaphorical or real and objective – depending on your perspective you will read different thoughts into the revelation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSSITION:</th>
<th>BEAST/666</th>
<th>BABYLON/HARLOT</th>
<th>REV 17:6 DESTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preterist</td>
<td>Rome/Nero</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Temple -70AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historicist</td>
<td>Rome/Pope</td>
<td>Catholicism</td>
<td>Catholicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>Gov/Religion</td>
<td>Good vs evil</td>
<td>Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>In Heaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futurist</td>
<td>Renewed</td>
<td>False Religion</td>
<td>Yet to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Emp</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Dest of Iraq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the futurist – Revelation is more about the prediction of events yet to come, though in a highly symbolic disclosure.
2. Example of Inerrancy vs. Infallible:
   a. Inerrant position holds that there are no errors of any kind in Scripture – this position is hard to argue for because Bible scholars have witnessed minor deviations from variations of the original texts available. Granted these variations are extremely minor and do not change or compromise the validity of the meaning of the text.
   b. Infallible position holds that Scripture will not fail to accomplish God’s purpose for which His Word has been sent into the world – this is easy to argue for as all Bible scholars agree with Scripture that God’s purposes will be accomplished.
   c. A middle ground position argues that the Scripture in its original form given to the original authors and hearers was perfect... inerrant. Since we do not have those original texts, but only copies of copies... we can accept infallible as a more reasonable position.
   d. Gospel Coalition resource – go to the “about us” tab on list at left, read “Theological Mission of Ministry” – this is a hybrid approach to inerrancy... a kinder, gentler inerrancy.
   e. Chicago Statement of Biblical Inerrancy resource – is the strict, modern approach.
   f. Traditional debate has been between:
      i. Without error of any kind – inerrantist approach.
   g. Read the 2 resources above – then explain to a skeptical non-believer what the Scriptures say to you and why you feel it is believable.
   h. Strip away the theological words and jargon. Show why the Bible is worth studying and meditating upon.
   i. Why is it different from the writings/scriptures of other faiths? What does the Bible mean to your life?
   j. Scripture is the means by which we grow, but it is much more than information transfer. God necessarily meets with us through the text... this is the Spiritually transforming nature of the Bible.
   k. What deal breakers do you have in regard to the differ views of the Bible?

B. Neo-Orthodoxy – AKA the new orthodoxy – the theological positions promulgated by Emil Brunner and Karl Barth:
   1. Began in the crisis associated with the disillusionment following WW1 with regard to the liberal movement that promised humanity was getting better. The naive expectation that Christianity was slowly transforming the world into a new paradise was thoroughly destroyed by the horrific evils perpetrated by man upon their fellow men. What seemed to be getting better only masked the underlying evil in the hearts of humanity, and the need for transcendence and transformational thought and life.
   2. The rise of Nazism in Germany caused many German Protestant theologians to
stand against this new evil. Paul Tillich, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Martin Niemoeller are among these theologians.

3. This new thinking involved “dialectical theology”, “theology of paradox”, and “crisis theology”.

4. This position holds onto the orthodox basics of faith – that is the virgin birth, sinless life, faith, atonement, etc., but insists the Word of God is existential in nature. When you read scripture and live it, it becomes revelation in your experience.

C. Liberalism – AKA the Liberal Protestant movement:

1. Emanuel Kant came from the age of enlightenment, which was known for the rise in tolerance and the expectation for the verification of truth that would ultimately win the day.
   a. They systematically removed the importance of the spiritual life of Jesus – miracles and Jesus’ deity were removed.
   b. Separation of the spiritual and physical realities – they held that because humanity could not sense the spiritual nature because exists on a different plane of existence. This was in conflict from the church fathers, Teresa of Avila and St John of the Cross who held that the Spiritual realm was imminent and open to our experience.
   c. They believed that the only way to experience God is through morality – and thus they sought for a universal moral law. They believed in the universal improvement of humanity through reason and grace, and the literal notion of heaven on earth of our making rather than a future Spiritual plane we are destined for.
   d. Thomas Jefferson actually cut out all the miracles of Jesus from his own Bible, including all references to His divinity. All that was left was a ‘good’ moral ethic with no transformational Spiritual power to live it.

2. Hegelian Dialectic – taught that history is getting better, things are gradually becoming better.
   a. All world and human failures were seen in the aspect of humanity as being ‘self-correcting’ – there was a fundament hope in the ongoing improvement and goodness of humanity.
   b. Things were moving from despotism to democracy – democracy working to improve life.

3. Schleiermacher – taught that at the center of God’s Consciousness is a ‘feeling of the divine’ that we could enter into. Redemption was seen as moving into God’s consciousness. Christian mysticism was being redefined from the early mystics to more of a Zen approach with human thought being the driving impetus.

4. Albrecht Ritschl – morality and personal human effort work to establish the Kingdom of God on earth.
   a. Study of Jesus becomes more about the moral truth, not about divinity.
   b. Jesus work was completed with the Cross and Resurrection and He wasn’t coming back... it was now up to us.
c. The Unity/Universal churches are close to where Ritschl was.

5. Van Harnach – the ‘pure religion’ of moral teaching was polluted by New Testament Gospel stuff.
   a. He taught that the work of the theologian was to remove the ‘myth’ from scripture to display ‘true Christianity.’ The supernatural was a scam in his thinking.
   b. Redemptive influence was about how you lived your life.
   c. Jesus was a man who was ‘God Conscious’ – which is the example for all to follow… not unlike Buddha, or Gandhi and other figures.
   d. Salvation is found in the ‘moral teachings’ of Christ and His Kingdom is one of ‘moral excellence.’

6. Liberalism Summation:
   a. There is no prayer – as there is no ‘God’ to hear and He won’t answer anyway.
   b. There is no hope, no hell, and no redemption… just the here and now and what we make of it.
   c. It is ‘Christian’ in name only – actually it is secular humanism based on Christian moral principles.
   d. It is an ‘unspiritual’ form of faith with a ‘Protestant’ heritage.

D. ‘Mainstream’ Christian Protestant denominations and their theological heritage:

1. Baptists:
   a. Conservative Baptist – are the most likely not to have any liberal ties.
   b. American Baptists – are a mixture of conservative and liberal.
   c. Southern Baptists – have vestiges of their pro-slavery Civil War past.

2. Presbyterians
   a. Orthodox – high church Presbyterians are extremely conservative.
   b. Presbyterian Church of America [PCA] – is fairly conservative and very Biblically minded.
   c. Presbyterian Church of the United States of America [PCUSA] – is a mixed bag. Menlo Park Pres is PCUSA – Ortberg’s church.

3. Methodists – are a mixed bag – Glide Memorial Church in SF is very liberal and is openly ‘affirming’ of homosexuality. The church’s position on homosexuality is becoming a defining issue – also with Anglicans and Episcopal.

4. Pentecostals
   a. Developed out of 19th century Methodism from the ‘World Holiness Movement.’
   b. The focus was on the Baptism of the Spirit proved through the speaking in tongues as a sign of their baptism.
   c. The ‘Second Blessing’ of spiritual gifts initially began in tongues but also included healings and other works of the Spirit and were prominently displayed in services. ‘Smith Wigglesworth’ is a notable example.
   d. Zeal for spiritual expression caused the launching of new churches including Assemblies of God, Pentecostal Holiness Church, Church of
God, Church of God in Christ, and Church of the Four Square Gospel.

5. Charismatics
   a. Also known as the neo-Pentecostal movement or Charismatic renewal began in the 1950’s in many main-line Protestant churches including Episcopal, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Catholic.
   b. Rather than splintering off for public demonstrations of spiritual gifts, this movement has largely remained in the background of many mainline denominations as a more subtle but profoundly Spiritual approach to Christian experience.
   c. Speaking in tongues remains a sign, but is not necessarily evident in all believers. The Spirit gifts as He chooses, it is not a one size fits all approach.

6. Pentecostal & Charismatic groups tend to have a conservative sovereign grace theology – examples of Pastors Jack Hayford & Chuck Smith – with vibrant expression of the Spirit based on God’s Word.

7. Spiritual Warfare groups – Peter Walker of Fuller
   a. Began the practice of doing battle against spiritual strongholds with prayer walks, and fasting.
   b. They rely on spiritual sensitivity and intuition where evil is felt or ‘discerned’ and then combated.
   c. Often the “gates of hell shall not prevail” is used to validate such action. It is a poor exegesis as the verse states “gates of Hades shall not prevail.” The teaching of Jesus was that the death of church leaders won’t stop the advance of the church as Hades was the place of the dead. The idea of going after the ‘gates of hell’ where Satan rules is not Scriptural.

8. Vineyard Movement – John Wimber
   a. Unfortunately this started reasonably well but became the lunatic fringe of Pentecostalism.
   b. Spiritual healings, shock & awe events are more show than truth... many are deceived into non-Biblical conduct of spirituality.
   c. There are obvious ‘tricks of the trade’ where people have experiences that are deceptive in nature.
   d. Unfortunately this has descended into empire building and wealth building that has Christian overtones, but worldly goals.