

Hank Hanegraaff, Walter Martin's Greedy Judas, the **sermonaudio.com**
Fake Bible Answer Man

Fake Bible Answer Man

By Larry Wessels

Bible Text: 1 Timothy 6:10, Matthew 19:24

Preached on: Tuesday, December 19, 2017

Christian Answers of Austin, Texas

9009 Martha's Drive

Austin, TX 78717

Website: www.biblequery.org

Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers

If you would like a free newsletter on this or other subjects, just give us a call at Christian Answers. The phone number is (512) 218-8022. Or you could email us at cdebater@aol.com.

1 Timothy 6:10 - "For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."

Matthew 19:24 - "And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

John 6:70-71 - "Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve."

Larry Wessels. My pastor of 30 years, Jackson Boyett of Dayspring Fellowship in Austin, Texas, said the following about Judas in a sermon found on our YouTube channel CAnswersTV which stands for Christian Answers Television, called "Judas: It would have been good for that man if he had not been born, Matthew 26:24."

Audio:

For one, John makes a remark in the 12th chapter about his hypocrisy concerning the poor and about how he used to help himself to what was in the moneybag, so we know that he was a thief. But other than that, we do not see any tendencies to instability or treachery. The disciples did not suspect Judas of being the one to betray Jesus but what Judas proves is that you can start well and end in wickedness, you can start well and end in rebellion, and it is always how you end that determines the ultimate fate.

The wickedest king of all was King Manasseh and yet the Bible records that he repented of his sins. He started badly and ended well, but Judas Iscariot started well and ended badly. He had done what the other disciples did. He had, in fact, the same two things going for him that all of them had. First was profession. He had made a profession of faith and allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ and no one could tell that his profession was any different from anybody else's. Of course he confessed that Jesus was Savior. Of course he confessed that Jesus was Lord.

Now it's very interesting, he never is actually pictured as calling Jesus Lord, he's only pictured as calling Jesus Rabbi, Master. That's the only term that he ever uses in speaking to Jesus but certainly he professed faith and that tells us that there can be a false faith that tells us that not everyone who professes faith in Jesus Christ actually has the change of heart to match; that those who are not actually born again may glibly say that Jesus is Lord or, "Of course I'm a Christian." And one of the things that the story of Judas makes us realize and shudder over is the fact that someone can be so close to Jesus and professing faith in his name and in his ministry and yet not have a heart that's right toward God.

So according to profession he started well, and according to power he started well. That's the second way that he started well because Jesus sent those disciples out on a mission tour and he commanded them to preach the Gospel and to heal the sick, and Judas was on that mission tour. Judas was one of those missionaries and we have no reason to think that he did not have God's power operating in him. We have no reason to think that God wasn't pleased to use him to heal some people. We have no reason to think that God did not use him to preach the Gospel and some people actually be converted under the preaching of a man who did not actually know Jesus as Lord. And do you realize that they were sent out two by two? So that means that another disciple was his partner and he was going out witnessing with Judas, the man of Kerioth, by his side and he never knew that the man beside him was false and would one day sell out his Lord and betray him and hand him over to his enemies.

This does not bode well for those who simply profess faith in Jesus Christ. And Jesus said, "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven but he who does the will of my Father in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in your name? Cast out demons in your name? And done many wonders in your name?' And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you. Depart from me, you who practice lawlessness.'" At the head of the line for that will be Judas Iscariot who cast out demons and did many wonders in the name of the Lord and yet he was not saved.

The second thing we know about Judas is that he had one besetting sin and that besetting sin was greed. We don't like to hear this because we fancifully construct other theories much more complicated as to why Judas did what he did. The Hollywood theory that is used in virtually all films about the Lord Jesus Christ is that Judas was a zealot, that Judas was a member of the guerrilla group that wanted to overthrow the government of Rome. It's completely unscriptural. There is not a shred of scriptural evidence that there was anything so sophisticated about Judas Iscariot. He just was a sinner whose besetting sin was greed. He loved money. It's just that simple.

You see, he had seen that Jesus had deprived him, or rather Mary had deprived him, of a box of alabaster oil that could have been sold for much and given to the poor, because it was Judas, as I said last week, that made that objection when Mary gave her extravagant gift of a box of oil that was worth a whole year's wages. And Jesus rebuked Judas for that. What Judas had been hoping for is that the box would have been sold and the money given to him who as treasurer could dispense it to the poor, and then he could have gotten a little take on the side. That's what John tells us in the 12th chapter.

But his besetting sin was simply greed and he went, it says in our text today, to the chief priests and said, "What are you willing to give me if I deliver him to you?" In other words, his whole concern was to get money. That was all that filled his vision. That was all he wanted and we don't like that. We would rather have some more exotic, complicated, complex explanation of this sinister character Judas because to say he's greedy means he's like us. To say he's greedy means that he has a love of money that is not all that far removed from our love for money. And do you know what? The Apostle Paul said that the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil.

In 1 Timothy 6, there is a passage that could be written about Judas Iscariot. It says in 1 Timothy 6:6, "But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and clothing, with these we shall be content. But those who desire to be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and harmful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition." That very word "perdition" means "ruin or destruction," and it is the very word descriptive of Judas by the Lord Jesus himself when he calls Judas the son of perdition. That word. "For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."

Could Judas Iscariot have really been so crude as to betray the Lord Jesus Christ for money? Oh, yes. If he wasn't a Christian, if he wasn't really real,

if he wasn't filled with God's Holy Spirit, there is no telling what he might do. You've read of crimes that have been done for far lesser reasons.

I say to you in closing the fate of Judas is the fate of all who die without God. Repent.

Larry. Imagine for a moment that after Judas betrayed Jesus to death, that Judas instead of hanging himself had come back to the scared and intimidated disciples immediately following the crucifixion of Jesus and told them that he, Judas, was now the "hand-picked successor" of Jesus by virtue of the fact that he held the office of treasurer and moneybag holder of the group. Imagine how Judas would have informed these intimidated disciples that they had better start doing what he wanted to raise money or else they were out of this new business enterprise completely. Perhaps Judas would have told the disciples to go out and hang themselves instead while quoting Luke 10:37 which says, "Go thou and do likewise."

This imaginary scenario about Judas reflects in essence what Walter Martin's Judas, Hank Hanegraaff, has done to Walter's ministry. This rather long video documentary will endeavor to document the many things Hanegraaff has done over the years to make money for himself and bring disrepute to the Gospel of Jesus Christ at the same time.

For those of you who would like to cut to the chase, so to speak, as to how Hanegraaff grabbed Walter Martin's ministry for himself in the first place, are urged to skip to the back of this video at the 4 hour, 8 minute mark and listen to Jay Howard's presentation from his well-documented book called "Hard Questions for The Bible Answer Man: Hank Hanegraaff and his takeover of the Christian Research Institute." This book can be purchased at www.focusonthefaulty.com. There is extensive firsthand documentation in the index section of this book which will verify the facts of the case. This book has been available to the public since 2009.

For those of you who would like to see this entire video, just watch on and may the Lord be with you.

Christian Answers of Austin, Texas
presents
Hank Hanegraaff
Ripped Off
Walter Martin
to Become the Fake "Bible Answer Man"

with host
Larry Wessels
Director, Christian Answers

Audio:

Hanegraaff Speaks

We in ministry are going to give an account for how we teach, for how we live our lives before others. We're going to give an account for everything that we have done well in the flesh so the real problem, and particularly from the perspective of Christian capitalism, is not wealth because by the world's standards we're all wealthy. It's a matter of degrees. But it is what we do with what God gave us; how we use what God gave us. That ultimately is the issue.

Capitalism says there is not a fixed pie and you have to divide it up equally, the distribution in an equal fashion of wealth that can create wealth, and therefore it can be used in a way to bless others and that's got to be our purpose. It has to be not self-aggrandizement but self-sacrifice at the end of the day, and the sin, if you look at Judas, was a sin, he was following the Master not because he loved the Master but he was following the Master because of what was on the Master's table.

Audio:

I remember walking through the streets of Brazil and seeing the hunger of so many people who are being fleeced by the cults literally and it appears to me that the cults are willing to do for a lie what many Christians are not willing to do for the truth.

Our entire bottom line of what we need to raise in a capital funds campaign is 5.5 million dollars. Take a moment and put that in perspective for me. What's 5.5 million dollars compared to 50 million dollars in a place as small as Santa Ana, we're talking about Tonga. What is, in fact, the perspective that we can give to people so that they understand how strategic this particular move is?

Prayerfully consider getting involved in this one of a kind, strategic opportunity and if the Lord leads you, a tax deductible gift to the Christian Research Institute. I want to leave you with a question today: are you willing to do for the truth what the cults are willing to do for a lie?

Larry. Hello, everyone. This is Larry Wessels of Christian Answers of Austin, Texas, Christian debater ministry. As you have noticed, the name of this video is "Hank Hanegraaff Ripped Off Walter Martin to become the 'Fake Bible Answer Man.'" This particular video seeks to document accurately the shady and underhanded methodologies employed by Hanegraaff to not only subvert the ministry of Walter Martin but to expose the type of religious charlatan Hanegraaff really is as he seeks to ever gain money for himself in Jesus' name.

As most of my regular YouTube subscribers already know, over 18,000 of them last time I checked, I became a born again Christian back on May 16, 1981, and in that same year by God's grace I came into contact with the ministry of Walter Martin and thus became a

big fan of Brother Martin as a young believer. For more on this fact, see our YouTube videos "Evangelism and Apologetics, Part 1: Origins of Christian Answers. Jesus the only way of salvation." Also, "Walter Martin inspired our Christian Answers apologetics and evangelism ministry, 1 Peter 3:15." And yet another video, "Walter Martin's Cults Reference Bible: A perfect street witnessing tool for Christian evangelists."

Audio:
National Radio Show:
Dateline Eternity
with Walter Martin

This is the Bible Answer Man, Walter Martin. You're on the air.

Caller. I'm calling to find out if there is any scriptural basis for a marital separation.

Announcer. Stay tuned for the answer to this and other important questions as the Christian Research Institute presents Dateline Eternity with Professor Walter Martin, the Bible Answer Man.

Larry. I followed Walter's ministry closely, listened to every Bible Answer Man radio broadcast I could, bought all his tapes and books, and was on his ministry mailing list. It was Walter's ministry which inspired me to go out to Mormon wards and temple openings, Jehovah's Witness conventions and kingdom halls, Reverend Moon meetings, Christian Science reading rooms, Unity School gatherings, Hindu and yoga teaching centers, Witness Lee and the Local Church functions, Islamic student centers, the National Atheist Convention in Austin, Texas with Madalyn Murray O'Hair, and repeated university campus encounters with Baha'is, Muslims, agnostics, atheists, evolutionists, communists, Marxists, abortionists, and every other stripe of anti-Bible cultists known to man. Since I am a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin, Bachelor of Science and Advertising, I can honestly say that if I needed Bibles to send overseas to missionaries or churches that were requesting them, I could go out there on the first day of each spring or fall semester and pick up hundreds of them. The reason for this was simple: the Gideon's International came out there, that's the University of Texas campus, every year at that time to hand out small mainly New Testament Bibles to the students. It was apparent that large numbers of Bibles taken by students were thrown on the ground, in the gutters, on the street, and in the available trashcans and all I had to do was gather them up, then ship them out. These days, according to polls, only about 4% of millennials have any kind of biblical worldview and the generations after them is even worse. This reminds me of what Jesus said in Luke 18:8, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"

Biblical ignorance is great even among people who claim to be evangelical Christians these days. See our video, "87% of evangelical Christians don't know what the Gospel is or what justification is." If 87% of so-called real Christians do not know what the Gospel is, then that obviously means that 87% of so-called real Christians known as evangelical

Christians aren't real Christians at all but are really fake Christians. See Matthew 7:13-29, cross referenced to Luke 13:23-30 to get Jesus' commentary on this.

What better environment for a fake Bible Answer Man to enter upon the scene. The Apostle Paul knew what was coming as a threat to the Christian church when he said in Acts 20:27-31, quote, "For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears."

Thus with the death of Walter Martin on June 26, 1989, a day I sat on my couch at home and cried about it when I heard the news, came some unknown person I had never heard of called Hendrik "Hank" Hanegraaff. It did not take me long to realize that Hanegraaff was as phony as a \$3 bill concerning Christian apologetics. Just by listening to him during the first few days he appeared on the Bible Answer Man radio broadcast, Hanegraaff was just plain ignorant about how to answer common Bible questions that were coming in, and Walter Martin's hand-picked radio broadcasters that were there, people like Craig Hawkins, Ron Rhodes, Rob Bowman, etc., had to do all the main answering while Hanegraaff just threw in some insignificant drivel. To me, Hanegraaff sounded like a total buffoon who absolutely had no business being on the radio broadcast at all.

I immediately began to wonder why Walter would leave his ministry to an apologetic joke like Hanegraaff. Over the years, I always suspected that something was definitely smelly in Denmark concerning Hanegraaff but I wasn't close enough to know exactly what it was that went on behind the scenes of Walter Martin's Christian Research Institute. I simply left the Hanegraaff situation to the providence of God, feeling that if God could use Balaam's ass to talk, then God could certainly use Hanegraaff too. See Numbers 22:21-38.

Lately I've been getting a lot more inquiries about Hanegraaff than I have in the past so I decided to make this video to deal with it. I know a lot more about Hanegraaff now than when he first began in Walter's place in 1989. The following is just one of the inquiries I've received.

Okay, the letter is several pages long but I'm just going to read this last part of the final page here. It says this: was Hanegraaff really Walter Martin's hand-picked successor? Or why does Hank make over \$250,000 a year? Why did he fire so many key people after he took over in 1989? Why did CRI buy him a \$66,000 Lexus sports car in 2004? Is Hanegraaff's "Personal Witness Training" a plagiarism of "Evangelism Explosion" by D. James Kennedy? Who should replace Hank on the Bible Answer Man? Let us know what you think. It goes on from there.

Besides this, there are many other issues with Hanegraaff going on such as his denial of the biblical record in Genesis. You can see there, "Hank Hanegraaff's Abuse of Biblical Truth," by Ken Ham from May 9, 2013. Now, looking at what Ken Ham says here in this article, he says,

"Most of you have likely heard of Hank Hanegraaff, president of the Christian Research Institute (CRI) and host of the radio broadcast Bible Answer Man. In a recent issue of the Creation Research Journal, which is published by CRI, Hanegraaff made some very disturbing statements about Scripture's account of dinosaurs and sea monsters—and the serpent in the Garden of Eden.

Hanegraaff wrote a book on the issue of creation titled "The Creation Answer Book." I previously published a review on my blog.

Sadly, "The Creation Answer Book" made it evident that Hanegraaff does not hold to a literal Genesis (but buys into geological and astronomical evolution), as he was unwilling to understand Genesis in its most natural form—historical narrative."

As we see here and for the viewers at home, we can see what Ken Ham is saying concerning what Hanegraaff is saying and what the Scripture actually teaches from Genesis. And for those that want to see that, they can freeze frame the information on their YouTube screen and read it and then proceed on from there. But page after page is documented here by Ken Ham concerning Hanegraaff and his strange views concerning creation.

Since Hanegraaff refuses to believe what the Bible clearly teaches concerning creation and what Jesus himself taught concerning this issue, see our video "Jesus on the age of the earth. He was a young earth creationist, not an old earth Darwinian evolutionist" on YouTube. It brings in the further question whether he's a real Christian or just another fake Christian like so many others.

Titus 1:15-16 states, "Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled. They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate."

The major mistake made by so-called Christians who want to deny what Genesis clearly states and what Jesus affirms is to use the hermeneutical fallacy of interpreting a biblical text called eisegesis rather than the correct method of biblical interpretation which is called exegesis.

Exegesis and eisegesis are two conflicting approaches in Bible study. Exegesis is the exposition or explanation of a text based on a careful, objective analysis. The word

exegesis literally means "to lead out of." That means that the interpreter is led to his conclusions by following the text.

The opposite approach to Scripture is eisegesis, which is the interpretation of a passage based on a subjective, non-analytical reading. The word eisegesis literally means "to lead into," which means the interpreter injects his own ideas into the text, making it mean whatever he wants.

Obviously, only exegesis does justice to the text. Eisegesis is a mishandling of the text and often leads to a misinterpretation. Exegesis is concerned with discovering the true meaning of the text, respecting its grammar, syntax, and setting. Eisegesis is concerned only with making a point, even at the expense of the meaning of words.

2 Timothy 2:15 commands us to use exegetical methods, not eisegesis but exegetical methods: "Present yourself to God as one approved, a workman who does not need to be ashamed and who correctly handles the word of truth." An honest student of the Bible will be an exegete, allowing the text to speak for itself. Eisegesis easily lends itself to error, as the would-be interpreter attempts to align the text with his own preconceived notions. Exegesis allows us to agree with the Bible; eisegesis seeks to force the Bible to agree with us.

The process of exegesis involves 1) observation: what does the passage say? 2) interpretation: what does the passage mean? 3) correlation: how does the passage relate to the rest of the Bible? and 4) application: how should this passage affect my life?

Eisegesis, on the other hand, involves 1) imagination: what idea do I want to present? 2) exploration: what Scripture passage seems to fit with my idea? and 3) application: what does my idea mean? Notice that, in eisegesis, there is no examination of the words of the text or their relationship to each other, no cross-referencing with related passages, and no real desire to understand the actual meaning. Scripture serves only as a prop to the interpreter's idea.

Thus people like Hanegraaff use eisegesis to force their secular Darwinian ideas about the age of the earth into the biblical text in order to get the Bible to agree with what they already want to believe rather than what the biblical text actually says. Eisegesis is a classic form of biblical misinterpretation used by false cults and religions around the world.

See our video on this phony methodology called, "Scripture twisting: 20 ways religious cults misread the Bible."

Video:

Larry. 20 ways the cults misread the Bible and basically I've listed out James S.'s different points he uses in the book on how biblical texts and so forth are perverted and changed by different groups representing themselves as Christians but in the end they deny the Gospel as Rob so

eloquently described at the beginning of the program. Of course in his book he's mainly covering how Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, groups like this, Christian Science and so forth, pervert it. It's overall a good guide to just how groups can take the Bible and, as we say, just twist them, as Peter said, to their own destruction.

Let's go through this list and start taking a look at what we can find out here. The first point is: inaccurate quotation. Now, what this means is it's a biblical text that is referred to but it's either not quoted in the way the text appears in any standard translation or is wrongly attributed.

Of course, we have virtue by association. I'm just going to run through these briefly and still have some time left. Esoteric interpretation. Supplementing biblical authority.

Larry. From the outset, I wish to thank Jay Howard who is the author of the eye-opening book "Hard Questions for The Bible Answer Man." Also, Paul Vendredi and former CRI Hanegraaff employee, Perry Robinson, who have all given me permission to use their insightful research in the making of this video.

Keep in mind what the Bible teaches concerning matters such as what we will be dealing with with the Fake Bible Answer Man, Hank Hanegraaff.

The Bible tells us to expose error. Ephesians 5:11, "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." And to expose error, we must make righteous judgments. Christians must judge in order to: 1. Try the spirits to see if they are from God for many false prophets are in the world. That's 1 John 4:1. 2. Mark and avoid false teachers, slaves of their own bellies, deceiving many with their smooth and flattering speech. Romans 16:17-18. 3. Rebuke false teachers, rebellious men and deceivers who subvert whole families with their false doctrine. Titus 1:9-16. 4. Have no fellowship with immoral, impure or covetous men. Ephesians 5:5-7. 5. Receive not deceivers who do not abide in the teaching of Christ into our homes nor giving them any greeting. That's 2 John 7-11. 6. Be wary of those who preach another Gospel. That's 2 Corinthians 11:4 and Galatians 1:6-9. Even David who feared touching one of God's anointed did not hesitate to judge and expose Saul's sin before the world, "Out of the wicked comes forth wickedness." 1 Samuel 24:10, 12-13. Thus shouldn't true Christians following the biblical standards laid down judge and expose the sins of false teachers, prophets, and immoral brothers in the church, all those who would pollute the truth with perverted doctrines or watered down teachings which tickle the ear? 2 Timothy 4:2-5, "preach the word; be ready in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with great patience and instruction. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but wanting to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths. But you, be sober in all things, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry."

From here, let's begin with an interview that host Paul Vendredi had with author and researcher Jay Howard concerning the Fake Bible Answer Man, Hank Hanegraaff.

Audio.

Paul Vendredit. Very few people know much about Hank Hanegraaff, the so-called Bible Answer Man. If you're one of those people who knows nothing about him, then you're in luck. I have on the phone with me the man who literally wrote the book on Hanegraaff. The book is called "Hard Questions for The Bible Answer Man: Hank Hanegraaff and his takeover of the Christian Research Institute." The author is Jay Howard, founder of the Religious Research Project in Logan, Ohio. Jay, welcome to the show.

Jay Howard. Thanks, Paul, it's nice to be with you.

Paul. Jay, I want to start with the subtitle of your book. The subtitle is: Hank Hanegraaff and his takeover of the Christian Research Institute. Let's just abbreviate Christian Research Institute to CRI for the rest of the show.

Jay. Sure.

Paul. Okay, Jay, the guy who founded the Christian Research Institute is actually not Hank Hanegraaff but no one would know that if you went to the website of CRI, would you?

Jay. No. I talked to a lot of people over the years who think that Hank Hanegraaff is the founder of CRI and, in fact to kind of give you a little idea of that, back in 2002, a friend of mine was doing a radio interview with him and they were talking about the Bible Answer Man program itself and he said, "Well, who is the radio fellow," he asked him, "who is the original Bible Answer Man?" and Hank answered something like, "Well, there have been many men behind the microphone but I'm the current Bible Answer Man." And this is a pattern that he had for many years where he went out of his way not to mention Walter Martin because Walter Martin was the Bible Answer Man. He started the show back in, I think it was the 60s, and so...

Paul. He's the founder of CRI as well.

Jay. Yes. He started the CRI in his basement in New Jersey back in 1960. They moved out to California in about '74 or '75 when Martin realized that all the major cult issues going on in the United States were kind of coming out of California and going east.

Paul. Imagine that, cults coming from California. Who'd a thunk it?

Jay. And so he kind of thought that being at the heart of the cult world would be the best place to be for a ministry like CRI which is heavy into cult apologetics. So they moved out there in '73 or '74, '75 time period. And of course, Martin ran the ministry from 1960 until '89 when he died and unfortunately he didn't really leave a will or anything about who would succeed him and so it was kind of up in the air as to who would take Martin's place if he was to retire or die.

Paul. And so who did take his place?

Jay. Well, it was obviously Hank Hanegraaff. I remember getting a newsletter from CRI in '89 or late '89 early '90 that had a little blurb in the middle of it talking about a guy named Hank Hanegraaff who was going to take the ministry forward into the future and at that time, I had never heard of him. I mean, I know a lot of people in the cult and apologetics world because I'm in the field myself and I had honestly never heard of Hank Hanegraaff and I just assumed he was some kind of a seminarian that Walter Martin was impressed with and kind of came out of nowhere. I knew nothing about him at that point.

Paul. And you thought he was a seminarian, which is what most people would have thought, but in fact your book says that he was really just some kind of a bean counter there at CRI.

Jay. Yeah. I got ahold of his resume for the book and the book talks about the different ministries that he supposedly worked for, he helped raise money for them and this kind of thing. There is no mention in his bio that CRI had that said anything about him being any kind of a theologian, having any seminary or Bible college training in the field of cults and philosophy and apologetics. There is nothing like that in his biographical statement.

Paul. So what was he doing at CRI? I think you said in the book that he was a fundraiser and that's why Walter Martin brought him onto the board.

Jay. Yeah. You see, Walter Martin would go to a church called Mount Paran Church of God in Atlanta, Georgia where the pastor really liked him, about once a year, and at that time, Hank Hanegraaff was attending Mount Paran in Atlanta and that's when he first met Walter Martin and he started talking to him and kind of promoting himself to Walter Martin. So they met a couple of years before he got involved at CRI back in the '80s.

Paul. Okay, so he met Hank Hanegraaff in Atlanta and then that's where he decided to bring him on board as a fundraiser. So Hank Hanegraaff ended up getting onto the board and I read in the book that the board comprised all of 3 people aside from Walter Martin. That's rather unusual.

Jay. Yeah. From what I could see, for several years Martin kept a very lean board, usually 4 or 5 people, hardly ever more than 5, and at the time of his death in June of '89, there was only 3 other men on the board besides himself and Hank Hanegraaff had been one of those men.

Paul. Jay, the book gives a rather scandalous description of some of the shenanigans that went on at Walter Martin's funeral. Why don't you sketch that funeral for us and let us know what happened there.

Jay. Okay. Well, you know, the family and the board members were in a room. If you've been part of a funeral, there's always a room where the people involved in the funeral, the relatives, that kind of thing, they sit in this room until they're called to go and sit in the front of the church. So Walter Martin's immediate family, his board, John Ankeberg, Hank Hanegraaff, they were in this room together. There was a handful of people literally and a few minutes before they were to be ushered into the church, Hank Hanegraaff approached Darlene Martin, who was Walter Martin's widow, and asked to see her funeral notes. So she was in a state of shock and she wasn't going to doubt the guy because she trusted him, so she handed her notes to Hank Hanegraaff and Hanegraaff took them to another man that she remembers handing the notes to this other man, and he wrote something on the paper, on the bottom of her funeral notes. So he came back a couple of minutes later and said, "Read this note once you finish reading your prepared typed out speech."

So she just tucked it in there at the bottom and took it with her and when she got to her prepared statement, the typed out statement, she read that about her husband and his ministry, and then I listened to the audio tapes of the funeral and right when she hits this prepared statement that he had written down, not that he had written down but somebody else had written for her in cursive writing, she started to stammer a little bit because she was trying to read it for the first time in her life. And the note, and I have this note because she sent me a photocopy of this handwritten note that was at the bottom of her statement....

Paul. It's also reproduced in the book.

Jay. ...yeah, it's in the book. In that, she started talking about how her and Walter had talked many times about who would take over CRI once he died or retired and then she launched into this... and that man is Hank Hanegraaff and we thank God for Hank Hanegraaff and Hank Hanegraaff is a great guy and he's going to do this, he's going to do that. So it was really kind of a mini-commercial for Hank Hanegraaff that she had not even prepared. It was Hanegraaff's own statement that he literally wanted read into the funeral notes, you know, into the recordings and the

videotaping of the funeral so that it would appear that she was giving her imprimatur, her pledge of loyalty to Hank, that he was the man that Walter Martin had chosen.

Now, I interviewed Darlene Martin several times over the course of putting the book together and she told me something very interesting that when Walter Martin would come home at night from CRI, you know, he wanted to be just a father and a husband. She said that he never would talk about what's going on in the ministry, who we're hiring, who we're firing, nothing about stuff they were going to be doing, and so she didn't know anything about Hanegraaff. There was no talking, you know, in bed, to hang around with Walter Martin, you know, in the wee hours of the morning talking about what would happen if he died. That was all made up. Hanegraaff just created this whole image out of whole-cloth to make it look like there had been thought put into his being chosen as the president when in actuality there was no advance warning that he would become president of CRI.

Paul. Just a classic example of opportunism.

Jay. Yeah. He had, I don't know, I think he started building this case for himself in his head because he got on the board of CRI in February of 1987, which is about a year and a half or so before Walter Martin died, and so he was on the board with those other men, Stan T. and Everett J. and then Walter Martin. So he had only been on the board for a little over a year and a half when Martin died unexpectedly of diabetic complications.

Paul. Now just to set the tenor of what Hanegraaff's regime was going to be like when he took over the Christian Research Institute, his first action as president apparently was to hike his salary?

Jay. That was one of the very first. Yeah. Walter Martin at the time of his death was making the princely sum of \$40,000 a year which is really nothing, you know, when you think about being the head of an organization, and the first thing that Hanegraaff asked the board for was a \$20,000 raise from \$40,000 to \$60,000. That was his first move within the first month of him being there.

Paul. Ladies and gentleman, the book is called "Hard Questions for The Bible Answer Man: Hank Hanegraaff and his takeover of the Christian Research Institute." The author is Jay Howard. Jay, I want to read a quote from your book because I think that it starkly contrasts exactly what kind of ministry Hank Hanegraaff was going to run and I think it starkly contrasts his character with that of his far worthier predecessor, Walter Martin.

The quote is found on page 59. Quote, "From July, 1989 until 1995, over 100 people were either fired or felt compelled to quit under Hank Hanegraaff. All of this in only the first six years of Hank Hanegraaff's Machiavellian control of CRI. But Hanegraaff's presidency, which would be marked by avarice and an almost maniacal need for self-promotion, had just begun. There is no record of Walter Martin firing staff during his tenure at CRI over a 30 year period." End of quotation.

Jay. Yeah. You know, I didn't know Walter Martin. I mean, I had met him several times but I didn't know him, like, really well. I don't think he could have picked me out in a crowd, to tell you the truth. But he was always a very jovial, happy, lovable fellow, and I've talked to many of his employees after the book came out and before the book came out, and nobody was saying that he was tyrannical, he had a bad temper or anything, so it's hard for me to believe that Martin ever, you know, fired pretty much anybody unless they had some kind of a real need to be fired. But when Hanegraaff came in, he was so insecure. He had no real apologetics cult philosophy education. He had a high school diploma and quite a bit of college at Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Paul. Yeah, I think you wrote Calvin College.

Jay. Yeah. It was a Dutch Reformed school. But the transcripts show that he never even graduated from Bible college. He left short of graduation.

Paul. So he just meandered his way through college without even finishing, whereas the researchers at CRI had to have degrees and he was going to be president of all these degreed people.

Jay. Yeah. At the time that Hanegraaff took over, it was a requirement that if you wanted to be a research person, you know, I'm not talking about a secretary or something, but if you wanted to be a research person, you had to have at least a bachelor's degree, working on a master's, etc. and, you know, if you had a high school diploma, that wouldn't cut it as a research person.

So, yeah, Hanegraaff came in and took over a very highly educated ministry with less than a college degree and that's one of my points in my book that I make that I reason that a man like Hanegraaff who knew pretty much all the evangelical scholars of the day, you know, the most brilliant Christian minds of America at that time, if he was picking a successor, he would not have picked a person with a high school diploma. I mean, I don't care how nice the guy was, it just wouldn't be part of his make-up to pick a person with limited knowledge in the field that CRI was involved in.

Paul. And he wouldn't pick somebody who would alienate everyone on the staff and then go on to alienate many other people in the Christian world. Jay, we've been talking about the people whom Hanegraaff terminated at CRI. On pages 39 to 43 of your book, you give a list, necessarily a partial list but still a long list, of some of the people whom had Hanegraaff fired. Let's go through some of these and just find out what the reasons were behind the firings. Jay, tell me about Robert Bowman.

Jay. Well, Rob Bowman I've known for quite a while. He told me about his CRI experience with Hank Hanegraaff, that I think the turning point for Rob was one day Hank Hanegraaff was on the Bible Answer Man program and he was quoting from what's called a CRI Perspective, I believe, which is like a one page sheet on a group.

Paul. Let's make sure we're clear, this is after the death of Walter Martin.

Jay. Oh yeah, this is after the death of Walter Martin. And Rob Bowman had written that particular perspective, it was a one page outline of the group's theology and history and that kind of thing. And according to Rob, what he told me was Hanegraaff read that on the air as if he had written it, he took credit for writing it, and Rob Bowman went into his office a little later after the show and said, "You can't do that because I wrote that. I mean, I know I wrote that because that's my writing." And Hanegraaff sort of protested a little bit and it wasn't until a week later Bowman kind of found out what happened, he was fired. He was fired from CRI and told they had a financial problem that month and they had to let some people go.

Now, Rob actually went back into the numbers of that month and found out that in truth the giving for that month was actually higher than normal for the year and he was the only one fired, so it wasn't like a massive group of people let go on that particular week. You know, the people you don't let go when you're having trouble are the people that keep your ministry going. The research department, he was a researcher, one of the top researchers at that time, and so they fired him and so it was a retribution firing for doubting or challenging Hank Hanegraaff.

Paul. Jay, tell me about Craig and Lisa Hawkins.

Jay. Well, Lisa, I think she worked in the...she was a secretary there, I believe, but Craig was one of the senior researchers. In fact, many times when Walter Martin was out of town for a weekend or something or for a couple of days, he had Craig fill in as the voice of the Bible Answer Man for a day or two. And Craig's another one of those people I have met in the past. I don't really hang out with him too much anymore. He lives in

California, I believe, but, you know, he's a very gifted speaker. He has a background in philosophy and cults and world religions and so, you know, he was really good at getting behind a microphone and taking calls and questions because he had such a broad knowledge of the Bible and philosophy and Christian apologetics, something that Walter Martin had.

So Craig Hawkins spent many many days being the voice of the Bible Answer Man when Walter Martin died. After...there was Ken Samples, Rob Bowman, Paul Card and there was about a half a dozen men that filled in, but Craig did it a lot. And to be the president of CRI, you'd have to be the voice of the Bible Answer Man. I mean, you couldn't be the president of CRI and not be the voice of the Bible Answer Man program. So Hanegraaff understood that he had to do something to get rid of Craig Hawkins. In fact, he told people before the firings and after the firings that his wife, Cathy, had had, like, a dream or something and God had told her that Craig Hawkins, he was, like, demon possessed.

Paul. Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man, in other words.

Jay. Yeah. And so they fired Craig Hawkins, I should say they forced him out, made it terribly uncomfortable for him to be there because, you see, Hanegraaff again, he needed to be the Bible Answer Man voice and Craig Hawkins was probably the one man who could stand between him and that chair. So he got rid of Craig Hawkins. He really, I mean, he feared Craig Hawkins, in a sense, because most of these men, you know, I think he was living in fear that they would figure out how bad he was, how limited background he had in cults and philosophy and the Bible and everything else, and so he little by little got rid of pretty much everybody who had a real background in these kind of things, who had studied them, gone to college for these issues. So little by little most of the men were sort of moved out of CRI or outright fired and Craig Hawkins was one of those.

Paul. Jay, let's switch gears here from firing and talk about hiring. Tell me about this Paul Young character whom Hank Hanegraaff brought on board.

Jay. Well, Paul Young was a Canadian. He had met him up in Canada because there's a thing called CRI Canada which was started about 10 years before Walter Martin died. So Hanegraaff went up there after Martin died to check out CRI Canada, met with John P., the director of CRI Canada, and he ended up firing John P. and the whole staff that was up there because they were not too happy with the way he was running things and they became very concerned.

So John P. was let go and it was kind of a bloodbath up there, but he did meet Paul Young. They must have hit it off somehow because he invited

him to come down to Southern California to be his right hand man, you know, to be the vice president of CRI. The only problem was at that time Paul Young was married to a woman by the name of Estelle and he literally picked up, moved down to Southern California, left his wife in Canada, left her with the bills and all the problems of what happens when you leave your spouse. She called down to CRI to talk to Hank Hanegraaff privately about the desertion of her husband to work for CRI and she went public on this and she said that Hanegraaff would never take her phonecalls and never would help her to reconcile with her husband. So he literally took on a man who would abandon his family.

Paul. And I do believe the Bible says that a man who will not provide for his family is worse than an infidel.

Jay. Exactly. You have a man at the head of the CRI, you know, this Christian Research organization, that is actually, you know, basically breaking the biblical statements. I mean, you don't help a man or a woman flee their family when they are responsible to their mate. I mean, this was a marriage. This wasn't boyfriend/girlfriend. This was a marriage and Hanegraaff completely disregarded that relationship and took Paul on and left his ex-wife to flounder by herself.

Paul. The name of the book, ladies and gentleman, is "Hard Questions for The Bible Answer Man: Hank Hanegraaff and his takeover of the Christian Research Institute." The author is Jay Howard. Jay is on the phone with me right now.

Jay. There was a good friend of Walter Martin's by the name of Tony C. and I interviewed him back in, I think, 2001, 2002 when I was working on the book research, and he told me a little interesting story. He said that they had a dedication of their building, CRI had a dedication of their building in Irvine, California, and Tony C. came out to attend the little shindig and while he was there, Walter Martin had invited him to go to a Baptist church with because Walter Martin had been booked to speak there. I think it was in Garden Grove or Garden City, one of those towns.

So they get in the car and they're driving away and Tony told me that Walter, he was asking him about how things are going at CRI and Walter started, like, waxing eloquent about several men there that had sort of shown themselves to be superior Christian leaders there. He mentioned Paul Cardin. He mentioned Craig Hawkins by name. He might have mentioned like Rich Paul who was there for a time. And you know, he was talking about all these young men who he had hired to be researchers at CRI and it just so happened that driving to the church engagement, the man driving was Hank Hanegraaff and he was behind the wheel. Now, I asked him, "Did he say anything about Hank Hanegraaff? Did he say how

wonderful he was and this is going to be my next president of CRI or whatever if something happened to me?" And Tony said, "No. I mean, the guy drove the car," and there was no extolling of Hank Hanegraaff's credentials to him.

Now, the reason this is significant is because Tony C., and I've heard this from other people, they were like really good friends. I mean, Tony and Walter were good friends that had been friends for many many years.

Paul. Back in New Jersey.

Jay. Back in New Jersey because that's where Walter Martin was originally from. And you know, if you're going to be driving to this church thing and you're at the dedication and you've come all this way to see your friend Walter, you'd think this would be a great time to discuss with him and say, "Hey, do you know who's driving this car right now? The man who is going to take over for me after I die or if I retire. Hank Hanegraaff, he's the man. He's driving this car right now. And this is why he's so wonderful." But he didn't say one word about Hank Hanegraaff and to me that would have been the perfect time to discuss the future with his friend Tony, and I do think that's indicative of one of the reasons why Hanegraaff is not or should not be the president because, you know, Walter Martin said nothing about him to anybody that I can find in public or private. I interviewed many people and none of them had any advance knowledge of Hank Hanegraaff going to be the next president. It just wasn't in the cards.

Paul. So the men whom Walter Martin mentored and trained all got canned, whereas the chauffeur/fundraiser is the one who ended up becoming president of CRI and the Bible Answer Man.

Jay. Exactly.

Paul. Jay, you've got a priceless quote about this on page 29. I want to read it. Quote, "Hank was given authority by the board to build the BAM program by adding or subtracting radio stations in order to make the BAM program profitable. This, again, was only a business related project. He was not being asked to appear on BAM and had never spent any time on the radio show at that point. To put this into perspective, it would be analogous to a business manager at a hospital being offered the position as the head of thoracic medicine. It would never happen because the manager has no training in that field."

Jay. One of Martin's board members whose name was Stan Thomas, and he just died here a couple of months ago, he was a great guy. I mean, I met with him in 2008. I flew down to Fort Meyers, Florida to spend a week

with him and his wife. And Stan had saved pretty much everything that he was ever given from CRI. He had notes and he had minutes from board meetings. He had boxes and boxes of stuff and so I was able to take all the board minutes that Stan still possessed at CRI or from CRI, home with me and I took a big thick briefcase with me and stuffed it full of notes and I took it home and in the book itself, I quote from several board minutes of different years that Hanegraaff was on. He was on there from February of '87 until he took over in '89, June of '89.

Now if you read these board minutes, you'll notice that there is any time that Hanegraaff speaks up in a board meeting, it's related to business, you know, fundraising, going on a cruise, raising money to go on a cruise for CRI people or whatever it was. There were all kinds of projects and things he talked about but he was never talking about, you know, being the BAM guy or being a theologian, working with the research crew. He was always talking about raising money, cutting costs, very accounting related stories.

Paul. Yeah, he was just counting the shekels, in other words.

Jay. Yeah.

Paul. Now, some people may be puzzled at this point because if you listen to Hanegraaff on the radio now, he's a smooth operator and I think just by dint of longevity, he has become so but that wasn't always the case. When he first took over on the Bible Answer Man, it was a daily disaster and, Jay, you have a letter here that you've reproduced in the book by Michael Stevens, former director of broadcast media at CRI. I just want to read a couple of the choice sentences from this and you can jump in at any point.

Jay. Sure.

Paul. Okay, here we are on page 53. Quote, "Never did the BAM broadcast go by without Hank rewording a caller's question to enable himself to answer the reworded question. Hank would usually ask, 'Does that help?' or something along those lines, and the response by the caller was often something like, 'Well, actually,' in which Hank would say, 'Well, stay on the line and we'll send you some information,' and not ever really answering the question probably due to ignorance."

Moving down, quote, "There were also two of the unfortunate things that happened on the Bible Answer Man quite regularly. The first is this: Hank would walk into the studio, briefly scan the pre-screen call sheets, and then scramble to find a quick fix answer. Oftentimes he would ask Ron Rhodes or Bob Lyle what this or that word meant or what that cult believes. Some of the questions to which Hank had no answer were

frighteningly simple. I must say that he didn't always do this. The sad fact is that when he didn't, the answer would often be wrong."

Alright, so he's depending on Ron Rhodes and Bob Lyle there, two of the men we said earlier were probably qualified to sit in as the actual Bible Answer Man.

Jay. Yeah. Also, I've talked to a couple of radio people there and they said they had created, they created a book with tabs so you could open the book with tabs saying Jehovah's Witnesses, and they would have, like, statements in there by Jehovah's Witnesses so he could pull information. Now, one of the radio guys, I want to say it was Michael but I'm not sure who it was, had told me that he had actually given him a device to use on the air, he gave Hank Hanegraaff a device where he would be reading something off the page and he'd stammer and stop and make it look like he was pulling it all from memory. So when he would be quoting a source from Mormonism or Jehovah's Witnesses or something, he was trying to make it sound like he had this already memorized. He would stop and stammer and like he was fighting to pull it out of his memory. So he would use these little devices to make himself look good on the air.

Paul. The name of the book is "Hard Questions for The Bible Answer Man: Hank Hanegraaff and his takeover of the Christian Research Institute." The author is Jay Howard.

Jay. You know, he positioned himself, he was a vice president on the board, which means nothing in real terms because I've sat on boards and just because you're the vice president of a ministry board doesn't mean that you have the knowledge to actually sit in that seat in the real ministry world. That's just a position that he held on the board and, you know, he may have worked with and talked them into letting him be the president for a while because he thought, well, maybe... he may have said, "Well, you know, I'll be the president for a while until we can find somebody to take my place."

Paul. Just a caretaker president.

Jay. I think it's worth noting, too, that they didn't wait until weeks or months after the funeral to make him president. Hank Hanegraaff called a special meeting at 8:45 in the morning the day of the funeral and had them vote on his presidency. Now, who needs to have a new president, you know, the morning of their funeral? But, you see, I believe that he was struggling to consolidate his power as soon as possible so nobody could, you know, fight him on it. Then, of course, he had John Ankerberg during the funeral announce that he was unanimously voted on as president of

CRI or for CRI in the morning. But you just don't have a business meeting the morning of the funeral of the founder. It's unheard of.

Paul. Unanimously voted by 3 people, Hanegraaff being one of the 3 people.

Jay. Yeah, exactly. I mean, everything he did was seemingly calculated to consolidate his power as quickly as he could.

Paul. You know, as much as that makes the steam come out of my ears, I've got to admit there's a part of me that admires that level of piracy, just being able to pull off a feat like that, there is something... I mean, it's admirable in a deplorable way, if you know what I'm saying.

Jay. Yeah. I mean, you know, we call it chutzpah. Do you know that Yiddish term, chutzpah?

Paul. Oh yeah.

Jay. He had a lot of chutzpah just to think that he could even try to make this work. But as you mentioned a few minutes ago, he is not an original person. He could never have started the CRI himself so the only way he could make it in the world was to, you know, take over the existing ministry and as I've shown in the book on several pages, even before he supposed became a Christian in 1979, Hanegraaff admitted that he wanted to have money and power. He craved to have a lot of money and so he used CRI as his personal ATM machine. I mean, the guy is making in excess of \$400,000, him and his wife because she is supposed to be the head of public relations.

Paul. Yeah, what exactly does she do? She makes \$80,000 a year. What does Cathy Hanegraaff do?

Jay. Well, I don't think anybody has ever been able to figure that out because when I was working on the book, I talked to people and they said she was never around. You know, if she was doing PR work, she was doing it from her home because she had like 8 or 9 kids or something, but she never was in the office to work. She was always doing it supposedly at home so we don't really know how she worked or what she worked on but this is what she was supposed to be doing. But between that and I'm sure he has an expense account, so he probably has another, I've heard it's close to \$600,000 now because my book when it came out, it was about \$400,000.

Paul. Jay, we talked about how Hanegraaff stole CRI, apparently even before he came on to CRI, he began his ministry career with a rip-off.

You've interviewed D. James Kennedy and apparently Hanegraaff stole from him as well. Why don't you explain that.

Jay. Yeah. I interviewed D. James Kennedy in 2000 because at that time Hanegraaff was going on the radio and claiming that D. James Kennedy was an astrologer and trying to mess up D. James Kennedy's ministry career by claiming that he was a heretic and an astrologer. So I called Hanegraaff's office and set up an interview with him and because it became pretty clear at that time that Hanegraaff had stolen or plagiarized material from what's called "Evangelism Explosion," which is sort of the opus work of D. James Kennedy back in the '60s or '70s I think.

So I called D. James Kennedy's office and talked to him for 10 minutes and we talked about how, you know, he knew about the plagiarism, he was very concerned about it. He wasn't going to sue him. He wasn't going to take him to court because Christians don't sue Christians, he told me. He's pretty biblical.

Paul. Yeah, 1 Corinthians 6.

Jay. Yeah. And Hanegraaff knew that he knew about it and he tried to, you know, he met him at a hotel one time and sort of, kind of a little bit pleaded with him not to do anything, you know. And Kennedy told him, "Don't worry. I'm not going to sue you. I'm not going to make a big deal out of this." But he was, you know, Kennedy was routinely being sent copies of the PWT comparing it to EE...

Paul. That's "Personal Witness Training."

Jay. Yeah, "Personal Witness Training," and that's Hanegraaff's material. And it was really close. Now, Rob Bowman back in '95 did a point by point comparison which I replicated most of it in my book...

Paul. And just to remind listeners, Rob Bowman was the CRI employee who actually wrote the CRI Perspectives.

Jay. Right. So he did a point by point comparison to show that the plagiarism was real and it really was. I mean, it's so blatant that it could not have been just a coincidence, you know. So, yeah, he has written several books but they have always been written by a committee or by other people.

Paul. He being Hanegraaff.

Jay. Hanegraaff, and he puts his name on it.

Paul. Yeah, you know, that's extremely interesting, Jay, because I'm not the biggest fan of Hanegraaff's books but the one that I actually did like was "Christianity in Crisis" and it turns out that's written by a committee.

Jay. Yeah, CRI staffers.

Paul. Yeah, CRI staffers.

Larry. Did Hanegraaff actually plagiarize D. James Kennedy's "Evangelism Explosion" for his own "Personal Witness Training"? Next, let's hear from well-known minister, Dr. D. James Kennedy of Coral Ridge Ministries in Florida about this issue.

Audio.

D. James Kennedy. I began to get numerous letters from people telling me that he had been attacking me again on several occasions on his radio program. He has been doing this off and on for the last 3 or 4 years and has attacked me in books and on tapes and magazine. I have made it a position over 42 years of ministry that though I would take on the atheists and the agnostics and the cultists and the pagans and the humanists and the evolutionists, but I never would attack fellow evangelical believers. And so I had called him one time trying to get him to not do that but he continued to do it and apparently is increasing that attack, and so I finally simply wrote a letter to the people that had sent me letters telling me that he was attacking me, tried to explain why what he said wasn't the case, and apparently and I'm not sure but somebody said that they think that he took that and put it on the web and made it public and now is accusing me of attacking him, which is utterly absurd because I have been sitting here saying nothing for 3 or 4 years while he has continued this assault.

Host. Okay, how did Hank Hanegraaff come to get involved at Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church, your home church?

Kennedy. Well, he was led to Christ by one of our "Evangelism Explosion" teams that visited in his apartment one night and led him to Christ. He came and was received as a member and he was a very eager young man. He had a good mind and was growing very well. We led him to Christ. We taught him Reformed theology. We taught him how to evangelize through "Evangelism Explosion," then he came to work a couple of years later for EE and in the fundraising department, and then finally he left and went to Atlanta to work with Archie Parrish.

Host. Approximately how many years was he attached to your church there in Fort Lauderdale?

Kennedy. I was afraid you were going to ask that because I really don't know, and this would just be, you know, a guess. I don't know. I really

have no idea. I would say it seems like it might have been 5 years or more, but that's purely a guess. I have not checked any figures and my memory for those things is getting a little bit fuzzy.

Host. Was there any particular reason that you know of why he left the Fort Lauderdale area and the Coral Ridge Ministries there?

Kennedy. He was working for EE and when Parrish, who was then our vice president, went to Atlanta to start his own ministry, he went with him to work for him.

Host. So there was no problem with him that you know of?

Kennedy. No. No. As far as any personal problem, not that I knew of. He later was removed from that ministry because of the conduct that he exhibited there. I just talked to Archie Parrish at General Assembly a couple of days ago and he was telling me about the very unhappy circumstances whereby he was forced to let him go.

Host. Now, maybe you could just speak to this just for a moment, was Hank Hanegraaff a representative for "Evangelism Explosion" in Atlanta or just when he was with you?

Kennedy. Just when he was with us, he would then represent us to donors anywhere in the country, not just Atlanta. But when he left us and went to Atlanta, he no longer was.

Host. Okay, so there was no reason, so he didn't leave the EE program in Atlanta, he actually left that in Fort Lauderdale.

Kennedy. That's correct, the best I remember. That's been 20 years or more ago.

Host. Sure. Now, when did you first hear about Hank Hanegraaff's "Personal Witnessing Training" program?

Kennedy. The first time I ever heard of that is when I began to get letters from people telling me that he had, that Hanegraaff had plagiarized my book, "Evangelism Explosion," which is the basis of the whole evangelistic, EE, "Evangelism Explosion" ministry all over the world, and that he had come up with a very very similar program, and I guess that's what he called it, and it wasn't until people began to send me a page of his book and a page of my book right next to it, another page of his and a page of mine, and on and on, that I had ever seen it or even heard of it. And they were wanting me, I had all kinds of people saying, "You really ought to sue this man for plagiarism," and I said then what I have always said, I

don't think that's what Christians ought to do. I don't think we're supposed to sue other Christians. And I met him one time at a hotel somewhere, I don't remember when or where, and he was trying to explain to me how this wasn't really plagiarism and I said to him, "Hank, look, forget it. Don't worry about it. I have no intention of suing you. I don't believe Christians ought to sue other Christians so just forget about it." And so that was my experience with that.

Host. Do you have a sense of how many years ago it was? I mean, when you first started hearing about this new PWT program?

Kennedy. Oh, gee. I don't know. Was it 10-12? When did he publish it? I don't remember.

Host. Well, it's been out since he was in Atlanta because that's when he first started developing it.

Kennedy. Well, you know, it could've been longer than that. I don't know. I started hearing about it when people began to write me letters and tell me about it. Other than that, I had never heard of it.

Host. Now, Christian Research Institute and Hank Hanegraaff claim that you gave Mr. Hanegraaff permission to use "Evangelism Explosion" materials for the development of the "Personal Witness Training" program, either verbal or written authorization. Did you ever do this?

Kennedy. No, that is just not the case. In fact, the matter is I did at his request take it to the board and ask them if they wanted to get involved with doing something like this and they turned it down. And if I had given him permission, I would ask at that hotel that time, why would he have so belabored the point that this really wasn't plagiarism? Now, I think I had seen the pages set side by side. I never even made an investigation on my own to get ahold of it or anything, but since people had sent me the copies of pages and that there was such a startling comparison between the two, you know, why was he trying so hard to convince me that this wasn't plagiarism when he could have said to me, "Well, Jim, you know, this is what I've come up with and since you gave me permission to use your book any way I wanted, I guess you'll recognize large segments of this coming from your book." He never said that. He kept saying it wasn't plagiarism. Now apparently he's saying it was but he had permission from me.

Larry. Now let's hear from former CRI employee, Perry Robinson, of his own experiences while he worked behind the scenes at Hanegraaff's operation there at CRI.

Audio.

Paul Vendredi. Perry, one of the objections that you and I continually encounter when we speak negatively about Hank Hanegraaff is that Hanegraaff is a genius with an encyclopedic knowledge of the faith but you, Perry, from your experience at CRI, have actually been in the studio during the recording of the BAM radio show. BAM, of course, stands for Bible Answer Man. You've seen what actually goes on behind the scenes. Why don't you tell us about the radio magic and sleight of hand that makes Hanegraaff look and sound so good.

Perry Robinson. Yeah, some of this is confirmed by other former employees like Mike Stevens and others who work in the radio engineering department so it's not just my word. There are multiple eye-witnesses to this.

When Hanegraaff came to CRI in his own words as he expressed in a recent interview with Frank B., he really knew nothing about cults or apologetics so he had to crib from the other employees who actually had degrees because to be a researcher, you actually had to have earned degrees, at least a bachelor's degree to be even considered for hiring. It had to be a bachelor's degree in a relative field.

So what people have to understand about the BAM show is, first, now that Hanegraaff has been doing this for 25 years, he's gotten better at this kind of facade but generally he has a number of tools. He only answers about 5 to 6 questions per hour. He has a call screener, of course, and so he can screen out all the hard questions that he's really not qualified to answer. He also has about a 10 second delay, or at least he did when I was there, because it gets shot up over satellite.

Paul. So he can dump a call if it goes bad, then.

Perry. Yes, he can. He can just turn down the volume and make it seem like he's answering the person and the person doesn't have anything further to say, and then be like, "Okay, I hope that helps. Now we're on to the next question." These are tools that he uses. Now, he has a computer on the desk which he uses for caller ID but also to look up information. When BAM first, when he first started on BAM, there was no computer there so there were other employees from the research department, such as Irwin D. who was a junior researcher, who would literally feed Hanegraaff texts to read from from other people's work or standard statements for CRI on a particular issue.

Now, I was not very old but I had done enough apologetics to realize that if you're doing this, you're really not qualified, and on top of that, Hanegraaff was just making all kinds of egregious historical and theological mistakes. Initially he kept talking about three separate persons

in the Trinity. That was one. He couldn't put major historical events within 5 centuries. If you can't nail down the Crusades or the Inquisition within 500 years, you probably don't know what you're talking about.

So what happened was whenever Hank would make a major screw-up, the BAM show for that day would become mysteriously unavailable because the error was so bad and it took up so much time that they just couldn't edit it out of the tape that would then be purchased for distribution to the public.

Paul. It just went down the George Orwell Memory Hole, in other words.

Perry. Right. Exactly. So what people are seeing in the show is not reality, it's a facade. He has no earned degrees in any field: not plumbing, not HVAC. He has no earned degree and he has 3 years at Calvin College, I believe, as an undergraduate which he dropped out from, and he can't read the biblical languages. He has no competence in philosophy or church history. So it's all just a big show. It's fakery. This is why he doesn't generally do debates because on a debate you have to do a couple of things: you have to construct an argument, present it, and respond on your feet. You have to be able to think through your opponent's objection right then and there. You don't get time to edit it out or hit the mute button.

So one debate he did with a Dallas Seminary graduate which is on YouTube for viewing, he gets annihilated.

Paul. Is that Mark Hitchcock, the eschatology debate?

Perry. Yeah, that's the Hitchcock debate over Revelation and you can see Hanegraaff about 2/3 of the way through becomes visibly angry and starts lashing out at people in the audience because he's losing the debate really bad, which is really not professional and not somebody with his supposed stature should be doing.

So he's really incompetent as a theologian, as a philosopher, and this is why you generally get the same questions over and over again. After about a year, you've pretty much heard everything Hank's going to say both in terms of verbosity, using a lot of big words to make it sound like he's educated, but he's like the JW, once you get the JW off his memorized spiel, he's helpless.

So to illustrate very quickly, a few months ago there was a caller who called in who was an Orthodox Catechumen and the Catechumen asked him about arguments against the papacy from an Orthodox point of view because the guy's wife was still Catholic and she didn't want to convert, so this was the linchpin for her, which is understandable. Hanegraaff talks for

7 minutes and he can't name one argument. He cannot provide one argument against the papacy from an Orthodox perspective.

Paul. Perry, in several of your blog posts, there is this exasperated expression that keeps cropping up and it goes along the lines of: after 30 years of doing theology 5 days a week, he should know this by now.

Perry. I think that's exactly right. He should. I mean, for example, he does not understand the Protestant view on justification that works are merely contiguous to faith, they don't participate in justification. He doesn't understand either a Catholic or an Orthodox view on justification, that our good works under the power of grace are God's works and therefore they please him. There are not these two things next to each other, they are actually one and the same thing. He doesn't understand that.

Now, I use myself as the measure for this because it's about the same amount of time. I learned these things because I read the Reformers. I read Luther in Scholastics, I read Reformed Scholastics. I went to lecture after lecture of contemporary Reformation authors from John G. and Mike G. and people like this for months. So I'm not holding him to a standard that I don't hold myself to, but he should have been able to articulate these things even before he was received into the church but he can't. He really doesn't know what he's doing.

Paul. Perry, what you are doing is what a scholar is supposed to do and that is to go back to the primary sources, *ad fontes* is what they said in the Reformation, whereas you have pointed out that Hanegraaff will not do anything beyond a mere surface level. I think the phrase you said that he uttered in your presence once was, "The research has been done. Now all we have to do is package it."

Perry. Yeah, and I'm not the only person he said that to. So this is why CRI really hasn't done any cutting edge apologetics in almost 30 years. The research staff has been liquidated. He publishes popular books under his name which there is ample reason out there, he's been called on the carpet for having ghostwriters for these books. So when he presents himself as having written 20 books, well, I'm very doubtful of that. Researchers put together entire sections of "Christianity in Crisis." There are other books that he took the titles of from other authors who already had books published on this. This has been out there if you wanted to use Google to see it. It should at least strike people as red flags that there is enough smoke there that there is probably fire in there somewhere.

But in general, all of this is just a facade. He's not an apologist. Hanegraaff is at best a popularizer who has to have information fed to him. I mean,

he's a glorified teleprompter reader so it's an entirely false appearance that you're getting.

Paul. You know, it's okay for the Christian faith to have popularizers, but when the popularizer portrays himself as an academic, that's the problem. And Perry, Hanegraaff has made himself appear, if people just listen for 20 minutes here and there, to be a top apologist and he's done it by means of this sleight of hand that you've talked about in the radio studio. Now, according to your blog, though, the ironic result of that is that the Christian Research Institute now under Hanegraaff is at an extremely rudimentary level of apologetic sophistication. It's really not very scholarly at all.

Perry. No, it's not and as I said before, they have another problem on top of that. Because their stuff is so basic for the most part, you can find it just about anywhere. You can find what they provide on the internet just about anywhere and the majority of books and materials that they provide, especially the books, you can just get them on Amazon. You can get them over the internet through various booksellers. There is no particular reason to go through CRI. There is nothing really unique that they're offering and people, for example, in the countercult community know that the really best stuff, for example on Jehovah's Witnesses, you don't go to CRI for the best stuff on Jehovah's Witnesses, you go to Duane Magnani's Witness Inc. If you want some of the best stuff on the Mormons, you go to the Tanners and people like this. It's long since been the case that CRI has nothing substantial to offer on apologetics other than just getting your feet wet.

Paul. Well, at one time they did because, of course, that was the foundation that was established by Walter Martin. Regrettably, you cannot get Martin's materials through CRI anymore.

Perry. Yeah, to my knowledge you can't. No. I'm not holding Hanegraaff to a standard he doesn't hold other people to. He regularly denounces people on TBN and other venues, word faith teachers, all the popular televangelists, for living a lavish lifestyle at the expense of ordinary people. Now regardless of their theological quackadoxy on TBN, the principle is still the same and applicable to Hank. Hank lives, to my knowledge and this is public record so I'm not gossiping, in a 9,200 square foot, 3.1 million dollar house in Charlotte, North Carolina. Now if you were to buy a house for that price, in say, Newport Beach, California on the coast, that would get you probably a 1,500 to 1,800 square foot little house on the beach. So you wouldn't be getting a lot but you're paying for location. But he's got a 9,200 square foot house. Now people will say, well, that's because he has 12 kids. Well, most of his kids are all adults and they have been for some time. They're not necessarily living there. He

lives on essentially a country club estate. The entrance fee for the country club, I believe, which is also public record, is about \$65,000 for the entrance fee and it's about \$1,000 a month.

Paul. And \$65,000 is more than what the average American grosses in a year as well.

Perry. Yeah, well, I mean, that's real money to the rest of us poor people. I mean, ordinary people, 65k is not chump change.

Paul. Perry, are you speculating that the reason he moved the Christian Research Institute from California to North Carolina was that his real estate dollars would go farther?

Perry. Well, it's interesting, you see, that's a possible speculation, and to be fair, I don't want to try and speculate, but I do know that when he was here in California where I reside, he purchased a home in Coto de Caza which is prime real estate in Southern California, a brand new home for \$731,000 in, I believe, 1992, which is also public record. And you have to understand, \$731,000 then was a lot of money and it was, I believe, about a 4,800-5,200 square foot house so it wasn't a small house. Then, of course, he lies about it, that he never paid that amount of money for the house. He just flat out lies. There is a YouTube video that you can see called "Did Hank Hanegraaff lie about his house?" made by another former employee.

Paul. For the listeners, that YouTube channel is Mr. Call Me the Seeker.

Perry. Right. Yeah, that's another former employee.

Paul. On that same channel, there is a video of Hanegraaff blatantly reading straight out of Walter Martin's book "The Kingdom of the Cults" and passing it off as his own answer on the Bible Answer Man show.

Perry. Yeah, he does that and I document that even recently in the last three months. For example, he gets a call on justification and then he just reads off a prepared statement with the appropriate pauses interjected in to make it sound like he's just doing it off the top of his head but he's just cribbing from this. So he really doesn't understand the theology.

But the point about his lying about the house to callers in the past is that you can't take him at his word. Even though he sounds really sincere, how would you ever know if he's telling the truth or not? You know he's demonstrated he lies. You know he misrepresents himself and uses the works of others without attribution. And really the most troubling thing in my mind is there are instances where Hank is essentially selling doctrinal

approval for the ability to have speaking opportunities or the exchange of funds. He's selling doctrinal indulgences, for lack of a better term.

Paul. Right. That's the term that you used with me in our phone conversation and I thought it was wonderfully evocative. Let's elaborate a little bit more on that. Explain what an indulgence is and how it applies to Hank Hanegraaff.

Perry. Well, the crass popular Medieval understanding in Catholicism was that for those people who were going to end up in heaven and had to go through purgatory, they could, one of the kinds of acts of charity that they could do to lessen the time in purgatory was by making a monetary donation, and this, of course, through John Tetzel, scandalized Luther and gave the impression that somebody could buy forgiveness and so that set off the Reformation debates that you and I'm sure many of your listeners know.

So Hank is selling approval and I witnessed this in a debacle with a group in Southern California at the time called Set Free, but there are many other groups that I strongly suspect or have good reason to think that this was actually done.

Paul. Alright, let's back up just a moment, Perry. Who are Set Free?

Perry. Set Free is or was a group in the early '90s that was affiliated with TBN. They were a biker church, for lack of a better term, and what had happened is a number of complaints had been made about abuses there, abuses of power, potential selling of drugs within the church and things like this. I don't know if any of those things were true but these were the complaints that were conveyed to Oden Fong at Calvary Chapel Costa Mesa. These complaints eventually became so serious that Fong handed over everything to CRI. CRI then issued a statement saying that they could not recommend Set Free as a church because of all of these problems, that there was sufficient evidence there to warrant that there were significant problems in the leadership.

So what happened in my case was every once in a while we would get a letter and a donation from somebody who really didn't understand our ministry, so you'd have some Mormon lady listening in Utah, listening to our show critiquing Jehovah's Witnesses which she thought was just hot-diggity, right? So she would send in \$20 and then she'd say, "I'm Mormon and I love your ministry." So what we would do is put the money in a pending account and send her a letter saying, "Well, it's really not right for us to take your money. If you still want to give it to us, that's fine, but this is who we are. We also critique the Mormon church," for example.

So I started getting letters from Set Free, people in Set Free saying Set Free loves CRI and things like this, and I went to my boss across the hallway who was Cindy D. and I said, "Cindy, should I just put this in," whatever the four digit account was, like 4080 or whatever the account was, "and send them the standard blurb?" And she says, "No, just put it in the general donation fund and route the letter to research," which was not what we were supposed to do. But she was my boss and I said, "But, yeah, we should do this," and she said, "Just route it to research, Perry." Okay. And then another one came through and another one and another one. That was the first day. The second day, we started getting all these pink envelopes with Set Free printed on them, dozens of them, and that was the same thing, "Route them to research. Put the funds in the general donation, route it to research."

Now, one of the other job responsibilities that I had was tracking the mail. So the mail was batched into groups and we would keep mail by date and batch number up to 2 years back. We had a catalog system in the back warehouse. This was in case there was a mistake in an order so we could go back and say, "Ah, we missed this." Or, "No, you didn't actually order this." So it was just to cover our behind, so to speak, which is good business practice. None of those letters ended up back there in the batches with the other mail for that day which is where they should have gone.

Now, the third day we got boxes, post office boxes full of these letters, so we're talking 3 or 4 of these boxes filled with letters of donations from Set Free in these bright pink envelopes. They all went up to Hank's office and I never saw them again. Now, that by itself seems bad but I was walking down the hall and I ran into Jane H. and that name, of course, means nothing to any of your listeners but Jane was one of the vice presidents at CRI and I asked Jane, I said, "Jane, ah, what's going on with all the Set Free stuff? Keep getting all these letters and I'm sending them to research but it's kind of weird." So I'm playing dumb and Jane obliges me and says, "Well, what happened is Hank was on the phone with Phil Aguilar trying to work out a deal where he could do his 'Personal Witness Training' at Set Free, and what happened," she said, "is Aguilar taped the phone conversation without Hanegraaff knowing it," which I believe at the time in California was not illegal to do. And then she said that Aguilar leveraged that recording against Hanegraaff that he better go through with the deal or Aguilar will just let the tape come out to the public. So we were stuck taking all those donations. We couldn't get out of it as an organization without humiliating Hank.

Paul. So what we have is we have a doctrinally dubious organization that, for lack of a better word, is able to blackmail or strong-arm Hanegraaff into giving them cover, giving them legitimacy through the name of CRI.

Perry. Yeah, and the doctrinal statement that CRI had done on Set Free was yanked within a few days. So there were other books that I noticed that we yanked and I don't know if you want to get into this here or later on.

Paul. Let it fly.

Perry. But this was not the only case. So for example, there was another book by a guy named Gomes out of Biola at Talbot School of Theology, a professor of Theology there called "Lead Us Not Into Deception." The book had an endorsement from Bob and Gretchen Passantino. It had a front page endorsement from Walter Martin, I believe, himself. It had been sold from CRI. It was an expose of Youth with a Mission's finite God teaching. So this is like open theism before open theism existed and so CRI had been selling this expose but all of a sudden we stopped selling it. So this is about 1991 and this is, of course, before the days of caller ID so you could crank call anybody you wanted as a kid and get away with it because nobody knew where you were calling from, right?

So when I got home, I called up Alan D. and I said, "Dr. D., you don't know who I am but I work at CRI and I can't tell you who I am but I want to know is Y still teaching the finite God doctrine?" And he said, "Yes." I said, "Has anything changed substantially with Youth with a Mission? Have they sat down to talk with you? Have they negotiated their position?" He said, "No." I said, "Do you know why they pulled the book?" And he says, "No."

And this was done in a number of other cases where things, materials would be pulled which is why I am so very suspicious that the deal, the change in position of CRI on Witness Lee and the Local Church reeks to high heaven.

Paul. And that's far more recent, too.

Perry. Yeah, that's very recent. On top of that with Witness Lee and the Local Church, one of the CRI board members self-confessedly has said that he's been going to the Local Church for multiple years. Well, how can you be an impartial judge of a group when one of your board members is a de facto member of the church that you're evaluating? I mean, that's a direct conflict of interest.

Paul. Well, I hate to sound like a cliché but where there is smoke, there is fire and I don't have hard evidence for this at all, Perry, but there is anecdotal evidence all over the internet from people who belong to the Worldwide Church of God and belonged to it in the '90s when CRI decided to remove its cult label. You know, the people who were actually

on the ground in the Worldwide Church of God said, "No, the theology hasn't changed at all." Joseph Tkach is either pulling the wool over Hanegraaff's eyes or something more nefarious is going on.

Perry. Yeah, I mean, I don't know about that case. I do know about Set Free and I do know about some of these other cases and I do know I was not alone in this. And really what people have to understand is we were all loyal to CRI. We all sacrificed financially and career wise to work there because we believed in its mission. We didn't go there to try and find problems. We didn't complain because we were fired. We were whistleblowers within the organization. So these kinds of problems are brought to light by people from every level of the organization, from the shipping department all the way up to board members, to members of the Martin family. Darlene Martin served on the board for a number of years before Hank booted her off the board. And we all have the same kind of story and the only thing that's constant is Hanegraaff.

Paul. The couplet that Johann Tetzl used to like to sing was, "When the Groschen in the coffer rings, the soul from purgatory springs." I guess we can say in this case, "the cult from cult status springs."

Perry. Yeah, it's something definitely like that I think has been going on and that's really why it's the most serious problem because CRI was set up to expose and to inform the public of what was actually inside the can of whatever it is that they were buying.

Larry. There is a big parallel between money man Hanegraaff and many of the other phony but filthy rich tv preachers out there in the world, namely lots of money, big salaries, fancy cars, expensive houses, and other amenities.

Let's see how gullible Hanegraaff is when he is interviewing Robert Morey about Morey's book "The Islamic Invasion" on the Bible Answer Man broadcast. As we begin, let's just take a few quotes from these 2 apologists for the 21st century, Hank Hanegraaff and Bob Morey.

As the viewers can see, quote, "I, myself, am a plain old layman. He," Walter Martin, "asked me to become president of the Christian Research Institute." That's Hanegraaff from the Bible Answer Man radio show on November 15, 1993.

Now a quote from Morey here, quote, "I'm a professional apologist as opposed to a lay-apologist." Morey from "In defense of the faith," March 19, 1994.

Once again, Morey says, quote, "Folks, I love Walter Martin. He is a man that God used. God uses crooked sticks to draw a straight line." That's from Morey in his "Truth Seekers" radio show January 15, 1994.

Quote, "Ask the critical questions: where is your documentation? A lot of times what happens with these conspiracy theories is that we find out that there is a story told by someone who is supposedly reliable. You find out when you check it out, that it's a rumor, sensationalistic." That's from Hanegraaff's Bible Answer Man show of November 15, 1993.

And looking at some other quotes here mainly from Robert Morey, he says, quote, "If there is one problem to which we must trace back the present stupidity, absurdity and craziness, is the fact of gullibility which I call gulpibility. Christians are gulping down all this stuff. They never stop to test it, they just gulp it down like dogs. End result, they are believing the most absurd, crazy, insane things." That's from Morey as a guest on the Bible Answer Man from January 7, 1992.

Quote, "When someone says one thing and does another, you don't say, 'Well, we just have to be uncritical and just gulp everything down.' No, you say that guy is a liar. He says he's a Christian, that guy is a liar." That came from Morey on the Bible Answer Man radio broadcast of January 28, 1992.

Quote, "Well, they are," talking about Christians, "being gullible. If they're not asking who is this woman, what is her organization, what is her evidence, they're just gullible. People who like conspiracy theories, you know. It's this kind of stupidity. It's stupidity, brother. It's stupid and it's this kind of stupidity that just embarrasses me, embarrasses the Lord, that these people in the name of Christ would say such insane things. They never give you the address, they don't give you exact dates. Well, did you hear and people just grab it and they run. They love to believe that conspiracy." That's coming from Bob Morey, "Truth Seekers" radio, February 19, 1994.

Now with all that said, let's find out how gullible and stupid Morey and Hanegraaff think their radio listeners really are.

Audio.

Host. Welcome to "Tales of the Strange and Weird." We're going to take an analysis of Truth Seeker Bob audio cassettes and listen to some choice excerpts. Since many things Truth Seeker Bob says are confused and inaccurate, does this relate to his written research? The answer is yes. What you're about to hear is from the Bible Answer Man broadcast put out by the Christian Research Institute dated August 6, 1991, catalog number J1, and also J3. You'll hear two separate broadcasts given during 1991.

Audio.

Robert Morey. And you need stuff that's readable. This is why I put together this book on Islam. It took me 5 years. It's not a 6 month's wonder. I had to read, the type of research I do, every English title on Islam in the Library of Congress.

Host . Now J3.

Audio.

Robert Morey. This is the reason I wrote my new book, "Islam Unveiled." It took me 5 years. I studied every book on the subject in English in the Library of Congress, then with the Georgetown University, Temple University, New York City University.

Host. The listener should be informed here that "Islam Unveiled" was the name of Morey's "Islamic Invasion" before Harvest House took over the contract for it and changed the name of Morey's book from "Islam Unveiled" to "Islamic Invasion." So he's basically saying "Islamic Invasion" took 5 years of, quote, "research." Morey's reference to having read every English title in the Library of Congress, it's interesting that if you look at the March/April, 1992 Christian Research newsletter where they interview Truth Seeker Bob, Truth Seeker Bob in this printed interview says that he had read every book in the Library of Congress on Islam. He doesn't mention English titles here, and there are other references to this as well, but we won't go into it at this moment, but if the listener were to call the Library of Congress, the phone number is (202) 707-5000, and the Library of Congress Reference number is (202) 707-5522, they can inquire of an information specialist or a reference worker about the numbers of titles on Islam in the Library of Congress. In fact, the total number of titles is 7,212 as of the date of this recording, and the English titles as revealed by a Library of Congress information specialist at the time of this recording using an incomplete computer search of English titles, was 1,951 titles for the post 1968 books on Islam. Now there would be more titles before 1968 but as stated by the information specialist, these titles aren't available. So the number of English titles is actually greater than 1,951.

Let's now continue listening to the Bible Answer Man where Truth Seeker Bob is the guest of Hank Hanegraaff, president of Christian Research Institute. This show is from April 27, 1992, ref catalog J20, and here with Morey sitting right next to him, Hanegraaff gives a tremendous plug for Morey's "Islamic Invasion" book and suddenly the number of years of research that have gone into Morey's Islam book goes from 5 years to 10 years.

Audio.

Hank Hanegraaff. In the studio you've been listening to Dr. Robert Morey. His book, "The Islamic Invasion," is available to you as radio offer #222. It's a suggested donation of \$15 or more. Again, "The Islamic Invasion" by Dr. Robert A. Morey. Ten years of research have gone into this book including Morey reading every single book in the Library of Congress on the subject of Islam, and after you read it, you'll not only understand Islam and it's 800

million followers, you're going to understand how to reach them and how to refute this false religion.

Host. Here now, again, another Bible Answer Man broadcast with Morey sitting right next to Hank Hanegraaff, this one coming from April 28, 1992.

Hank Hanegraaff. "Islamic Invasion" by Robert A. Morey, 10 years of research have gone into the book including reading every book in the Library of Congress on the subject of Islam. And I'll tell you, folks, that's no small feat. You are able to live off the sweat of a scholar who has cloistered himself in the Library of Congress, studied to show himself approved, taken the nuggets, distilled them in such a way that you can understand it, internalize it, and thus apply it. In other words, touch the lives of other people. After reading this book, you're not only going to understand Islam and its 800 million followers, you're going to be able to understand how to reach them. That's the bottom line: how to reach them and how to refute the false religion. Folks, it's time to equip yourself. If not now, when? We are at a time where we have stuck our heads in the sand as Christians. We have not equipped ourselves.

Host. Once again, we hear about the 10 years of research and the sweat of a scholar reading all these books in the Library of Congress.

Audio.

Speaker. You seem to go against the grain from what I've heard.

Robert Morey. Yeah, I'll make it very very simple. When I was a student at Westminster, you must understand that God gifted me to be a profound reader. I mean, I'm talking 20 books an hour, 25 books an hour, where I literally would go and find such things.

Larry. Robert Morey who has claimed in his ministry mailings the he held a degree from Faith Theological Seminary, Gujranwala, Pakistan, has had this supposed degree revoked by the same institute. The certificate of cancellation is seen here and the school can be contacted for more information.

Audio.

Host. Well, when it comes to doing research, how does Truth Seeker Bob evaluate a book? Let's find out.

Audio.

Speaker. As with any cultic mentality, they claim everybody and his uncle. In regards to ??, he tried to sue me. I called his book "Argumentum Ad Ignorantiam" because he claimed that no one had

ever dealt with the issue and I looked in his bibliography, he had never read Walter Martin. He had never read Henry B. He had never read Loraine Boettner. He never read anybody. Well, he did no research, hence his argument is based on sheer unmitigated ignorance.

Host. Using Truth Seeker Bob's own standards for judging the quality of research for a book, how does Morey's book on Islam stack up? How many books on Islam has Truth Seeker Bob read according to his own bibliography? His bibliography lists 130 titles. Many of these include standard references such as the Encyclopedia Britannica and tracts from the American Tract Society.

Audio.

Speaker. Well, he did not research, hence his argument is based on sheer unmitigated ignorant.

Host. Is this what Truth Seeker Bob would say about his own book based on his own standards of judging research? The Library of Congress lists over 7,000 books on the subject of Islam and almost 2,000 titles, if not more, of English titles on Islam in the Library of Congress, yet Morey's own bibliography lists only 130 titles.

Audio.

Speaker. He never read anybody. Well, he did no research.

Host. Based on Truth Seeker Bob's small bibliography by comparison to all the books available on Islam, how many books and writings does T. S. Bob list in his bibliography that are written from a pro-Islam point of view, i.e. books by Muslim scholars and apologists? If he lists any at all, do these represent the sum total of all Muslim scholarship available? Is it possible that T. S. Bob had, quote, "never read" certain Muslim writers and, quote, "hence his argument is based on sheer unmitigated ignorant"?

Audio.

Speaker. About 30 years in grace, and I have about 30 books and I do a book a year for every year of grace when I was born again. I think that's important.

Speaker. When it comes to the Mormons, I have the book, "How to Answer Mormons." Jehovah's Witnesses, you brought it up. I wrote a book "How to Answer Jehovah's Witness." No, I haven't written 30 books, been involved in the apologetics for 30 years.

Larry. The listener just heard Truth Seeker Bob on his Truth Seekers radio shows, 2 excerpts in fact, one from November 13, 1993 and the other one from April 30, 1994. In

both cases, Truth Seeker Bob claims having written 30 books, however, at the time of these recordings, his research and education foundation comprehensive catalog listed only 17 titles. The question, then, needs to be asked: do small pamphlet sized booklets count as "books"? What about unedited manuscripts that no one wants to print or publish? What constitutes a book? Of course we know Truth Seeker Bob would never exaggerate or sensationalize something.

Audio.

Hank Hanegraaff. Dr. Morey, weren't you attacked or almost attacked by a Muslim mob at one time while giving a lecture?

Robert Morey. I was speaking at a major university, an academic lecture, and about 400 Arab Muslims stormed the platform. I had two bodyguards and I had to be rustled out a side entrance. Thankfully no one was hurt. Emotions were high and they chanted in Arabic, they got upset and what frightened me, they accused me of being an Israeli, not an American, and that I was a member of the Mossad, that is, the CIA of the Israeli nation, which means there would be open hunting season on old Morey here. And let me in case anyone is listening, Hank, be assured I'm not an Israeli and I'm not a member of the Mossad.

Larry. These sensationalistic statements by Truth Seeker Bob were spoken on the Bible Answer Man broadcast of April 28, 1992 with Hank Hanegraaff.

Notice these two pictures. One is just a little closer up shot of the other. This is the scene on October 3, 1991 at Jester Center Auditorium at the University of Texas campus immediately following Morey's Islam lecture. Notice three groups of students down on the floor discussing with each other. Notice now the number up on the platform where Morey is. Are there 400 Arab Muslims storming the platform? Unfortunately, the photo is not clear but still the viewer can discern a certain number.

Now let's look at the second picture at the bottom. A closer view of the "400 Arab Muslims" who "stormed the platform." Here we see Morey surrounded by these hostile Arabs. How many can be counted here? This photo was taken moments after the above photo. In fact, many in this scene are not Arabs at all and many are actually Christians, i.e. the two white men to the right behind Morey, the tall one is Christian apologist David Krill. Does this look like a violent situation?

Now let's hear a few more quotes from Truth Seeker Bob.

Audio.

Robert Morey. There are people like that who if they really were honest and they really wanted to know the truth, they would be willing to look at this.

And there are a lot of liars out there and Jesus said, "Be not deceived, there are lots of false prophets. They will come to you in sheep's clothing." And there are a lot of people who write a lot of books who lie about a lot of things.

I'm just saying that I don't care if they are so-called Christian writers or not Christian writers, try to check it out.

Speaker. That is, men who fear God, therefore they will be trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain.

Robert Morey. I didn't have any previous training but if the sucker can be taken once, he can be taken several times.

Speaker. You seem to go against the grain from what I've heard.

Robert Morey. Yeah, I'll make it very very simple. When I was a student at Westminster, you must understand that God gifted me to be a profound reader. I mean, I'm talking 20 books an hour, 25 books an hour, where I literally would go and find such things.

Speaker. A few weeks ago you were mobbed in Texas and can you tell us a little bit about that?

Robert Morey. Well, there I was speaking at University of Texas Austin on why I'm not a Muslim and I was invited to give the lecture. It's an academic setting. This is the largest university in the United States. I think they have 75,000 students and it's a very wealthy school with the Texas oil money and what-not, the Texas Longhorns, for those who are football fans. And the way it worked out, almost 400 Muslims showed up and these were Arab Muslim, not so much black Muslims, the Farrakhan kind, and to put it long and short, I gave my lecture and then instead of giving me questions, they rioted.

Larry. This is from yet another radio show entitled "Perspective" on WGSF 91 FM with Kevin Johnson of Mount Carmel Outreach and, of course, here Truth Seeker Bob makes his claim about 400 Muslims and a riot taking place, and even makes some statements about the University of Texas having 75,000 students and so forth. All of these things, the 400 Muslim students, the riot and the 75,000 students at the University of Texas are false and, once again, the listener is invited to get the research paper "Islam Bob" and they will see pictures immediately following the lecture that Morey gave and they will find out that Truth Seeker Bob is, indeed, making up tales to sensationalize his lecture.

Audio.

Robert Morey. Well, what I'm simply saying is that Christian scholars above and beyond anyone else should be, they should be utterly dedicated to telling the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help them God.

Host. Not hype for the sake of hype.

Morey. Not sensationalism, not myths, not legends, not statements that cannot be documented, wild statements. For example, you're not doing Christianity a favor by spreading rumors that have no basis in reality. I'm simply trying to say, look, let's demythologize the situation, let us take away the myths, the legends, the frauds, let's get down to reality and let's just stop pretending. You've got to understand, these people are simply lying. It's hype and they're simply trying to sell books.

Larry. The previous was Truth Seeker Bob speaking on the Bible Answer Man radio show of August 8, 1991 where he explains why people sensationalize, lie and hype certain things.

Bob Morey often makes exaggerated or sensationalistic claims to embellish his own work. In the case of his Islamic book, the book entitled "Islamic Invasion," he claimed that he read every book in the Library of Congress on the subject of Islam. Now, I, Larry Wessels, decided to investigate that claim by calling the Library of Congress and asking them about this.

Audio.

Speaker. Another (unintelligible) Jewish Arab Relations, Economic Development (unintelligible). Some of them may not, so some of them may be the main primary section (unintelligible) So it's still about Islam. Okay, I see 5,569 books published since 1968 on the subject of Islam.

Larry Wessels. You can't say a specific number because (unintelligible) been describing to me. So if someone were to say he's read every single title in English on the topic of Islam, how would he possibly be able to do that if he were going there? Is that possible to do if you were actually there in physical person? I mean, that seems like it would take an awfully long time because of the complexity you've just described.

Speaker. Right. I would say that that would be very highly unlikely (unintelligible)

Larry. You mentioned at the beginning of the conversation that (unintelligible), that's not a number you just picked out of the air.

Speaker. No.

Larry. That was not?

Speaker. No.

Larry. From your computer records, you were saying that there is like 7,000 titles.

Speaker. Right. What I did is I just searched Islam and I got 5,969 with the subject of Islam post 1968, 1,643 pre-1968.

Larry. Oh, and all these are listed in the Library of Congress, but as she described, the complexity levels (unintelligible), economics or whatever.

Speaker. Right.

Larry. Okay. I'm starting to see the situation here.

Larry. It should also be noticed in reference to the Library of Congress that a person can only check out one book at a time according to the rules of the Library of Congress, therefore, when Morey claims that he can read 20-25 books an hour, it would be impossible to fulfill this scenario of his in light of the rules of the Library of Congress to where you can only check out one book at a time.

Now let's see what Robert Morey really thinks of Hank Hanegraaff.

Audio.

Caller. I heard you say you were a good friend of Walter Martin.

Robert Morey. For 27 years.

Caller. I just wondered if you would comment on what do you think the direction of his organization is now. I'll just hang up and let you comment on it.

Morey. Well, thank you very much. Well, since I'm not a member of CRI, I really can't tell you the direction. The head of it in his own background didn't get beyond high school so we're not dealing with somebody who knows Greek or Hebrew or theology or philosophy, no academic credentials, but he's just released a book attacking primarily Benny Hinn and some of the blab-it, grab-it preachers.

Speaker. There was a discussion between Benny Hinn and Hank Hanegraaff as a result of that. You're talking about Hank Hanegraaff.

Morey. Yes.

Larry. That clip came from the Central Florida Forum Radio program hosted by Rev. George Crosley, circa 1993. And the next clip you're going to hear is from In Defense of the Faith, another radio program dated March 19, 1994.

Audio.

Robert Morey. Well, it's just simply, I mean, you're dealing with people like Hank Hanegraaff, just a high school diploma, no philosophy, no theology, no Greek, no Hebrew. He doesn't know any better so he thinks that to deny the foreknowledge of God is perfectly within evangelical and Christian theology. It's simply abysmal ignorance and you just have to simply pity such a man for making such statements.

Larry. This leads us to the question: what does Hank Hanegraaff and his CRI staff think of Truth Seeker Bob and his scholarship. The following clip is from the Bible Answer Man program from February 18, 1993.

Audio.

Caller. As a theologian, a well-respected theologian that you guys also like also, that said that he made an inclusive investigative special report that reveals the heretical nature of Boyd's theology, I don't know what that means. I sent for that.

Hank Hanegraaff. Well, anybody that would say that is probably not someone that we would recommend.

Caller. Well, you'd be surprised, brother. Do you want me to mention his name on the air?

Hanegraaff. I don't really care. It doesn't make any difference to me, but I'm just saying that someone that does that has to be someone that is not able to rightly divide what is being written in this book, "Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity." We've had it gone over not only internally by our research staff, but also many other outside theologians who are at the very top of their field, orthodox biblical Christians, and they don't find any problems with it. There is one man, someone that we would not recommend at all, who did something which you should never do even if you're dealing with occultists and that is you should never take them out of context. This particular individual took Gregory Boyd out of context over 22 times and had him say the exact opposite, in some cases, of what he actually said. This is not the kind of scholarship that we would recommend in any way.

Speaker. It's not scholarship. This was a terrible situation of really taking things and putting them in a different context in which they did not belong. Robert Bowman is a real scholar when it comes to the area of Jehovah's Witnesses, when it comes to the area of Oneness

Pentecostalism. He's gone over this book and given it not only a clean bill of health but says that it is an excellent book. Bob and Gretchen Passantino have worked in the area of cults for over 20 years, they give it a thumbs up. This book is a very fine tool and the person who has ridiculed it, in my opinion, has clearly shown himself not to be a scholar in these areas.

Caller. The gentleman that I have as a thing here and he's a well-respected theologian. He's very very, I mean, I'm sure, you know...

Speaker. Well, I don't know how you know he's a well-respected theologian but...

Caller. Okay, well, maybe I shouldn't read it but maybe I should read it on the air. Okay, so I don't know who wrote this thing here but the newsletter is "The Researcher" and it says here, it says "In an exclusive investigative special report, Dr. Robert Morey reveals the heretical nature of (unintelligible)." I don't know if Dr. Robert Morey wrote this or someone else from the staff wrote this.

Hank Hanegraaff. Well, we will hope and pray that he did not pen those words himself because it is one of the, as Robert Bowman has articulated, one of the worst pieces of scholarship that we have seen. In fact, I think, Ken, you made the statement that you have been in countercult ministry for many many years, you've taught comparative religions on a college level, university level, and you've never seen anything that was as shoddy from a scholarship point of view. So it's probably the worst thing we've ever seen.

Ken. I was literally shocked when I saw how this individual misrepresented another Christian's work. It was literally shocking. And, again, Greg Boyd, you know, Greg Boyd has come a long way. He used to be a member of the United Pentecostal church. He is a person that attended Princeton Seminary and now he has become a fine Christian man, a man who has a great love for the Gospel.

Hank Hanegraaff. And Even if he was a heretic, that's one thing but don't take him out of context. That's dishonest and not very scholarly. That's about all we'll say about it. We don't want to dignify it with any more air time.

Larry. Obviously, Hank Hanegraaff and his CRI staff do not think much of Truth Seeker Bob and his scholarship.

It is interesting to see Hanegraaff blasting Morey for exposing Hanegraaff's endorsement of Gregory Boyd who is an advocate of Open Theism which is a blatant heresy. For more

on Open Theism, see our video, "Unpopular Bible Doctrines 15: The immutability of God," that's unchangeableness, "versus Open Theism heresies" on YouTube.

Question: what is Open Theism? Gregory Boyd, author of the Hank Hanegraaff endorsed book "Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity" published in 1992. Boyd also published another book called "Trinity in Process" that same year. He is an Open Theist. Boyd was a professor of theology at Bethel University for 16 years before he resigned after there was a dispute between himself and some of the professors there over his Open Theism advocacy. Greg Boyd now teaches at Bethel University on an adjunct basis. Boyd is also known as one of the leading supporters of Open Theism which he explores in the book "God of the Possible" published in 2000. In essence, Open Theism is the view that the future is partly open and therefore known to God partly as a realm of possibilities.

Boyd was raised a Roman Catholic, later became an atheist, then converted to Oneness Pentecostalism and then evolved into an Open Theist. Jesus said, "You will know them by their fruits," Matthew 7:16.

Answer: Open Theism, also known as Openness Theology, the Openness of God, and Free Will Theism, is an attempt to explain the foreknowledge of God in relationship to the free will of man, thus attempting to give fallen simple man a way to overcome the sovereignty of God in determining the future. The argument of Open Theism is essentially this: human beings are truly free. If God absolutely knew the future, human beings could not truly be free, therefore, God does not know absolutely everything about the future.

Open Theism holds that the future is not knowable, therefore, God knows everything that can be known but he does not know the future. The Wikipedia entry for Open Theism states, quote, "While this argument has historically been used by some Open Theists, currently most Open Theists affirm that God knows the future perfectly, but simply deny God believes the future is fixed." Open Theism bases these beliefs on Scripture passages which describe God changing his mind or being surprised or seeming to gain knowledge. That's found in Genesis 6:6, Genesis 22:12, Exodus 32:14, Jonah 3:10.

In light of the many other Scriptures that declare God's knowledge of the future, these Scriptures should be understood as God describing himself in ways that we can understand. God knows what our actions and decisions will be but he changes his mind in regard to his actions based on our actions. God's disappointment at the wickedness of humanity does not mean he was not aware it would occur. In contradiction to Open Theism, Psalm 139:4 and verse 16 state, "Before a word is on my tongue, you know it completely. O Lord, all the days ordained for me were written in your book before one of them came to be." Isaiah 46:11 says, "Calling a bird of prey from the east, the man of my purpose from a far country. Truly I have spoken, truly I will bring it to pass. I have planned it, surely I will do it."

There are many verses such as these throughout the Bible. How could God predict intricate details in the Old Testament about people, places and events if he does not know

the future? How could God in any manner guarantee our eternal salvation if he does not know what the future holds? How could the hundreds of Old Testament Bible prophecies concerning the coming of the Messiah not come to pass without God controlling the future? See our videos, "Supernatural Bible prophecy concerning Jesus the Jewish Messiah, Part 1 and Part 2," for more on this.

Video.

Larry Wessels. I'm sitting at a table here before we get into all these prophecies because this stuff really bears out scientifically when it comes to probability ratios. Okay, after examining 8 different prophecies, they conservatively estimated that the chance of one man fulfilling all 8 prophecies was 1 in 10 to the 17th power. To illustrate how large the number 10 to the 17th is, a figure with 17 zeroes after it, Stoner gave this illustration. Imagine covering the entire state of Texas with silver dollars to a level of 2 feet deep. The total number of silver dollars needed to cover the whole state. It would be 10 to the 17th power. Now choose just one of those silver dollars, mark it and drop it from an airplane. Then thoroughly stir all the silver dollars all over the state. When that has been done, blindfold one man, tell him he can travel wherever he wishes in the state of Texas but some time he must stop, reach down into the 2 feet of silver dollars and try to pull up that one specific silver dollar that has been marked. Now the chance of his finding that one silver dollar in the state of Texas will be the chance the prophets had for 8 of their prophecies coming true in any one man in the future. In financial terms, is there anyone who would not invest in a financial venture if the chance of failure were 1 in 10 to the 17th power? This is the kind of sure investment we are offered by God for belief in his Messiah.

Larry. Ultimately, Open Theism fails in that it attempts to explain the unexplainable through relationship between God's foreknowledge of man's free will. Open Theism fails in that it rejects God's true omniscience and sovereignty. God must be understood through faith for "without faith it is impossible to please God," Hebrews 11:6a. Open Theism is, therefore, not scriptural. It is simply another way for finite man to try to understand an infinite God. Open Theism should be rejected by followers of Christ. While Open Theism is an explanation for the relationship between God's foreknowledge and human free will, it is not the biblical explanation at all. Recommended resource: "No Other God: A Response to Open Theism" by John Frank.

The Waleed Nassar critique of Morey's book "The Islamic Invasion." The following is the cover letter that accompanied Waleed Nassar's critique of Robert Morey's "Islamic Invasion."

Waleed Nassar, M. Div.
International Evangelist and Teacher
P. O. Box 13864
Tampa, Florida 33681-3864

USA

May 6, 1997

Reverend Larry Wessels
P. O. Box 144441
Austin, TX 78714

Dear Larry,

Thanks for sending me the TS Bob update reports.

I have made a copy of my appendix from my book of my critique of Robert Morey's book on Islam which I found very sensationalized, distasteful, and most unscholarly. You have my permission to use excerpts and quotations from it if you need to do that, but please know that my book has copyright and this is a part of it as an appendix. The book is not yet available in the US and we are about to have the first printing of it made soon. It was published in Nigeria earlier but not the US as I use it for a manual to train nationals on how to reach Muslims as part of my vision to raise up an army of 10,000 nationals equipped to reach the Muslim masses of their nations through my MATS [that's Muslim Awareness and Training Seminar]. So far we have trained 200 in Australia, 900 in Nigeria, and coming up in August, over 4,000 in Kenya, then 500 in India in November. Praise the Lord! I am more interested in reaching the Muslims than in unveiling and exposing Islam.

I am enclosing two reports of our ministry to better acquaint you with it. If you do know of any missions minded US churches with a real interest in reaching Muslims worldwide, I would appreciate your recommendation of our ministry to them. To raise up an army of trained and equipped nationals reaching Muslims requires an army of missions minded churches here at home.

By the way, what happened to Robert Morey? Is he still doing the same thing, especially since your revelations of his lack of accuracy and scholarship? Also, I think sending Al Kestra a tape would be beneficial. Al is very careful and scholarly but I guess he was just taken by Morey's advertisements of himself.

Be blessed!
For the Untold Multitudes,
Waleed Nassar

Appendix D
[This coming from Waleed Nassar's book, the appendix is entitled]

Misconceptions, Misrepresentations and Harmful Teachings of Some "Experts"

Waleed Nassar
P. O. Box 13864
Tampa, Florida 33681
copyright 1997

Lots of books have been written recently about Islam by mostly western writers who are acknowledged as experts on Islam. Others are busy conducting radio and television interviews, setting up panels, and even debates about Islam, without stopping to weigh their own knowledge, background, expertise, credentials and preparedness on the subject. Consequently, we have an avalanche of misconceptions, misrepresentations, and harmful teachings being propagated to Christians about Islam under the guise of training for enlightenment and outreach. Most of these "experts" really became experts by consulting a book or two on Islam by other western writers without themselves having a decent knowledge of Islam, its history, beliefs, practices, and above all, its language, Arabic, the language of its own sacred scripture, the Quran.

I recently had the chance to hear one such "expert" on an interview on a local Christian station. I was stunned and shocked by both the content and attitude of what he had to say! I could hardly believe my ears! There he was employing all kinds of misrepresentation of Islam, Muhammad, and the Quran, when all the while he presented himself as one exposing the truth in order to win Muslims and educate Christians. He made false and ignorant accusations, and tried to justify them by misquoting texts from the Quran, quoting others without regard to their context, and bluntly misinterpreting and distorting others still! He did the same to the theology of Islam, its history, and its language of Arabic!

So I got his book and found it to be full of the same errors, if not worse, that I heard him make on the radio. I will proceed to list some of his major misrepresentations first, then I will list some errors of another book by another author, trusting that they will act as models for all misrepresentations, misconceptions, and harmful teachings out there, so that you as Christians worker can know what to avoid. Since this work has to do with what they wrote and not with who they are, I will not mention the names of the authors, but I will mention the titles of the two books. The first is "Islamic Invasion - Confronting The World's Fastest Growing Religion."

We note the following 6 different types of blunders in that work: ignorance of the teachings of Islam.

1. On page 28 of his book, the author claims that [and of course he's talking here about Robert Morey] that "what Mohammad ate and did not eat is made to be a divine law for all people." Although Islam like Judaism prohibits certain foods based on uncleanness, it does not make what Mohammad ate as a divine law for all people. The prohibition has to do with uncleanness and not Mohammad's taste and there is no forcing the foods upon people in Islam. Besides, if that were true, then Muslims everywhere would have to eat dates by law since Mohammad like dates.

2. On the Concept of Jihad.

Larry. Now what I want viewers hearing this to see is the page and the information that Waleed Nassar has provided. For the sake of time, I'm not going to read it all but the viewer at home could freeze frame the picture and read it for themselves in its entirety and then proceed from there. So point 3, The origin of the Kaaba, and you can see the information there. Freeze frame it as necessary. Point 4, The 99 names of God, and we have Waleed's information about that right there.

Number 2: Ignorance of the Quran. On the call of Mohammad, that's point 1 and you have the information provided there. Point 2, On marriage and Mohammad. You have your information provided there. Point 3, On relationship with the New Testament. You have the information provided there.

Now going down to III. Ignorance of Islamic History. Now these are fairly fascinating when it concerns Morey's book so let's look at this in more detail.

Point 1, On Mohammad's grandfather, the author, that's Robert Morey, tries to show that Mohammad was completely ineffective with those who knew him best, namely his family. He mentions that his own grandfather lived and died a pagan and never embraced Islam, page 70. This shows the gross ignorance of Islamic history by the author. When Mohammad's grandfather died, Mohammad was only an 8 year old boy and his preaching of Islam did not begin until he was 40 years old, so when his grandfather died, he could not have become a Muslim because there was no Islam yet.

Point 2, On Islamic names. The author, that's Morey, makes Uhud to be the name of an Islamic army general instead of the name of the slopes below Mount Uhud some 3 miles north of Medina where one of the battles of Islam was fought and later came to be known as the Battle of Uhud. The author says, quote, "The Meccans had finally decided that Mohammad was a serious threat and approached his band with a large army headed by Uhud. That's from Morey's book, page 83. The Muslims were headed by Mohammad Mustafa and the Meccans by Abu ?? but the name of the place they fought at was Uhud. This is enough to show how little this "expert" on Islam really knows.

Now IV, Misconceptions and misrepresentations. On the understanding of Allah, that's point 1. Over and over again the author insists that Allah of Islam is the same as the pagan moon god of the Arabs before Mohammad, pages 47-53, and although the pagan

Arabs worship Allah as the highest god among many gods, it is not exactly fair to say that there was no progress in Mohammad's introduction of Allah as the one and only God who created the heavens and the earth and who revealed himself to the world through the Torah and the Gospels. This was a marked advance over what the pagan Arabs believed. In fact, Mohammad broke all the idols of the Kaaba that the pagan Arabs worshiped. One must give credit where credit is due, yet of course, it was due to the influence of the Jews and Christians of Arabia that Mohammad adopted this monotheism.

Next we see Point 2, On the understanding of the table. You can freeze frame the screen and read the information there. Look at point 3, On Mohammad's marriage to Zaneb. Once again, the information is there. V. Presuppositions, Biases and Disparaging Remarks. 1. Presupposition: Allah and the Arabic bible. And there is plenty of information here about this. As I said, freeze frame the screen to read it all in detail. 2. Anti-Arab bias. Salman Rushdie. You have the information there. 3. Anti-Arab Bias. Arab racism. 4. Disparaging attitude. Religious rituals. And finally we have 5, Disparaging remarks, Mohammad, the child molester, and the information provided there.

This is just some of Waleed Nassar's own research and he does speak Arabic so he has far better understanding of Islam than Morey does.

Now let's take a quick look at a debate that Morey did with a Muslim lawyer in studio and we'll see how well Morey knows and understands Islam against this Muslim lawyer and expert on Islam.

Audio.

Speaker. The following clip is from Morey's debate with Dr. Khalid Al-Mansour which took place in May, 1994. It was a 4 hour televised debate and it was a debate that Truth Seeker Bob didn't want anybody to see or hear, but what you will hear now is just a few clips from it to give you an idea how these conspiracy theories of Morey and some of his other Islamic apologetics work you.

Robert Morey. Here we have the Armenians, a wonderful Christian people, in come the Muslims and one of the greatest holocausts celebrated every April where they slaughtered and enslaved Armenian men, women and children village by village.

Dr. Khalid Al-Mansour. 100 million?

Morey. Oh, was it 40 million? How much was it?

Al-Mansour. 40 million Armenians?

Morey. Altogether when you go through the ages starting from the first century.

AM. They didn't slaughter them in the first century. There weren't Muslims...

Morey. Not the first century.

AM. Get your historic facts correct. Islam did not operate in the first century.

Morey. No. When Islam first came into Arabia. What I'm saying is this...

AM. Wait a minute, what are you saying?

Morey. What I'm saying is this, it's very simple. I can swap you horror story...

AM. You'll never reach 100 million people.

Morey. ...for horror story. The Muslims have killed more than 100 million, my dear friend.

AM. Where? What do you mean?

Morey. Just name me one Muslim country.... Pardon me?

AM. What consequences do you mean?

Morey. Death. Imprisonment. What's going on in Egypt right now, Pakistan. Two men just were murdered...

AM. Alright, you want me to name you some names?

Morey. Name me an Islamic country that does not have Islamic.... Sure, give it to me.

AM. I'm ready. Malaysia.

Morey. Oh, no way. They have the law.

AM. Let me finish.

Morey. Oh, you picked the wrong one, honey.

AM. Malaysia, Indonesia, Kuwait. There are churches in Kuwait, yes. You don't know there are churches in Kuwait?

Morey. Of course I know, but I've talked to the Christians who are underground because they have been told that if they openly proselytize, they will be put to death. 2,000 Christians have been arrested in Saudi Arabia. Right now in Malaysia, the law has been....

AM. Let's go one at a time. In Kuwait....

Morey. ...passed that no Christian is allowed.

AM. In Kuwait in a hotel, let me just tell you. You haven't been to Kuwait, have you?

Morey. No.

AM. Well, let me tell you about it.

Morey. I talked to the missionaries who have.

AM. Missionaries. I talked to a lot of missionaries but let me talk about myself. I'm in the Sheraton Hotel and I'm listening to Christians try to explain to me, they have a Bible in Arabic.

Morey. That's right.

AM. And they call God Allah and they tried to tell me that it would be to my advantage to convert to Christianity. That's just a fact. And if I were to convert, I could go down to the church and pray if that's what I wanted to do. It's there today. There are churches in Malaysia.

Morey. No.

AM. There are churches in Indonesia. You asked me for 1 and I gave you 3.

Morey. No.

AM. One country, I gave you one and now you want 2.

Morey. And it's not true. You didn't answer it.

AM. I told you my experience in Kuwait.

Morey. No, you can't.

AM. You've never been to Kuwait.

Morey. I'm talking about people who live there, citizens, Kuwaitis.

AM. I'm in the country and here's someone proselytizing me.

Morey. In the Sheraton. That tells you... you're going to tell me about the populace by sitting in the Sheraton?

AM. I'm telling you of a person who was proselytized. You said it couldn't happen.

Morey. Was it a Kuwaiti or Westerner who was trying to witness to you?

AM. They were together.

Morey. No, no, was it a Kuwaiti citizen...

AM. I said they were together. It's a Kuwaiti and a Western Christian.

Morey. In the Sheraton, talking to an American.

AM. In the Sheraton, talking to an American.

Morey. They say it's perfect with no conflicting variant readings. Do you admit that there are variant readings.

AM. I haven't found any conflicting variant readings.

Morey. Well, Arthur Jeffrey in his book gives 90 variant reading.

AM. Just give me one.

Morey. What do you mean, give you one?

AM. Give me one. One conflict, you, give me one.

Morey. Oh, well, if you read this particular translation by Yosef, he has numerous footnotes that...

AM. Give me one. Give me one, not numerous. One. Your best one.

Morey. The best on is in Surah 2. There are 90 conflicting....

AM. Give me one of them.

Morey. I do not have Arthur Jeffrey's book here.

AM. You can't give one. But because of distortions like you are describing now...

Morey. I'm reading from chapter 9 and verse 5, "Fight and slay the pagans wherever you find them. Seize them. Beleaguer them. Lie in wait for them." Here is Surah 5:33...

AM. But read the entire Surah and you will find out...

Morey. "Their punishment is execution, crucifixion..."

AM. It is saying after, after they attack. Read the entire Surah.

Morey. No. No.

AM. I beg your pardon.

Larry. Morey's book "Islamic Invasion," he makes a big deal about the moon god, Allah, and the pre-Islamic origins of Islam. Listen to this following quote by Morey.

Audio

Robert Morey. The original meaning of something does not necessarily indicate it's meaning today such as the word Easter today in 1994 to me means a celebration of Christ's resurrection from the dead. So it doesn't matter that before the Christ era that there were those who worshiped the festival of spring and what-not. It has nothing to do with it. The meaning of it now like with Christmas is around Christ, so I think it's important that we always must remember the contemporary meaning of terms is the context of understanding.

Audio.

Speaker. You seem to go against the grain from what I've heard.

Robert Morey. Yeah, I'll make it very very simple. When I was a student at Westminster, you must understand that God gifted me to be a profound reader. I mean, I'm talking 20 books an hour, 25 books an hour, where I literally would go and find such things.

Larry. This is just my own humble opinion but I think Morey should have said comic in his statement. In other words, he should have said he can read 25 comic books an hour.

As we have heard in the Perry Robinson testimony, Hanegraaff covered for numerous heretical groups just because it was financially beneficial to his so-called ministry. I, myself, remember when Hanegraaff was covering for former members of Herbert W. Armstrong's Worldwide Church of God as no longer being a cult when, in fact, they still were despite changing a few doctrines.

Hanegraaff also went against Walter Martin's stand against the Witness Lee and the Local Church cultism. Listen to Water Martin, himself, speak about this group at the link indicated here.

Audio.

Walter Martin. Did you see the Local Church ad in yesterday's paper? Yup, I did and I've already stated my opinion on it and I'm not going to get into it again. My opinion is I'm varied. We ought to pray for the Local Church. We ought to pray for Witness Lee and for the people that surround him. We ought to love them for Christ's sake and avoid their teachings like the plague that it is and we should not permit ourselves to get involved in argumentation with them. They are looking for arguments. They are dying to have me take out a half-page ad to answer their harebrained theology and I have no intention of doing it. Just keep one thought in your mind: every source they quote which allegedly disproves what we believe is quoted from people who disagree with them. All they've done is taken them out of context and made it look as if that's the truth. It isn't. The time will come when the truth will be known. In the meantime, Christians should just pray for them and avoid them. Witness Lee's cult will have to be judged by the Holy Spirit. I have done my job and my responsibility is finished. I have a cassette on it, some tracts on it, I've answered questions on it. Enough. Now let the Spirit of God deal with it.

Larry. Here's my own position paper against Witness Lee's Local Church and many of my points come from Walter's points. I have debated Witness Lee cult members on a campus and various locations and even in their own sanctuary here in Austin in the past and nothing has changed. By God's grace only, I was able to lead a few of Witness Lee's followers back to the God of the Scriptures. Freeze the screen on each page of my Witness Lee paper if you'd like to read what it says in detail.

Okay, as the viewers at home can see, this is a copy of my paper called "Witness Lee's Local Church versus the Sure Word," that's the sure word of God. I've got a quote there from Witness Lee right underneath it that says, "To be a Christian simply means to be mingled with God, to be a God-man." From Witness Lee. And of course, my paper here shows a brief history of where the Local Church came from. As we look on the next page, I go into the doctrines of the Local Church and one of the major areas where Witness Lee and the Local Church go wrong is on the very nature of God himself. I have all the documentation there. As I've said many times, viewers at home can freeze frame these pages on their screen at home and then read each page individually if they want to get all the documentation.

On page 3, I'm quoting Dr. Walter Martin, what he says about certain things. In fact, I owe Dr. Martin a lot of thanks for his research in this matter. As we go down the page, you see various things I have there. Page 4 is some of Witness Lee's favorite arguments,

his blurring of the Trinity, and things of that nature. The sure word of God shows these doctrines. On page 5, I start out with the sure word of God shows these doctrines to be completely heretical and blasphemous and I give the documentation there. You have Lee's doctrine of sin and Satan. And as we go on to page 6, Lee's doctrine of salvation. You can see how he thinks you're supposed to be saved. Lee's doctrine of church exclusivism on page 7. It's shown there with footnotes and everything listed. Now, page 8 as we go down, Lee's doctrine concerning Bible study and prayer and among other things.

Page 9 is my conclusion on the matter and what I say at the beginning there is the Local Church is simply a group of sincere people many of whom are immature Christians who have been misled into joining this rather vocal sect who are polarized around Witness Lee's interpretation of the Bible. Lee with almost papal authority, guides and directs the thinking, activity and worship of Local Church membership through his many books, pamphlets and tapes. Then I go on to state my conclusions there.

Then, of course, the following page, I have all my footnotes to document everything I was saying in this report, and it goes on to page 11 and some of my other resources there. Of course, I used to be Director of Dayspring Evangelism and you see there our old address way back in the day, back in the 1980s. Of course, we no longer have that mailing address so don't pay any attention to it now. I'm now running Christian Answers of Austin, Texas. That is sort of a local ministry there in Austin.

Notice here this article which is posted online called "Is the Local Church a Cult of Christianity?" Notice here what Hanegraaff says,

"While Hank Hanegraaff may indeed not consider the Local Church to be a "cult," in his *Amicus Curiae* he offers the following positive commentary:

"From my own direct study of and interaction with the Local Church and Living Stream Ministry, I have concluded that the word 'cult' does not apply to the Local Church either sociologically or theologically. While I disagree with Local Church leaders, as well as many other Christian leaders, on secondary theological issues such as eschatology and ecclesiology, these are issues Christians can and do debate vigorously without dividing over them." Source: Hank Hanegraaff, August 7, 2006

Hence Hanegraaff makes it clear that he and by extension, CRI, view The Local Church as theologically in agreement with the essential doctrines of the Christian faith.

This is a strange turn of events. After all, in a 1978 CRI statement titled, "The Teachings of Witness Lee and the Local Church," authored by Cal Beisner and Bob and Gretchen Passantino, they wrote, and this is under the auspices of Walter Martin:

"Our conclusion can only be that some of the basic teachings of Witness Lee and the Local Church are heretical and dangerous. We urge Christians to pray for those in the Local Church, help them see Lee's errors and return to the truth as it is in Jesus and the Word of God, which is the lamp unto our feet. Let us all heed the warning of God's Word in all matters (Acts 20:31). A number of the basic teachings of the Local Church are false, and it is man's carnal nature as well as Satan that breeds falsity (John 8:44). Such teachings are darkness (Eph 6:12), and the Christian must not walk in darkness (1 John 1:5-7). Let us walk in the light as He is in the Light (1 John 1:7)." That source is: Cal Beisner and Bob and Gretchen Passantino, "The Teachings of Witness Lee and the Local Church," Christian Research Institute statement DL-075

Larry. Freeze the screen pages if you want to read more or look this article up online. That's Witness Lee and the Local Church religious group.

Here's a video of CRI's Paul Young, righthand man of Hank Hanegraaff. This was recorded on August 26, 2011. The video itself is about 27 minutes and 35 seconds long. This video is a testimony of Paul Young, Chief Operating Officer of Christian Research Institute, CRI, at the recent Chinese speaking perfecting and training in New Jersey by the Witness Lee religious group's site.

Now what's interesting about this testimony of Paul Young at this Witness Lee religious organization meeting is that it turns out Paul Young, who is part of CRI which is supposed to be a countercult ministry, is actually part of a group that Walter Martin put in the cult category and said was very dangerous doctrines, particularly something close to modalism when it comes to the nature of God, yet here he is saying great things about this Witness Lee religious group. Let's take a look.

Video.

Paul Young. I'm so thankful for each one of you. I am learning from you. We are learning together and it's sad for me to report that some of my friends at the time and also after I heard Brother Lee, told me to shun that movement, that work. I am so glad that I am fellowshiping at the church in Charlotte. This is my family. You are my brothers and sisters. And every day it is getting better.

What I did realize in becoming part of the Lord's recovery was what you win them by is what you win them to. I'm so grateful for the recovery Bible. The footnotes are goldmines.

I gave her a copy of this book, "The Normal Christian Life,."

But I am loving what I have discovered and if this is more important than the cure for cancer, I have to tell everybody.

Larry. Now, while I was doing this research on this, I found by watching YouTube that there was another link to this video. It is found on YouTube called "Hank Hanegraaff speaks on Watchman Nee's impact on the Western World." The description text for this video says, "Hank Hanegraaff, the Bible Answer Man at the Christian Research Institute speaks on June 23, 2012 at an open house event sponsored by the church in Cerritos, California. Of course, that's a Witness Lee religious group outfit and you can see there the video of it if you so desire.

Now, looking at the church in Cerritos, it's the Witness Lee organization, on their site it talks about how they welcome anyone. Now, you can see the picture of this fairly massive building it looks like in the photo of their church building that was dedicated and Hanegraaff helped out with as far as being there to give them a talk. It has some of their information there. You have a fall college conference 2016, but as you go down the page and found out more about these guys, you see they have a big picture of one of Witness Lee's books, "The Holy Word for Morning Revival," and then you also see, "A Life Study from Matthew," by Witness Lee. And of course, we've already exposed all this Witness Lee stuff as being false earlier in this video.

So this is, in my opinion, pretty terrible. I mean, you have the founder of Christian Research Institute, Walter Martin, exposing this group as being false and dangerous doctrines and now you have someone like Hanegraaff who does not believe what Walter Martin believed. That's why he doesn't promote any of Walter's stuff, his books, tapes. He's thrown all of that under the bus. Now you have Hank Hanegraaff's man, Paul Young, as a member of this outfit. Amazing.

As you see here, "An Open Letter," by CRI's Paul Young, he's basically defending Witness Lee and his Local Church against all attacks against this Witness Lee group, and this may be in direct reference to an open letter that we're going to show you next by a bunch of evangelical Christian scholars on the problems with Witness Lee's doctrinal stances on a number of issues.

But anyway, one other thing I'd like to mention to the viewers here is, and this is public record information, but there in North Carolina in Union County, the tax records show a house that's jointly owned by Paul Young and also Hank Hanegraaff. Of course as you see there, it says Hendrik Hanegraaff, of course, his wife, Catherine. Now, this house is valued at \$1,122,600 and you kind of wonder, it's right there in the same golf community where Hanegraaff's other house is, and for both of them to own a joint property right there on a golf course, and you can see the picture of it right there, how big it is, it's rather interesting. I wonder why they had to buy a house together? I'm just curious about that. I wasn't able to find that out but apparently they did it and here it is.

Besides all this, numerous Christian ministers, seminarians, theologians, professors, apologists, have disagreed with Hanegraaff's protection of this Witness Lee heretical cult group such as can be seen here in this open letter which is posted online at <http://www.open-letter.org/>. A theological letter like this from dozens of Christian

scholars exposes the magnitude of what kind of theological idiot Hanegraaff really is in regard to essential Bible doctrine.

As the viewers at home can see, this open letter written "To the Leadership of Living Stream Ministry and the 'Local Churches'" outlines some of the essential theological differences that orthodox Christianity has with Witness Lee's cult group. One is on the very nature of God himself, as you can see there, "On the Nature of God." Then we see further down the page, "On the Nature of Humanity." Then you have on the next page, "On the Legitimacy of Evangelical Churches and Denominations." Then down there at the bottom, "On Lawsuits with Evangelical Christians." Then here you have all the various signers, most of which are Ph.D.s in their theological fields. And Hanegraaff, then, would obviously disagree with all these people.

Likewise, I found it repulsive when Hanegraaff invited the editor of the book, "The Agony of Deceit," Michael Horton, onto his radio broadcast to supposedly endorse the book since Walter Martin had written a chapter for the book exposing word faith preachers. This book has been endorsed by Walter Martin, had many other notable Christian writers contributing to it as seen here, and the book was even dedicated to Walter Martin, yet Hanegraaff instead of endorsing the book, chose to denigrate and attack the book in unexpected ambush style with Michael Horton sitting there in the radio studio. This was one of Walter Martin's last works before his death, yet Hanegraaff, Walter's so-called "hand-picked successor" as Hanegraaff claims, threw the book in which it was found under the bus.

Here's a clip from one of our series of videos based on this book called "Agony of the Phony Word Faith TV Preachers, #3: Real signs and wonders or fake miracles for money?" where we go through Walter Martin's chapter in this book.

Video.

Larry Wessels. We have a blow-up from Michael's book and starting with chapter 5, "Ye Shall Be As Gods," written by Walter Martin himself. And brother, what I'd like you to do is maybe mention some of these biblical passages that relate to this and then start analyzing for our viewers what we're seeing on the screen here.

Michael Horton. Well, the verse comes from the lie of Satan in the garden of Eden which he seems to continue propagating throughout the ages, "You surely will not die, the serpent said to the woman, for God knows that when you eat of it, your eyes will be opened and you will be like God." That was the promise Satan made and you remember Jesus Christ, the second Adam, when he is taken by Satan to a high mountaintop and tempted, he says, "I will give you all the kingdoms of this world, all you'll have to do, Jesus, is name it and claim it."

Larry. I see. Now you get into some quotes here. You've got Earl Paulk.

Michael. Yeah, Earl Paulk, the "bishop" Earl Paulk writes, "Adam and Eve were placed in the world as the seed and expression of God. Just as dogs have puppies and cats have kittens, so God has little gods." But he says we have trouble comprehending this truth. Until we comprehend that we are little gods and we begin to act like little gods, we cannot manifest the kingdom of God."

Larry. So he's teaching little gods and it takes us right back to what Satan said in Genesis 3 as we mentioned already.

Michael. That's right. Now Tilton adds, "You are a God kind of creature. Originally you were designed to be as a god in this world."

Larry. And to finish that quote...

Michael. "Man was created and designed by God to be the God of this world. Of course, man forfeited this dominion to Satan who became the god of this world." Kenneth Copeland adds that "man had total authority to rule as God over every living creature on earth and he was to rule by speaking words. His words would carry the power and anointing of God that was in him from the time he was first created. You see, that's the point, that you speak, you rule by speaking words. As God said, "Let there be light and there was light," we are now gods and so we can do the same thing. We can speak things into existence.

Larry. Or command things into existence.

Michael. Pat Robertson, in fact, makes that very comment when he tells us exactly how we are to call things into existence. He says, "Many Christians believe and teach that you have to pray for things to happen." Robertson says, "No, you don't pray for things to happen, you command things. It's the spoken word." He says, "Therefore you must command the money to come to you."

Larry. And why did Hanegraaff refuse to endorse the book "The Agony of Deceit"? Hanegraaff argued that Pat Robertson should not have been attacked in the book. Why would Hanegraaff do that unless he might have felt he could have derived some sort of financial benefit from leading Robertson alone or he needed an excuse to come up with his own book which would later be called "Christianity in Crisis" which was mainly written and researched by his browbeaten staffers. Anyone looking seriously at Pat Robertson knows he's just another phony TV preacher and false prophet.

Here is some research material on Pat Robertson. Those who want to can freeze frame each individual page if they want to read all the material that's on each page. I'm just going to read some of it. For instance, down here: each year Robertson takes to the airwaves with something he calls "Words of Knowledge," predictions that he says come

from God. Here are a few of the hundreds of revelations from God Robertson claims to have received as he begs for money from his supporters.

1980. Robertson predicted that the USSR would invade the Middle East.

1982 and 1984. Robertson predicted global economic collapse and that the USSR would invade Israel, control all the oil in the Middle East and foul up the world economy.

1988. Robertson said God told him to run for President of the United States. Robertson did run for President and failed miserably. Apparently God did not tell him to win.

1996. God told Robertson that Bill Clinton would not be elected for a second term. He also said that a terrorist with a nuclear weapon would strike within the United States.

1998. Robertson said God would strike the United States with tsunamis, hurricanes, earthquakes, and maybe even a meteor due to Orlando, Florida's city council voting to fly rainbow flags during a gay pride celebration. Orlando was never hit, though Virginia Beach, Robertson's home, was.

2005. Robertson said God told him that George W. Bush would pass Social Security reform, tax reform, and that the Supreme Court would end up packed with conservative judges. He also said there would be a wide scale conversion of Muslims to Christianity.

2006. Robertson said God told him that tsunamis would ravage the coast of the United States.

2007. Robertson predicted that there would be a massive terrorist event aimed at the United States which would result in a mass killing during the second half of the year. Quote, "The Lord didn't say nuclear but I do believe it will be something like that. There will be a mass killing, probably millions of people, major cities injured," Robertson said.

2012. Robertson said God told him who would win the presidential election that year but he would not tell, however, he later said, "I won't get into great detail about elections but I sure did miss it." Robertson also said that 2012 would bring about a collapse of the American economy. This information came only after a question and answer session with God that included Robertson asking if the disaster would be the result of an EMP blast or a Mayan galaxy alignment, all of which God took a pass on.

2013. For this year, Robertson revisited some older financial themes again, saying that a financial reckoning is coming, debts called in, money devalued, people on fixed incomes will suffer, creditors will seize assets to pay back debts.

And of course, all these things are a violation, particularly of Deuteronomy 13 and Deuteronomy 18, but if you want to see even more crazy and wild stuff that Pat Robertson has been involved in besides his phony-baloney word faith teachings that

Walter Martin and others blasted in the book "The Agony of Deceit," just read on from some of this.

Hanegraaff became an expert at hiding Walter Martin's work on any subject from public view if Hanegraaff did not agree with Walter's position. The classic example of this is Hanegraaff pretending that Walter Martin never wrote a booklet on Roman Catholicism. Here it is called "The Roman Catholic Church in History" written in 1960.

Audio.

Walter Martin. What ought our attitude to be? There ought to be an attitude of gratitude, an attitude of joy because God has delivered us from this system into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. We are not the descendants of this papacy nor do we wish to be. We do not wish its sacraments, we do not wish its dogmas. We worship only Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, Redeemer and Savior of lost men. We reject a corrupt church, a backslidden church, an apostate church, and reach out to her people with the love of Christ, holding forth holy Scripture as ?? said, and standing upon the liberty wherein Christ has set us free.

Let us not think that Rome has changed her basic positions. She has not. Her catechisms are essentially the same. Her dogmas uncompromising. It is the same Roman Catholic Church as at the Council of Trent only carefully adapted to American Protestant culture. It is a Roman Catholic Church which today threatens Protestantism in various parts of the world whenever she gains the upper hand.

Larry Wessels. Now we just heard Walter Martin, himself, say the Roman Catholic Church was apostate. In fact, that comes from Walter's tape which, of course, I already told everybody I bought just about every tape they ever put out by good old Walter, and here it is right here, "Peter the Rock, Catholic Church Tradition and Bible," and he said what you just heard right on this audiocassette.

Larry. This is Larry Wessels. Walter Martin says Roman Catholicism nullifies the Gospel, page 39 from his book "The Roman Catholic Church in History." Cross reference this to Galatians 1:6-9 where having another or nullified Gospel is cursed by God.

Speaker. The Roman Church, in effect, nullifies the good doctrine of the Gospel by adding the traditions or commandments of men. Herein lies the deadly parallel to Judaism mentioned by our Lord in Mark 7.

Larry. For those who would like to obtain a free transcript of Walter's entire book on Roman Catholicism, go to our YouTube video called "The Roman Catholic Church in History," by Walter Martin. 1. Pope Peter. 2. Catholic Tradition. And from there, go to the comments section below this video to hit the links on the following comment. For

those interested in getting a free transcript of this video, please go to and your link is right there and you'll find that on the YouTube page. When you see it, just click on that and that will take you right where you need to go. Once there, scroll down to the sermon transcription section where there will be a variety of options available such as view transcript, download pdf, and send to kindle. This video is now immediately available in 20+ different foreign language translations. You can now share this video with friends, neighbors or workmates that may speak a different primary language. This video message information can be easily sent to any kindle ebook reader wirelessly over wifi or 3g in minutes using the "send to kindle" link found on this sermon page link. The ultimate way to read on the go. 2 Timothy 2:15.

We have been exposing the religious con man Hanegraaff about this for decades. See our posted videos on this subject on our YouTube channel. Those videos are called "Review of Walter Martin's book on Roman Catholicism, Parts 1 and 2. Is Romanism an apostate religion or not?" Next, "Analysis of Hank Hanegraaff and Normal Geisler versus Walter Martin on Roman Catholicism, Part 3. Original Bible Answer Man, Walter Martin, says the Roman Catholic Church is corrupt and apostate. Virgin Mary's 7 steps to Godhood via Catholic dogma exposed by Bible Answer Man, Walter Martin."

Walter Martin's classic work called "The Kingdom of the Cults" published in 1965 is considered the most important reference on cults over the past 50 years, yet it does not mention Roman Catholicism. The reasoning by Walter Martin in his mind was simple: the Christian church in Rome, Italy, was a true Christian church back when the Apostle Paul was writing to that Christian church in Rome back in the first century. See the epistle of Paul the apostle to the Romans in the Bible. However, over time the so-called Church of Rome evolved or morphed into something else which became apostate and corrupt, devoid of the true Christian Gospel. Thus it became cursed by Galatians 1:6-9, "I marvel that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." In the Greek that's one of the strongest terms to indicate damnation, let him be sovereignly damned by God to everlasting destruction.

Concerning lawsuits, here's a report that can be found on the internet concerning Hanegraaff suing a Christian apologist named Bill Elmore who was also a friend of mine and who did a radio broadcast for our ministry. You can find it on YouTube called "UFOs and the New Age: Extraterrestrial messages or doctrines of fourth dimension demonic spirits?"

Now, viewers at home can find more than these couple of articles on Hanegraaff's lawsuits. But anyway, this one here you're looking at just says "Defamation lawsuit filed by Hank Hanegraaff thrown out of court." And of course, this was the, as it says here, a defamation lawsuit filed by Hank Hanegraaff against Christian apologist, Bill Elmore,

has been thrown out of court. Of course, this goes back to January, 2005 and people can go and find out much more about this situation. But Hanegraaff lost that lawsuit.

Now here's another report. It says, "Bible Answer Man sues apologist," by Dewana Litz. This is from November 14, 2006. And as you see here, there is much information. There are more links that can be seen concerning all this. But it says right up here at the beginning, Hank Hanegraaff, "The self-styled 'Bible Answer Man' will have to give an answer to God someday. He will have to give an answer for why he has sued a Christian brother and is now suing another Christian brother in a court of law and disobeying the Bible." Now it goes on from there, further down we see where it says, "Hank Hanegraaff obviously has no qualms about Christians suing Christians." And of course, more information about that. And looking further down the page, there is actually more information from Walter Martin's eldest daughter, Jill Martin Rische in her blog and the link is there.

So Hanegraaff suing Christians, it seems to give him no problem at all yet as we saw earlier in this video presentation, D. James Kennedy who could have easily sued Hanegraaff for plagiarism using D. James Kennedy's "Evangelism Explosion" materials, did not because, as he said, as Dr. Kennedy himself said, Christians shouldn't be suing Christians because the Bible says for Christians not to sue Christians. So we see a little bit of hypocrisy here in Hanegraaff. Hanegraaff, the self-righteous fake Bible Answer Man likes to selectively ignore any Bible passage just like any other false prophet does when that Bible passage does not suit his purposes, particularly if Hanegraaff perceives that someone out there, whether Christian or not, may be hurting his financial monetary intake. Here's what 1 Corinthians 6:7-8 says that Hanegraaff ignores. "Actually, then, it is already a defeat for you, that you have lawsuits with one another. Why not rather be wronged? Why not rather be defrauded? On the contrary, you yourselves wrong and defraud. You do this even to your brethren."

In my own case, I noticed all types of scandals and trouble were brewing under Hanegraaff's perverted rule of Walter Martin's Christian Research Institute back in the 1990s so I put out an 8 page report called "Matthew 18 Lawsuit" exposing a lot of what was going on over there. Okay, as our viewers can see from my own report that I compiled, the Bible Answer Man, I call it, of course, the Matthew 18 lawsuit. The Bible Answer Man, Hank Hanegraaff and the Christian Research Institute, CRI, named as defendants. Down below we see how I document a wrongful termination suit filed in Orange County, California on April 7, 1994. Former CRI employee, Brad Sparks, charges the Hanegraaff and other ministry personnel fired him because he blew the whistle on alleged ethical violations at CRI.

Now, I'm not going to go through all the reading of this, but as I've said many times already in this video, viewers at home can freeze frame the page here and they can read all the information to their heart's content and then just start the video up again. And as you go from page to page and we'll put each page up, you can see what's going on here and from various news reports from other sources. Like here on page 3, you see something from Charisma Magazine from October, 1994. It talks about the problems

going on, the lawsuit. It talks about on page 4, misappropriation of charitable contributions, financial excesses, racketeering as well as fraud. It says also besides the large salary Hanegraaff and his wife, Cathy Hanegraaff, receive estimated to be over \$750,000 plus benefits, CRI monies go to Hanegraaff to the tune of \$50,000 per year for a housing allowance. Then there is much more information provided there. It talks about his \$731,000 house out in California. And as we go to page 5, another news story from Christian media and this brings up that group that Perry Robinson was talking about in his talk that you've already heard in this video about Set Free and the envelopes and all that information is there. As we go through it, we see on the next page information continuing about Set Free and heresy hunters and things like that. At the bottom here you see that book review about Walter Martin's book, "The Roman Catholic Church in History," but then we go to a report update on all these matters and it kind of encapsulates a lot of what's been going on here with all this.

As we move towards the back end of this, we find here from Christianity Today dated September 11, 1995, it says, "Apologetics Ministry Resolves Wrongful Termination Suit. Other ex-employees still question book royalties." And this has to do with Hank Hanegraaff there, as you can see. There are questions about "Christianity in Crisis," and people are invited to freeze this so they can read the article in toto.

It is interesting that while I was making this report known throughout the country by way of our national mailing list and I was getting a lot of requests for it as a result, I got a call one day from an underling who worked at Hanegraaff's outfit. He asked me to stop distributing my Matthew 18 lawsuit report about Hanegraaff. I told him I would if Hanegraaff were to provide me with evidence that he can refute all the allegations against him. The underling told me he would within a few weeks so in the meantime I promised to stop making it available. After waiting almost a month and never getting anything from Hanegraaff, I went right back to making the report available. I concluded from that experience that CRI does not keep their promises.

What's interesting here is what Walter Martin's own family says about Hank Hanegraaff, and as you can see there in the paperwork before you, Walter Martin's family urges Hank Hanegraaff to step down as head of CRI. Hank Hanegraaff has been asked to step down from his post as president of the Christian Research Institute, CRI, by family members of Dr. Walter Martin who founded the organization in 1960. A majority of Martin's family members signed a statement asking Hanegraaff to resign. Walter Martin's eldest daughter, Jill Martin Rische, is a lead critic. A statement calling on Hanegraaff to resign as CRI's president has been signed by Rische and her husband as well as other members of Martin's family, including his children: Daniel, Elaine and Debbie, and Walter Martin's widow, Darlene.

For more documentation concerning Hank Hanegraaff and CRI, see the Facebook group called "Walter Martin, the Original Bible Answer Man," run by Walter Martin's eldest daughter, Jill Martin Rische.

While we were editing this video, we were tipped off that Hank Hanegraaff had recently changed his doctrinal statement on his website as of November, 2017. Here's what it looks like. As you see here under his beliefs it says, "Our beliefs on the CRI website," and he quotes 1 Timothy 4:16, and underneath that it says, "Over the years, there have been numerous suggestions for amending our statement of faith to reflect particular sectarian beliefs/biases. However, the Christian Research Institute (CRI) is committed to what is aptly referred to as "mere Christianity." In other words, "In essentials, unity; nonessentials, liberty; and in all things, charity."

Then as you can see there on the page, it goes on to talk about the Nicene Creed from the 4th century and it talks more about one of Hanegraaff's anomalies that he likes to do which is making stuff up that's more easy to remember. In this case, he has doctrine there and as it shows you here, deity of Christ, original sin, canon, Trinity, resurrection, Incarnation, new creation, eschatology. And that's pretty much their new doctrinal statement. It's about as bland as you can get.

This is so different from Walter Martin's original doctrinal statement. Hanegraaff focuses on mere Christianity, a phrase made famous by C. S. Lewis' book called "Mere Christianity." This is because Hanegraaff likes to minimize the exclusivity of the Gospel to its lowest common ecumenical denominator to give him the most broad appeal he can possibly get. By throwing the biblical Gospel under the bus, Hanegraaff can then appeal to a much larger group of people for financial support.

Okay, here's an example from C. S. Lewis' book "Mere Christianity." As the viewer at home can see, "Do All Roads Lead to Heaven?" Lewis wrote in "Mere Christianity" there are other people who are slowly becoming Christians though they do not yet call themselves so. There are people who do not accept the full Christian doctrine about Christ but who are so strongly attracted by him but they are his in a much deeper sense than they themselves understand. There are people in other religions who are led by God's secret influence to concentrate on those parts of their religion which are in agreement with Christianity and who thus belong to Christ without knowing it. For example, a Buddhist of good will may be led to concentrate more and more on the Buddhist teaching about mercy and to leave in the background (though he might still say he believed) the Buddhist teaching on certain other points. Many of the good pagans long before Christ's birth may have been in this position." That's coming from C. S. Lewis' "Mere Christianity," pages 176-177.

But the problem is, for Lewis, what does the Bible say? 1 Timothy 2:5, "For there is one God, and one mediator also between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Jesus Christ is both God and man and he is the one Mediator between God and men. Acts 4:12, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." John 14:6, "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." Romans 8:34, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Jesus Christ is the only name by which men can be saved, Acts 4:12. Jesus Christ is the only one who brings us salvation

when we believe on him, 1 Timothy 2:5. Buddha is not Christ. Buddha is a pagan god or just an enlightened man according to some of the Buddhist groups.

The Bible also says in Matthew 7:13-20, "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Now this will refute C. S. Lewis' false claims and his false Gospel. Verse 15, "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Now what's interesting here in Matthew 7, if you were to read through the rest of that chapter, you'll find that Jesus mentions many people who say, "Lord, Lord, didn't we do many wonderful works in your name, and do all these things?" They are people claiming to be Christians but even to those people, Jesus says, "I never knew you. Depart from me." So all these things show that C. S. Lewis and his Gospel, his mere Christianity, do not conform to what Jesus says in Matthew 7 or if you want to, go to Luke 13 and Luke 14 for more information about that.

For the viewers at home, here's a statement about C. S. Lewis that we placed in the comments section under a lot of our videos on YouTube and you can freeze frame it if you'd like to see a little bit more about this. We'll place the different pages of it here on the screen and as I said, you can freeze frame each page, read the information, and go on from there.

Audio.

Speaker. On page 35 of "The Grand Miracle and Other Selected Essays," Lewis said, quote, "The time is always ripe for reunion. Divisions between Christians are a sin and a scandal and Christians ought at all times to be making contributions toward reunion." Lewis bent over backwards to find common ground with all denominations, excluding from his books any doctrine that might be offensive to anyone and this to the point that even Mormons enjoy reading his writings.

In his book "Mere Christianity," Lewis' stated purpose is to provide a non-controversial theology. Of all things, I could never dream up a non-controversial theology. What doctrine in God's word has not been the battleground for great controversy through the ages? His theology is a generic kind of Christianity that suits everybody who can in any way relate to God.

In the foreword to "Mere Christianity," Lewis says that he submitted this book to 4 clergymen, an Anglican, a Methodist, a Roman Catholic, and a

Presbyterian, for criticism before its publication. He wanted to make sure he didn't offend anybody.

In his books, Lewis also and this is probably where our children come in mostly today, he sought to blend paganism with Christianity. He had a certain respect and awe for pagan religions. In his book, "C. S. Lewis: A biography," Roger L. Green quotes Lewis on page 276 in referring to Lewis' travels in the Mediterranean. Quote, "At Daphne, it was hard not to pray to Apollo, the healer, but somehow one didn't feel it would have been wrong. It would have only been addressing Christ, sub specie Apollinis."

"The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe," and all of his books promote the idea that Christianity and paganism can be blended together. "The Chronicles of Narnia" are an attempt to blend Christianity and paganism using thinly veiled pagan gods and goddesses like Bacchus as characters. He gives them other names but it's thinly veiled reference to these pagan gods. In Prince Caspian on page 192, Aslan, who is supposed to represent Christ, leads in a Bacchanalian orgy. His "Chronicles" actually serve as an introduction of children to the philosophies of the occult/pagan world.

How can this be when paganism and Christianity are so diametrically opposed? Paul says in 2 Corinthians 6:14 and 18 that God requires separation of his people from paganism. Listen to 2 Corinthians 6:14, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?" Then verse 17, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you."

In summary, then, what C. S. Lewis believed though he professed to be a Christian was contrary to biblical Christianity.

The last question with which I want to deal in the message is: why preach a sermon on C. S. Lewis? I want to give you about 5 reasons. First of all, because of Lewis' widespread popularity and influence in today's Christianity. Lewis is popular, as I stated, among Catholics, Pentecostals, occultists, Baptists, conservatives, evangelicals and all other stripes of Christians. He is also very popular in homeschooling circles and that's one reason I wanted to preach this message, because as far as I know all of our children are homeschooled.

Why is he so popular? Well, there are several reasons. For one, because he has great powers of communication. Brother, he knows how to get an idea across. For another, he could illustrate everything clearly. A third reason is because his books are so easy to read. Fourth, he is popular because of the spiritual weakness and vulnerability of modern Christians. I'll have more

to say about that in a moment. Fifth, he is popular because most of the today's Christians want the world's approval and C. S. Lewis keeps Christians from being called fools for Christ's sake. The mention of his name gives them acceptance with the world by giving them the endorsement of an intellectual who is respected by the world.

Why preach on C. S. Lewis? Second, because Christians are required to investigate and test all religious teaching before accepting it. Turn to 1 John 4:1. Christians are required to investigate and test all religious teaching before they accept it. 1 John 4:1 says to Christians, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." We must measure every book and every teacher by the yardstick of God's holy word.

Look at Isaiah 8:20. I don't know how many times I've come back to this verse in thinking about different people and their new theologies or their distinct theologies. Isaiah 8:20, "To the law and to the testimony," that is, to the Old Testament Scriptures, to the Scriptures, "if they speak not according to this word," the Scriptures, "it is because there is no light in them."

Now turn to Galatians 1:9. We must measure every book and every teacher by the word of God. Galatians 1:9, "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

Next turn to 2 Timothy 4:3-4. This certainly describes the age in which we live when so many professing Christians have fallen for this man and others like him. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." Isn't that a significant word? Fables means myths.

I ask you today, what I'm asking you today is this: look at God's word and look at this man's life and teachings and then decide how to think of C. S. Lewis and his words.

Why preach a sermon on C. S. Lewis? Thirdly, because of the shallowness and lack of spiritual discernment among professing Christians today. Modern Christians are alarmingly ignorant of God's word and spiritual things. Most Christians don't seem to have the spiritual discernment to realize who or what C. S. Lewis was and thus they promote his works as being great Christian books. You know, after reading these things, I wonder if these people have really read what C. S. Lewis said. Did you

know that many churches today have even used "The Chronicles of Narnia" for their Sunday school curriculum?

Why preach a sermon on C. S. Lewis? Fourthly, because God's word commands his preachers to identify and warn against false prophets and false teachers. Look at verse 17 of our text in Romans 16. It says we are to "mark them," that's false teachers, "and avoid them." "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." According to what we've seen in this message, C. S. Lewis is not a teacher of the truth and young Christians should, therefore, not be directed to his books. We must be careful to direct young Christians to faithful, sound, Christian books whether their authors are famous or obscure.

Why preach on C. S. Lewis? Finally, because God's curse is on those who preach other Gospels. Turn to Galatians 1:6-8. I want to close by reading this passage in Galatians 1:6-8. The Apostle Paul is speaking to people in the churches of Galatia and he says, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Let us pray.

Larry. A not totally inerrant Bible, that's what C. S. Lewis believed in. Lewis believed the Bible was the word of God but he did not think that meant every word in Scripture ought to be regarded as literal history. He wrote that most Christians "still believe as I do that all holy Scripture is in some sense, though not all parts of it in the same sense, the word of God." And C. S. Lewis wrote in a personal letter, he said the total result is not "the word of God in the sense that every passage in itself gives impeccable science or history, it carries the word of God and we, under grace with attention to tradition and to interpreters wiser than ourselves and with the use of such intelligence and learning as we may have, receive that word from it not by using it as an encyclopedia or an encyclical, but by steeping ourselves in its tone and temper and so learning its overall message."

Now, C. S. Lewis is at odds with Jesus Christ and the Scripture. Let's find out how, and this sort of reminds me also of Hanegraaff in his dismissal of the book of Genesis earlier in this presentation.

Facts and Evidences. 1. Genesis 1 states "God said" 9 times. It's interesting in Genesis 3 where the serpent, the devil, actually questions, "hath God said?"

Point 2. Malachi says, "Thus says the Lord" 23 times. God speaks from Genesis to Malachi.

Point 3. "The Lord spoke" appears 560 times in the first five books of the Bible alone.

Point 4. Isaiah claimed "his message came directly from God" 40 times. Ezekiel claimed that his message came from God 60 times. Jeremiah claims his message came from God 100 times. At least 3,800 times in the Old Testament, "the Lord spoke" appears.

Point 5. Jesus quoted from 24 Old Testament books alone. The quotes are still the same today. They have not been lost in transmission. Examples. Jesus believed Moses wrote the first 5 books of the Bible, Matthew 19:8-9; John 7:19; Mark 12:29-31. Jesus believed Isaiah was a prophet. That's found in Luke 4:17-21, cross reference that with Isaiah 61:1-2; Matthew 15:7-9, cross reference that with Isaiah 6:9. Jesus believed Daniel to be a prophet, Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14. Jesus believed in the Adam and Eve account, Matthew 19:1-6. Jesus believed the great flood and Noah accounts, Matthew 24:37; Luke 17:26. Jesus believed the Sodom and Gomorrah accounts, Matthew 11:24; Luke 17:28-29. Jesus believed the accounts concerning Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Luke 20:37; Matthew 22:32. Jesus believed in the Jonah and the great fish account, Matthew 12:39 and following. Jesus believed the Old Testament was the word of God, authoritative and without error, Matthew 23:35; Luke 24:27 and 44; Matthew 26:54; Luke 16:17; Luke 18:31; Luke 11:51; Luke 17:29 and also 32; Matthew 24:15, 34 and 18; Mark 12:26; John 6:31-31; also John 3:14. Jesus passed the same authority of the Old Testament to the New Testament, John 14:26; John 15:26-27; John 16:12-15. Jesus believed the Psalms were inspired by God, Luke 20:21-44; John 10:34, cross reference that with Psalm 82:6. To summarize, Jesus simply believed the Bible was the word of God, Old Testament, New Testament, and anyone that doesn't believe in the Bible as the word of God, the inspired word of God, doesn't believe Jesus, and if they don't believe in Jesus, they cannot be saved.

Remember, the way to shoot the head off the devil and his multitude of lies is with the sure word of God. In Matthew 4 and Luke 4, Jesus defeated the devil three separate times by rebuking the devil with the word of God. Jesus said in Matthew 4:4, "But He answered and said, 'It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God.'" Jesus responded to the devil's second temptation. Jesus responded again, "It is written," Matthew 4:7, "Jesus said to him, 'Again it is written, you shall not put the Lord your God to the test.'" And on the devil's final temptation in this section of Scripture, Jesus rebuked the devil a third time in Matthew 4:10 saying, "Then Jesus said to him, "Be gone, Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.'" That's a reference from Deuteronomy 6:13.

Alright now, we've seen how Hank Hanegraaff has changed his doctrinal statement for his Christian Research Institute away from the original doctrinal statement, as you can see now on your screen, here they are. The old CRI beliefs, it says right here, "It is the commitment of the Christian Research Institute to faithfully uphold the revealed truths of holy Scripture. We, therefore, commit ourselves to the following summary statement of the vital teachings of Scripture and the Christian faith. We believe that," then there is

number 1, the holy Scriptures comprised of the Old and New Testaments, "are fully and verbally inspired by God and are, therefore, infallible in the original writings and completely trustworthy in all areas in which they speak." And those at home can read the rest.

Number 2. "There is only one eternal Almighty and perfect God. Within the being of this one true God exists 3 eternally distinct and co-equal persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. These 3 persons are the one true God."

Number 3. "Jesus Christ is the eternal Son of God, the second person of the Trinity who took upon himself human flesh through the miraculous conception of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the virgin Mary. He who is true God became true man, uniting 2 natures into one person forever." And those at home can read the rest there.

Number 4. "The Holy Spirit is the eternal third person of the Triune God, the regenerator and sanctifier of the redeemed, the bestower of spiritual fruit and gifts, and the abiding Advocate who empowers believers for godly living and service."

Point 5. "In Adam, human beings were created in the image of God, i.e. they share in the finite way. The communicable attributes of God include personality, spirituality, rationale and morality." And you can read there about the fall of Adam and so forth.

Point 6. "Jesus' death on the cross provided a penal substitutionary atonement for the sins of humanity. In salvation, we are rescued from God's wrath by his unmerited grace alone, through faith alone, on account of Christ alone." That's a key point here in the original CRI doctrinal statement.

Point 7. "Those who have received the free gift of salvation will be raised from the dead or raptured, snatched up from their earthly lives, to meet Christ at a second coming and their bodies will be transformed like unto his glorious immortal body." And those at home who are watching this video can read the rest there.

Point 8. "The Christian church, which is the body and bride of Christ, is composed of all persons who through saving faith in Christ Jesus have been regenerated by the Holy Spirit." And the rest of the information is provided there.

What we notice immediately is there is no mere Christianity of the C. S. Lewis kind mentioned here in this original CRI doctrinal statement. C. S. Lewis and his "mere Christianity" are nowhere to be found.

Another very important part here is point 6, "Jesus' death on the cross provided a penal substitutionary atonement for the sins of humanity. In salvation, we are rescued from God's wrath by his unmerited grace alone, through faith alone, on account of Christ alone," is completely thrown out of the new CRI doctrinal statement of Hanegraaff and what he has basically done by throwing out point 6 is he has thrown out the whole Protestant Reformation by getting rid of point 6. He's basically saying the Reformers and

the Protestants and their doctrines on this of grace alone, by faith alone, through Christ alone, is false.

For more on this, let's hear from R. C. Sproul, one of my more favorite Christian theologians.

Video.

R. C. Sproul. At the church where I'm the minister preaching and teaching, we have on our bulletin every Sunday morning a list of the 5 solas of the Protestant Reformation and they include sola fide, which means justification by faith alone; sola gratia, salvation is by grace alone; solus Christus, that our salvation is through Christ alone; sola Scriptura, that the sole authority that binds the conscience of the Christian is the Bible alone; and then finally sola Deo Gloria, to God alone belongs the glory.

So we're going to start our study of the solas by looking at the first one, sola fide. Again, the substantive issue that was the core point of dispute was the doctrine of justification and the Protestant view is expressed in the shorthand of the Latin, sola fide. At the heart of this dispute was not a tangential debate over how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, or a needless controversy over pedantic points of theology and of doctrine that professors disagree about, but this issue touched the very heart of the Christian faith because the question of justification is designed to answer the deeper question: how can an unjust person possibly survive the judgment of a just and holy God?

Now, in our day, I find that people really don't care that much about the doctrine of justification. It has been reduced pretty much to a non-issue. Just as the differences among churches historically over the substance and the meaning of the Gospel itself, that those differences have now been minimized as being no significant matter because we're living in a time, in the first place, of relativism that says truth is relative, or pluralism that says there are many different approaches to truth and views of truth, and doctrinal issues should never divide us because what really counts are personal relationships, not doctrine, that despite the New Testament is replete with apostolic concern about correct doctrine. But that's not where the church is in this day and age and sometimes we have to ask the question why?

Well, to try to answer that questions, let me use a little anecdote that came to my attention just yesterday. I was driving my car down the highway and I was listening to my friend, Alistair Begg, on Christian radio and he was giving the second of his addresses on being an almost Christian and he talked about people who were exposed to the preaching of the Gospel, who joined the church, who come Sunday after Sunday after Sunday, but who have never really committed their lives to Christ. And in the context

of this particular radio program, at the end of his message where Alistair was basically giving an altar call over the radio, he said to the people in his own congregation, "There are some of you here today who have heard this message of the Gospel and are untouched by it. You are indifferent to it and you have not responded to it and you perhaps today will not respond to it, and for you people, what you are faced with is the judgment of hell itself." Then he went on to give a recapitulation of the biblical doctrine of the last judgment and of hell and told his congregation what awaited those people who rejected the Gospel of Christ and basically what he was saying is that those people who reject the Gospel of Christ stay in their sins and remain unjustified. And we think back to the Old Testament to David's rhetorical question: if the Lord would mark iniquity, who would stand? And it's rhetorical because the question is obvious that the answer is: no one. And what Alistair was trying to awaken to 21st century Americans with his message was that promise, that divine promise from the lips of God that all men will be brought into his judgment and will be judged according to the righteousness of Christ and those who are found wanting will be sent into the abyss of hell, is a doctrine that the church doesn't believe anymore because if it did believe it, it would preach it; and if it did believe it, justification would be just as much a theological issue today as it was in the 16th century.

You see, if you're going to understand the upheaval that came about in the 16th century, you have to understand that the church in the 16th century believed in a last judgment. The church in the 16th century believed in the wrath of God. The church in the 16th century believed in the justice of God. And the church in the 16th century believed in hell. That's why at center stage was the question: how can I be saved?

Recently I published a book with the simple title, "Saved From What?" a book that I wrote at the risk of offending the intelligence of anybody out there. Why would anybody ask the question what we are saved from? Isn't it axiomatic, actually manifest in the clear that what we're saved from is the wrath of God that is to come? I would think it would be axiomatic but it's not. People are now saying what I'm saved from are bad habits, addictions, social failure, psychological deficiency, broken relationships, and all the rest. We are so concerned about the relationships that we have in this world, we don't even worry about the relationship that we have with a just and holy God; that what the Christian faith is about in the first instance is not the restoration of human relationships, although it cares very much about human relationships, in the first instance is it has to do with the repair of our relationship to God.

Video.

R. C. Sproul. Justification by faith alone. He made the famous statement that the doctrine of justification by faith alone is the article upon which the

church stands or falls. The article that is so important that he said that if we lose it, we lose Christianity. He said justification by faith alone is the prince, the Lord, the authority, for all else that comes to us out of sacred Scripture. Again going back to the motto, it's the article upon which the church stands or falls. What did he mean by that? He meant that if you don't have the doctrine of justification by faith alone, you don't have the Gospel, and if you don't have the Gospel, the church has no reason to exist; the church, itself, ceases to be a church and falls into apostasy.

But beyond the general ecclesiastical application there, Luther by extension would be saying that the doctrine of justification by faith alone is the article upon which you stand or fall, the article upon which I stand or fall. Again, why? Because it is the article that answers the question: what must I do to be saved? How a person gains salvation, the biggest problem that the human race has is this: God is holy, he's righteous, he's just, and we're not.

So the question of justification boils down to this: how can I as an unjust person have a right relationship with my Creator? That justification is the hinge on which everything turns. It's not the doctrine that saves, it's Christ who saves, and what the church is trying to explain in terms of the doctrine of justification by faith alone is to explain how Christ saves his people and what we're saying is that justification is by putting our trust in Christ and in Christian alone, not in our theology textbooks, not in our creeds as important as they may be, not in our confessions but in our actual faith whose object is Christ, not the doctrine about Christ. You see the difference, I hope.

Now, I have often wondered, myself, and I know for sure that no one is saved just because they affirm the doctrine of justification by faith alone; the devil knows that's true; but the other side of the coin is not so easy. What happens if you deny the doctrine of justification by faith alone? That's a different matter because now you're denying that you're saved by Christ and by Christ alone and that denial may be enough to damn you. That was believed by the Roman Catholic Church, as we will see, as well as the Protestants. Both of them believed that the doctrine of salvation was crucial for our everlasting redemption and what we believed about Christ was critical forever, but they also believed that the false teaching of it was worth damnation, as we will see when we look at the Council of Trent and also Paul's letter to the Galatians.

Larry Hanegraaff has a very good idea, marketing wise, by using the mere Christianity Gospel which basically is no Gospel at all. Viewers should watch our video, "87% of Evangelical Christians don't know what the Gospel is or what justification is." Now this kind of ties into what R. C. Sproul was saying about how people don't really have much idea of what's going on these days as far as justification and other things, but Hanegraaff

is tapping into something here where he can take advantage of the ignorance of so-called Christians and come across like he's some kind of expert on Bible theology and Gospels and all that kind of stuff. Check out that video which will really explain how the evangelical so-called Christian community is in terrible shape and why for marketing purposes, Hanegraaff has done a good thing in the sense of being able to make money from a group like this where 87% of them don't know what the Gospel is in the first place, and have no clue what justification is.

Now let's hear from researcher Jay Howard, how this confidence man and opportunist, Hanegraaff, took over Walter Martin's ministry.

Audio.

Jay Howard. Good afternoon. Today we're going to be talking quite extensively about the presidency of Hank Hanegraaff of the Christian Research Institute. For many years, there has been concern and some doubt whether he was truly hand-picked by Walter Martin, the founder of the ministry, and tonight we're going to be looking at this issue more in-depth than, I think, anybody else has really looked at before. We're going to be dealing primarily with the hand-picked successor issue and how he actually became president of CRI. Also, we're going to be looking at several scandals that took place after his presidency began in 1989.

Shortly after the death of Walter Martin on June 26, 1989, the Christian Research Institute published a ministry newsletter which served as a tribute to him. It was in this newsletter for the first time there was a public mention of a man named Hank Hanegraaff and that he would be the new president of CRI. At that time, it was believed by most people outside of CRI since virtually no one had heard of Hank Hanegraaff, that Martin had probably discovered him in some seminary and had been impressed with his theological brilliance and apologetic acumen.

Up to this time in 1989, there was no mention of him in any of CRI's publications. He had never authored any articles, never mentioned in any newsletters, hosted the Bible Answer Man program, nor been involved in any public ministry for CRI. To the supporters of CRI, he was a complete unknown entity.

For several years after this, it never occurred to me that he was anything else but the hand-picked successor of Walter Martin that he incessantly claimed to be. In those first few years, he repeated the hand-picked successor mantra to anyone who would listen. He repeated it on the radio, in public appearances, in CRI publications, and he said it so many times and for so long, that everybody just assumed it was true.

In 1989 in a chance meeting with Kevin Rische, Walter Martin's son-in-law, I began talking with the Martin family about Hank Hanegraaff. They

began to share with me some of their ongoing concerns with his veracity. They had come to the conclusion that Walter Martin had hired Hank Hanegraaff to simply help with fundraising at CRI and that no one from the Martin family had ever heard him talk about Hanegraaff as the next president of CRI. I decided I had to investigate the presidential claims of Hank Hanegraaff. I needed to understand what was really true, so I began to research and interview as many people as possible that were part of CRI in the 1980s and 1990s. It would also be necessary, I concluded, to interview people who currently worked for the ministry. I obtained the name of a former board member of Walter Martin who had served on CRI's board for 19 years. I spoke with initially two researchers who worked with Martin in the 1980s and worked in the office on a daily basis whose names are Craig Hawkins and Rich Paul. They all recalled clearly that Monday morning when they heard of the death of Walter Martin but they also told me at no time did Martin ever talk to the staff about Hanegraaff ever becoming the new president of the ministry. To their knowledge, he was strictly involved in fundraising and increasing the visibility of CRI to the public. This was also a statement made by Stan Thomas and the board member who had been with Walter Martin on the board for 19 years. He had never heard Walter Martin mention Hank Hanegraaff as a possible successor in any CRI board meetings or in personal conversations.

In an interview I did with him in August of 2000, we had the following exchange. "Did you ever hear Martin state that Hanegraaff was to be his successor?" Stan Thomas, "No, he was looking for other individuals but he never mentioned Hank Hanegraaff as his successor."

I had contacted CRI via email in June of 2000 to ask what post-high school education Hanegraaff had and if they could furnish me with either a letter or audiotape of Martin expressing his desire that Hanegraaff become president upon his death. I received no reply. Almost a month later on July 25, I sent another email stating I was looking for a letter or a tape of Martin offering the presidency to Hanegraaff and that my inquiry was in conjunction with a small article I was writing concerning Hanegraaff as president of CRI. Within 24 hours, I received an email response. Curiously there was no information in the body of the email concerning Martin's public or private decision to make Hank Hanegraaff the next president of the ministry. I was invited to call a toll-free number and talk to John S., the ministry operations manager at CRI who had sent me the email. In the ensuing conversation, he questioned my motives for calling him. He told me of the problems with the Walter Martin website; he also told me that all the things that J. Rische and her husband, Kevin, had told me about Hanegraaff were all lies. One thing he did not comment on was whether there was any proof of the so-called hand-picked successor story.

He then suggested I speak with Elliot Miller who had worked with Walter Martin for many years and who was still an employee of the ministry. I then repeated my question to Elliot Miller if he knew of any letter or audiotape by Walter Martin. He told me there was no such evidence of Martin's offer to Hanegraaff. I then asked him if he ever heard Martin mention to the staff that Hanegraaff was to be the next president. Miller informed me that he had heard him say this at least on one or two occasions in the presence of other researchers. I asked him if any of the other ex-staff members could confirm this story. He said some probably could but I should not be surprised if they said Martin never said it because, he went on, some of them may have an ax to grind with Hanegraaff and probably would not tell me the truth.

Elliot Miller wanted me to believe that most of all the ex-staff members that have been interviewed by Bill Alnor and myself concerning this issue, have lied to us for one reason or another, and though Miller is the only research person left from the old 1980s Martin staff because the rest were either fired by Hanegraaff or quit because of the pressure they felt from him, we are supposed to take his word over multiple statements of ex-staffers who never heard Martin mention Hanegraaff as a possible president. The idea that he is the only one telling the truth defies the laws of probability. Since he is the only one still employed at CRI as senior editor of the Christian Research Journal, he has much to lose if he was to ever contradict Hank's story.

During my research in the summer of 2000, I also interview Tony C., a long time friend of Walter Martin, who knew him when he was still living in New Jersey before moving the ministry to Southern California in the 1970s. Mr. C. came out to California in October of 1988 for the dedication of the new headquarters building of CRI in Irvine, California. And I asked him these questions. "You asked Martin in October of 1988 at the dedication how he was doing." Tony C., "He said he was training some young men like Craig Hawkins and Rich Paul, but he did not say anything about a successor. I met Hank Hanegraaff only once during this time. Hank Hanegraaff drove Walter and me to a Baptist church in Garden Grove where Walter was speaking at a cult conference." And my question was, "Did he say anything about Hank Hanegraaff during the drive?" "No, not a word," said Tony. This would, indeed, be a strange occurrence.

Tony C. and Walter Martin had been friends for decades. October of 1988 was less than 9 months before Hank Hanegraaff would take over the presidency yet we are to believe that Walter Martin, who had been grooming Hanegraaff for the presidency for months, did not take this golden opportunity to tell his good friend, Tony C., that they were being driven to the speaking engagement by the next president of CRI. Martin should have been proud of his new potential president and protege yet he

did not say anything to Mr. C., though a few minutes before he had been talking freely about the abilities of Craig Hawkins and Rich Paul. If it were true that Martin had mentioned Hanegraaff as the future president to many staffers, why would he not make his intentions clear to his long-time friend from New Jersey?

We have found no one, whether they are family of Walter Martin, former CRI board members, ex-staff members, or close friends of Walter Martin, who ever heard him discuss Hank Hanegraaff as the future president of CRI. The only person who has come forward to the contrary is Elliot Miller, the only researcher who is still employed with the ministry from this original staff of Walter Martin and a man who has proven himself completely and utterly loyal to Hank Hanegraaff.

Since there is no empirical evidence that Hank Hanegraaff was ever asked by Walter Martin to take over the ministry, the question needs to be asked: is it possible that Walter Martin would promote a man like Hanegraaff? First, it can be adequately demonstrated that Walter Martin had a vast love for the educational process. I began reading "The Kingdom of the Cults," Martin's opus work, in 1976. After finishing reading my copy of it, I became extremely interested in acquiring other writings by him and listening to his lectures via audiotape. Until his death in 1989, I read no less than 6 of his books, listened to dozens of hours of his tapes, and from September of 1978 to April of 1979, I lived in Anaheim, California and attended his Sunday school class that he taught at M. Church, the church that he was associated with in the 1970s. Throughout his writings and lectures, he made frequent reference to his educational experiences at schools like Stony Brook New York University and his days in seminary. He recounted experience after experience that had helped shape his life and his thinking. He told stories in great detail of teachers and fellow students he had known throughout his life. He spoke with great affection of how his educational background had led him inexorably to the place where he could defend the Christian worldview against all comers with a combination of skills that heretofore had not been employed before to uplift the cross of Christ and defeat its legion of enemies in the guise of false religious systems.

To say that Walter Martin had a love of education is a little like saying that Mona Lisa is just another painting. He surrounded himself at CRI with a research staff that was highly educated. By the early 1980s, the researchers you encountered in the office had bachelor's degrees, some were working towards master's degrees, and others on doctorates. In stark contrast, when you look at the biographical information on Hank Hanegraaff on the CRI website, there is not even the tiniest reference to any education or schools that he attended in his life. The only college background that we know that he has is Calvin College in Grand Rapids,

Michigan, from 1968 through 1972, but he never graduated. He had not even declared a major field of study. It is beyond the pale to believe that a man who has such reverence for higher education and surrounded himself with men and women with advanced degrees would select a man who has so little higher education.

The reason that there is no mention of Hanegraaff's educational background is fairly apparent. Were CRI to say that he has only less than 4 years of college, it would tend to cause people to wonder why a person who is trusted with such an important and scholastically intense ministry has so little academic training to run such an organization. To underscore this point of Hanegraaff's under-qualified academic background is why Martin would not trust him to lead CRI.

Kevin Rische, the son-in-law of Walter Martin, told me about a conversation he had had with Martin in 1981. The year after Kevin married Jill Martin, they decided to move to Southern California. Coming to California with no job prospects, Kevin was anxious to land a job at his father-in-law's ministry. He asked if he could work as a researcher in the office. He was told by Martin that he had a strict policy to hire only people who had at least a bachelor's degree to work in the research department. At this time, Kevin had only one year of school. Kevin and Jill had met while they were students at Oral Roberts University in Oklahoma.

I contacted Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan, the school that Hank Hanegraaff attended after he got out of school. In speaking with their records department, they were able to tell us about his transcripts. He attended from 1968 to '72 but never graduated. In fact, I was told that on his transcripts there was no mention of a major. I was told that the major is always listed on the transcript when a student declares the information. There was not even sufficient classes taken in any one area of study, I was told, to indicate if he had a major field of study in mind. His lack of drive to obtain even a 4 year degree seemed to be the polar opposite of Walter Martin's thirst for higher education.

The official story by Hank Hanegraaff that he has been telling since 1989, is that Walter Martin had something to prove. The story goes that Martin had always had a theory that anyone, no matter how common, could be turned into an apologetic and cult researching machine by working and studying directly with him. Apparently, if we are to believe Hanegraaff, he was Martin's Eliza Doolittle in a kind of Christian version of "My Fair Lady." The Christian world has been led to believe all these years that Walter Martin broke his own rule because he wanted to test his theory and not only hired Hank Hanegraaff with virtually no college background, but advanced him to the very pinnacle of the ministry, that of president.

There is a fatal flaw in the myth that Hanegraaff has been passing off as the truth all these years, that is the fact that when you read all of Walter Martin's material and you listen to his countless hours of lectures on audiotape, he never mentions once about his desire to implement this so-called theory that Hanegraaff has foisted on the Christian public. Martin did talk quite a bit about making information accessible to everyone, this, however, is not the same as taking an unskilled person and working to make him the president of the largest cult apologetics ministry in the world to show that he could train anyone. Walter Martin's love for education would not allow him to do this. It is clear that Hank Hanegraaff was never really conversant with the works of Martin or he never would have advanced this ludicrous theory.

Over the years, it has become clear that the leadership of CRI is actively trying to hide the fact that Hanegraaff does not have the academic qualifications to be president. When people inquired about Hanegraaff's educational background, they received a standard reply. This is the automated response that CRI used to send out when this inquiry came in.

"Thank you for visiting CRI's website. If you wish to ask Hank specific questions or respond to your comments, you can submit your email with your mailing address through the following address. Thank you for your understanding and patience.

May God bless you. CRI Operations."

CRI has recently changed the information that they release about his education. Instead of making it into a personal inquiry issue between the person who sends in the request and Hanegraaff, they have altered their response. This is the new one.

"Greetings in the precious name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and thank you for contacting the Christian Research Institute. Although the volume of inquiries we have received has continued to increase, we do not currently have staff to consistently provide a timely and in-depth response to each inquiry."

Hank Hanegraaff was disciplined under the ministry of Dr. D. James Kennedy and once served on the staff of 'Evangelism Explosion.' Hank is, for the most part, a self-taught apologist and much of his knowledge comes through personal study. When he was a non-believer, in his late 20s one of the resources that helped convince him of Christianity's validity is 'Evidence that Demands a Verdict' by Josh McDowell. We carry the new expanded version, 'The New Evidence that Demands a Verdict,' for \$29.99."

Now parenthetically, I find this a little unusual that right in the middle of a letter explaining Hank Hanegraaff's qualifications they actually make a plea for somebody to buy this book, but that's what they do.

"How does Hank find time to study? Well, there is no easy to follow formulaic answer to your question. There are some practical considerations that can be taken into account. First of all, as host of the Bible Answer Man radio broadcast and President of CRI, it is literally Hank's business to study theology, cults and so forth and keep up-to-date on the events affecting the Christian community, therefore, during the time when others are on the clock in their secular vocations, Hank is typically hard at work conducting primary source research. Even this must be balanced, however, since the duties as President of CRI encompass much more than his research obligations. In addition, as you can probably imagine, Hank's passion for defending the truth of God's word is also an integral part of his personal life as well, therefore, you are as likely to find him reading and studying the Scripture outside of the work setting as you are to find him so doing within the walls of CRI.

"Apart from the above, the answer really just boils down to time management. When Hank is on the airplane bound for a speaking engagement, he studies. In mornings before his children wake up to get ready for school, he studies. At night after his kids have gone to bed, he studies. Rest assured, we are not employing hyperbole here. When you occupy the office of CRI, even spare moments need to be utilized for God's glory.

"Finally, and as Hank would say perhaps most importantly, his wife shares Hank's commitment to truth and works tirelessly to assist him as needed, freeing him up for more pressing pursuits.

"This response was made possible by the sacrificial gifts of people who have been helped by the ministry of CRI."

So it close by asking for a financial contribution. But again, what they are pointing out here is that he just studies all the time, there is no real time when he doesn't study. The only thing, again, that is missing is any mention of any educational background that would allow him to become the president of this ministry.

The request for the educational background of the president of a ministry is not all that unusual. For CRI to take such a guarded position about Hanegraaff is extremely strange, however, for CRI under this present leadership to hide information from the public is becoming all too common.

To examine how other ministries dealt with the question of education of their leadership, I contacted several well-known ministries: Focus on the Family, Insight for Living, The Apologetics Resource Center, Spiritual Counterfeits Project, Grace To You. They all talked openly and freely about the educational experiences of their president. Also, I find it interesting that even though my ministry search was random, yet all the ministries I looked at had information about the education of their president.

So in light of this, it would seem extremely surprising that CRI would not discuss the education or lack thereof of Hank Hanegraaff. In fact, the biographical information available from CRI on Hank Hanegraaff is extremely sketchy, to say the best of it. When you read the information, it tells you that he is the president and chairman of the board of CRI, the host of the Bible Answer Man program. It tells very briefly why he is a Christian and spends paragraphs promoting his books, some of his media appearances, and says he and Cathy, his current wife, have 9 children. What is striking is that there is absolutely no mention or no information in his biographical statement that would hint at why he is qualified to be president of this ministry. It reads more like a promotional brochure for the writings of Hank Hanegraaff than it does a biographical piece.

While it is true that many cult apologetics ministries are started by individuals since the 1970s, have founders and presidents that were all but self-taught in these fields, that it is imperative that all who work in this area of ministry must have a college degree if not the heart of the objection. It comes down to would Walter Martin ask a man who does not even possess an undergraduate college degree to lead his organization where even a newly hired researcher must have a 4 year degree? It is overwhelmingly clear that this would not have been something that Martin would do.

Hank Hanegraaff talked often in the early days of how Walter Martin had groomed him for the presidency, however, when you look at the Christian Research Journal as far back as 1987, there is not one article written by him or a mention of him. If he was being groomed by Walter Martin, why didn't he ever host the Bible Answer Man program? Martin often at times allowed other research staff to host the radio program. It would only be fitting that the man that would take over his office some day would fill in from time to time. The fact is that it was over a year after Martin died that he finally got behind the microphone on the Bible Answer Man program full time.

It is abundantly clear that he used the first year to try to cram as much information about cults and apologetics into his mind as possible. Still to

this day, he does not have a fraction of the information than Martin had acquired in a lifetime of preparation. There is also no record of him speaking on behalf of CRI at any cult conference before July of 1989. Martin was anxious to groom young talented minds, this is true. When you look at the CRI activity of researchers like Robert Bowman, Craig Hawkins, Ron Rhodes, Rich Paul, Paul Cardin and others, they were continually writing articles and some of them hosted the radio program multiple times before and after the death of Walter Martin. For a man who was the hand-picked successor, he did absolutely nothing in the area of cult and apologetic ministry for CRI before July of 1989.

Monday, June 28, 1989, two days after Martin had died, at the CRI headquarters in Irvine, California, according to staff members who were there at that morning with an incredible mixture of stunned sadness and overwhelming confusion, contrary to Hanegraaff's assertions that Martin had planned for this eventuality, it was not true. Though he had struggled for many years with diabetes, his death was sudden and, after all, he was only 60 years old. He didn't have a full sense of how sick he was and though it is true that he was always interested in training young men and women to become top apologetic researchers, his family and staff were never told of any one individual who was being groomed to take his place at the time of his death, including Hank Hanegraaff.

According to Darlene Martin, Walter's widow, Hanegraaff assumed the role of media spokesman for CRI after the death of Martin. He helped draft the media press release, talked with the media who wanted information and acted as a buffer between the ministry, Martin's family and the outside world. Mrs. Martin told me how kind and thoughtful Hanegraaff was to her during those trying days. In the next couple of days, Hanegraaff began to see the opportunity that lay before him. He realized there was no clear presidential hopeful waiting in the wings and he began his conspiracy to take over the ministry.

The question is often asked: if Hanegraaff is not the legitimate president of CRI, how could he take over the ministry without raising concern? There are only two men who know how it happened, Hank Hanegraaff and Everett Jacobson, one of the remaining board members from Martin's board. It is obviously not in Hanegraaff's best interest to tell an Everett Jacobson, who was on the board of directors until his death in July, 2007, never spoke to anyone outside of CRI of what convinced him that Martin wanted Hanegraaff to assume the reins of the ministry. Jill Rische who remains the main spokesman for the Martin family, and is Everett Jacobson's niece, has stated that even though 19 years have gone by, Jacobson had never explained to her in all that time about why he backed Hanegraaff in 1989.

When we look back on the days immediately after June 26, it is clear that there was a power vacuum and the family and the staff were struggling with shock and profound grief. With this in mind, it is extremely easy to see how someone who was opportunistic could take full advantage of the situation. Since Stan Thomason, the other board member, was moved off the board in the Spring of 1990, it is clear that he had nothing to do with the coup. Therefore, seeing that Everett Jacobson had never spoken to anyone outside of CRI about the matter and he was one of only 2 left from the original board of directors, it becomes obvious that he was the one that Hanegraaff approached. It has been said that Hanegraaff is very persuasive and charming a person when he wants to be. It seemed clear from things that the Martin family has said to me, that the exchange between Hank Hanegraaff and Everett Jacobson was not a financial one so it was through persuasion that Hanegraaff convinced Jacobson that he was to be the next president. Stan Thomason confirmed with me in a meeting I had with him in January of 2008 that when he asked Everett Jacobson how he knew Hanegraaff was Martin's choice, he replied, "God told me." It should be noticed that Jacobson never replied that Martin had told him about this information, but he never revealed to Mr. Thomason how exactly God had broken the news to him.

The staff of researchers, secretaries, shipping, accounting, and receptionists were extremely motivated to work with CRI because of the uniqueness of the ministry in Southern California and because they believed in its mission. They were obviously willing to work with Walter Martin or whoever was at the helm of the ministry. They would not have had inside information about the working of the board and its choices, therefore, it is logical that they would have no real reason to suspect Hanegraaff's new presidency in the beginning since there was a seemingly full and exuberant backing by the CRI board consisting at the time of Everett Jacobson, Stan Thomason and Hank Hanegraaff. There was a great deal of talk by Hanegraaff after Dr. Martin died that he had been groomed to take over the ministry. This easily demonstrated that he was in reality only brought on to the board at CRI to help raise financing for the ministry. When the board minutes of CRI are examined, it is clear that he was only presenting financial related information and he was never called upon to be involved in theological aspects of the ministry but reported almost exclusively on business issues.

The following are excerpts from CRI board minutes. On February 23, 1987, Walter Martin introduces the idea of having Hank on the board of directors. This is a quote from the minutes now, "Dr. Martin presented the name of Hank Hanegraaff as a possible board member."

After he was brought on the board, he had reference in the subsequent minutes as presenting financially related information. This is from the

May 27, 1987 board minutes. Quote, "Hank Hanegraaff stated he must maximize the potential of our current donor base and get volunteers to increase the turnaround time in responding to letters received at CRI. Hank will work with Leona to accomplish this task."

July 3, 1987, another quote about Hank Hanegraaff in the board minutes, "Hank Hanegraaff stated that we need to solve the problem of the deficit and managerial need immediately. Hank said that development is commitment to detail."

July 29, 1988, "Hank Hanegraaff addressed the capital campaign for the new building. He said that we have to establish a goal, allow for shrinkage, identify persons who will do the solicitation, and then identify those people capable of solicitation, and finally, to identify people to be solicited. Hank will implement the program."

On June 3, 1989, this is less than one month before Dr. Martin would die and Hanegraaff would become the hand-picked successor, he was still talking business only. Quote, "Hank reported on the proposed CRI cruise and read a letter being sent to selected supporters. It would be a Caribbean cruise from October 28 through November 4 of this year. The motion by Stan was made to proceed with the cruise and that Hank arranged to have letters sent out to all people on our mailing list. Hank presented a written report on Brazil and made comments on his trip to Brazil. Hank feels that CRI is definitely in the right place in Brazil. Hank commented on the many different problems at CRI that were critical and should be dealt with immediately. The board gave Hank complete authority to deal with and correct all the problems at CRI. Hank will give a report at the next board meeting on this matter."

Note, the only other board member beside Dr. Martin or Everett Jacobson, a banker, and Stanley Thomason, a pharmaceutical researcher. These two men did not have the time to devote to these problems. This would have hardly signified that Martin had planned to turn over the ministry to Hank Hanegraaff but only that he had time on his hands.

Hank was given authority by the board to build the BAM program by adding or subtracting radio stations in order to make the BAM program profitable. Note, this again was only a business related project. He was not being offered to appear on BAM and had never spent any time on the radio show. To put this into perspective, it would be analogous to a business manager at a hospital being offered a position as the head of thoracic medicine. It would never happen because he has no training in that field. In fact, in a resume kept on file for Hank Hanegraaff by CRI, it states: "Heinrich Hanegraaff, our newest board member on the board at CRI is President and Founder of Memory Dynamics, Inc. headquartered in

Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Hanegraaff has served in the past as faculty member of the Developmental Association for Christian Institutions." Note that he did not supply the ministry of Serve International in Atlanta, Georgia, from which he was fired from in the early 1980s. "He has been development consultant to Christian organizations in long range planning, management, marketing, development strategy and staff training. By providing training technical assistance and consulting services in current and capital giving programs, he has helped Christian organizations as Campus Crusade for Christ, Intersity Fellowship and Youth With A Mission, to significantly increase donation income."

Again, this is strictly a business related resume and never mentioned any background in cults or apologetics. If Martin was mentoring Hank in the ministry aspects of CRI, the board minutes would have reflected at least some of this. It is clear that the only interest Martin had in Hank was as a fundraiser and a person who would help CRI find ways of cutting costs at the ministry.

In those early years that Hanegraaff was involved on the board, there were actually a couple of men who were discussed as possible associate directors at CRI. The first was Ron Carlson who currently has a ministry called Christian Ministries International. The other was John Stewart. These two were talked about during various board meetings as working directly with Walter Martin.

In board meeting minutes dated October 17, 1985, there is this mentioned, "Ron Carlson is still interested in the position of Associate Director of CRI but has not sold his house, and if he accepts the position, will not be available until some time in 1986."

In the board minutes dated September 12, 1986, there is this mention of John Stewart as a possible assistant director, "Stan then brought up John Stewart's proposal and reiterated the board's discussion earlier in the meeting to John. Walter stated his views on what he expected from an Assistant Director."

There is nothing in any of the minutes from those years in which there was ever discussion about Hanegraaff as a possible associate director for CRI. This associate director position appears to be the position that was offered when Martin had special interest in a man. It will be incumbent for CRI at this date to show actual documents that would show Martin's interest in Hanegraaff to be the next president. Hanegraaff has spoken over the years of conversations that he had with Walter Martin of his keen interest in Hanegraaff's abilities. Claiming private conversations with Martin about his alleged interest in Hanegraaff as a replacement for him, is hardly offering rock-solid evidence. It is as if Walter Martin and Hank

Hanegraaff had a meeting under the bridge in Pomona, California, at 2 in the morning where Martin pledged that he would be the next president.

Perhaps CRI will attempt to claim that since October, 1988, Hanegraaff was given an executive position on the board. Martin meant that to indicate that he wanted him to take over the ministry. Logic would not be on its side. Most boards contain titles such as vice president, secretary, etc. This is not usually an indicator of an ability to assume leadership outside of the boardroom. In Hanegraaff's case, it was believed by Martin that he could oversee the financial issues of the ministry. If a person with a normal ego was put in this position, they would not conclude that they were all prepared to carry out any and all tasks that the well-trained head of the organization performed. After Walter Martin's death, Stan Thomason was made vice president of CRI. If Hanegraaff had died suddenly, it would then have been appropriate to appoint Mr. Thomason, who by trade was a pharmaceutical researcher, the new president of CRI? In almost all cases, the board position is a function within the board only.

Many people have written to CRI over the years asking to see some type of written evidence for Hanegraaff's claim that Martin wanted him to take over when he died. Those requests have gone completely unanswered. We will now see the way in which a great ministry was usurped by a man who can rightfully be described as a megalomaniac.

The question needs to be asked: if Hank Hanegraaff truly had the best interests of CRI at heart, why was he in such a hurry to be crowned president of CRI? A man who did not have the abilities to carry out in the capacity of president of CRI? No one on the board had any real theological training to be the president of this most vital ministry. Stan Thomason was a pharmaceutical researcher in New Jersey and Everett Jacobson was a banker in Florida. If the intent was not to usurp a ministry that he had no rightful claim to, only the continued preservation of a great ministry, the correct thing to do would have been to put together a CRI search committee to find the most qualified person to become the new president, but that was not Hanegraaff's chief motivation. His motivation clearly was to find a way to control CRI to such an extent that would help him achieve a level of wealth that would allow him to acquire the things in life that he seems to believe would get him the respectability that he so craved.

In a calculated attempt to steal the presidency, he convened a board meeting at 8:45 AM the morning of Walter Martin's funeral. The following was recorded by Everett Jacobson, the board secretary.

"A special board meeting of the Christian Research Institute was held on June 29, 1989 at 17 Hughes Street, Irvine, California, due to

the home going and passing of the president of the institute, Dr. Walter Martin on June 26, 1989. Present were Stan Thomason, Everett Jacobson and Hank Hanegraaff. The meeting was called to order at 8:45 AM. The opening prayer and the meditation by Hank Hanegraaff. Everett made a motion that Hank be named president of the Christian Research Institute with reaffirmation that Stan Thomason continue in the capacity of vice president, treasurer and Everett Jacobson be as secretary. A second was made by Stan Thomason and the motion unanimously passed."

Why 8:45 in the morning of Walter Martin's funeral? Clearly the naming of his successor could have been put off until much later. It would have given CRI not only time to grieve but to conduct a national search to find the most qualified person to lead the ministry forward, however, time was not Hank Hanegraaff's friend. He was a desperate man. He needed to move quickly to cement his position before anyone had time to think. He wanted that vote in the morning so he could in the afternoon tell John Ankerberg, the man who acted as the MC at the funeral, that he had been unanimously voted in as the new president so that afternoon as the hundreds in attendance at the funeral listened on, John Ankerberg made it official, the board of CRI had granted to Hank Hanegraaff the position of president. The only thing not known to those in attendance and the thousands of CRI supporters around the world was that the board was not made up of multiple people but only 3, one who had secretly been convinced by Hanegraaff and 1 who had never been approached. When people hear the phrase "board of directors" it conjures up an image of a large group of people, perhaps half a dozen or more, so when John Ankerberg said it was a unanimous vote, it sounded more dramatic than it really was because all it took was simply Jacobson and Hanegraaff to vote for Hanegraaff. In reality, Stan Thomason's vote was extraneous. Hanegraaff would have still been president had Thomason voted against him. The sad truth is that had there been even 1 more person on the board, the presidency of Hank Hanegraaff probably would never have happened.

On June 29 a memorial service for Dr. Walter Martin was held at the Capistrano Valley Church. Darlene Martin spoke to the audience and in her closing remark appeared to announce for the first time that Walter Martin had picked Hank Hanegraaff to be his successor. The following is the text from that portion of her message.

"Walter and I talked often about who would take over for him at CRI if God were to take him home. Since last October, Walter Martin asked Hank Hanegraaff to work with him and to be that man. Little did we know that it would come this soon but Hank is a man that Walter Martin wanted, that Walter wanted to lead CRI, and I am eternally grateful for this man for the uplifting that he has done for

me in these past few days. He is a Godsend and I'm grateful for him and his family. I know the Lord is going to bless CRI and the ministry is going to flourish under Hank's direction. I thank the Lord for him and for CRI and for all the staff from whom are going to carry on even in the midst of Walter's absence and I just praise the Lord for it. Thank you again."

This would appear to be proof that Walter Martin had personally asked Hank Hanegraaff to take over the ministry. After all, it was the wife of the founder who made the announcement, however, the truth is that the page that she read last was given to her by Hank Hanegraaff a few minutes before she went to the podium. The message she read was written in someone else's handwriting at the bottom of her proposed notes. According to Darlene Martin, Hank Hanegraaff approached her before the funeral only a few minutes before they were all ushered into the sanctuary as she and the rest of the Martin family and the 3 remaining board members waited in a room. Hank Hanegraaff came up to her and asked her for her prepared message. He told her that he would bring it back in a couple of minutes. When he did, he told her to read what was on the bottom of her notes at the end of her presentation. I have had a handwriting analyst look at the printed message and the report states that the printed message was definitely not Darlene Martin's handwriting. Also, on the audiotape of the memorial service, there is a distinct pause when Darlene Martin got to the portion that was handwritten. She falters and appears to be reading something that she's not familiar with. This was indeed the case. Darlene Martin explained during an interview that this, indeed, was unknown text to her. She stated that her husband did not like to discuss ministry activities at home and definitely had not discussed possible replacements in the event of his death, with her.

What a better way to begin your presidency than to make it appear as if Darlene Martin knew of her husband's plan and approved. This form of arrogant sleight of hand is common with Hank Hanegraaff. It should be evident that this is not a case of hand-picked successor gone bad, Hank Hanegraaff had planned this ministry coup. We know of no other example in the history of Christian ministries where this form of Machiavellian style takeover has ever been accomplished.

According to Stan Thomason, within days of the death of Walter Martin, Hank Hanegraaff asked and received a president's salary of \$60,000. It should be noted that in the early 1993 interview with Ron Rhodes of the Christian Research Institute, Hank Hanegraaff said this about his interest in acquiring wealth, "As a new Christian, my life changed dramatically. Before becoming a Christian, my life was characterized by a pervading sense of inferiority. I never felt as though I measured up. The only way to make myself feel significant was to acquire wealth. It was as though I was

saying, 'Look at me, I'm worthwhile. I have a beautiful home and own lots of nice things.'" In this case, his old sinful desire for money is still affecting him. His love of money has completely overshadowed his presidency. Whereas Walter Martin earned a modest livelihood from CRI, Hank Hanegraaff and his wife, Cathy, have a combined income from the ministry in excess of \$335,000 as of 2005. This is easily the largest salary within the Christian countercult community. This is also in the upper 5% of all Christian ministry salaries.

In Hanegraaff's first public message as head of CRI, he made this statement about his primary task. "One of the greatest tributes to the leadership of Walter Martin is that he astutely prepared for his home going. He often expressed the fact that CRI would be more important in the decade of the '90s and beyond than when originally founded 30 years ago. Under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, Dr. Martin developed a plan so CRI could move forward with strength and vision. In the near future, it will be my privilege to unfold for you the exciting vision and plans he left behind for the ministry of CRI." Now the question is: has he really kept to the vision of Walter Martin that he mentioned in this presentation? In fact, during the memorial service, he talks quite a bit towards the end of the memorial service about the love that he has for the late Walter Martin and how he was going to fulfill the vision of Walter Martin as the new president.

Now, for the next few minutes we're going to look at some of the scandals that have broken since Hank Hanegraaff took over the ministry at CRI. There are 3 things that we're going to take into consideration. One is the early firings that took place from 1989 to about 1994 and many of the key people that Walter Martin had hired as staffers were simply dismissed or chased out of the organization right after Hanegraaff took over. Also, we're going to look at a scandal, a financial scandal that rocked CRI in 2002 when a young woman found that there were receipts being uncovered at CRI that show that lots of high priced items were being purchased for Hank Hanegraaff with CRI money. The third scandal we're going to look at briefly is the letter that was written in January of 2005 that tried to raise money based on the fact that Hank Hanegraaff claimed that the post office that operated the mail for him in Southern California had lost their mail for 90 days. We're going to look at that letter as well.

But let's go back to the firings of original staff members under Walter Martin when Hank Hanegraaff originally took over. It should not be too difficult to understand why a person who managed to steal a ministry and was destined to use the organization for his own personal gratification and financial enrichment. It should also not be too difficult to believe how anyone in the first few years who questioned his abilities to lead CRI or would show concern for how he was using staff and other CRI resources

to create personal wealth for himself, was fired or forced to quit. The surprise is how quickly his own need for power and wealth so completely began to color his decisions, and even the first few weeks after he took control, his first act as president was to increase the salary he would receive to \$60,000 per year within days after Walter Martin died. This was to be the first sign that CRI's primary mission would no longer be about ministry but rather how Hank Hanegraaff would be able to enrich himself on the backs of staff and thousands of well-meaning contributors.

It should be noted that from the founding of CRI in 1960 by Walter Martin whose mission was to minister to the church and to reach into the vastly under-evangelized kingdom of the cults, had never been known to create an air of scandal or suspicion in nearly 30 years of ministry. Contrast that to Hank Hanegraaff who was not president for 30 days before people began to see problems in how he was running the ministry. It was because Walter Martin was called to this area of ministry and Hanegraaff was only becoming involved when he realized how much wealth could be extruded from the organization.

The first major scandal began within months after he took over in June of 1989. Walter Martin had been very good at finding talented young researchers to help him carry out this very important ministry. This, in a real way, was key to helping provide up-to-date information on the many cults and false teachings that were a constant threat to the health of the church. The training and education of the research staff was going to create a barrier between Hank Hanegraaff, at least in his mind, in the ultimate control of CRI. He was painfully aware that each of his own research staff were required to have something that he lacked, a college degree. It is truly ironic that while Hank Hanegraaff publicly made quite a noise about how much he had a mandate to carry out the vision of Walter Martin, however, behind the closed doors of CRI, he began to find ways of firing or forcing to resign the very people that Martin had stated he had such pride in.

This is a list of employees who left CRI from July, 1989 to April, 1994. Note the first employee left within a month after Hank Hanegraaff took over. Lisa Hawkins was a secretary and she left in July of '89.

Dan Slazenger, he was the research coordinator and accused of being divisive and was presented with several points of criticism by Hank Hanegraaff. He was fired in October of 1989.

Jerry Kessler was a data entry department person and he was fired by Hank Hanegraaff one day after he turned in a one month notice of resignation because of his complaints of Hank Hanegraaff. He was fired in March, 1990.

Craig Nelson, director of broadcast media, he was fired when he questioned why Hanegraaff's for profit company, "Personal Witness Training, and Memory Dynamics," was not paying for advertising on the radio program. He was fired in May, 1990.

Craig Hawkins was a researcher and also hosted the Bible Answer Man program. He confronted Hanegraaff on 5 points of lapses of integrity and attempted to resign. The board tried to intervene and tried to get them to reconcile but Hanegraaff pushed the resignation. He left in June of 1990.

Mark Hoover was the human resources accounts payable officer. He witnessed the misuse of CRI funds for Hanegraaff's "Memory Dynamics" business and attempted to document irregular handlings of CRI checks to "Memory Dynamics" with little or no documentation. He left in June of 1990.

Stan Thomason, who was the board member for 19 years under Walter Martin, though he was not a paid employee, he was planning to confront Hanegraaff at a board meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, with a list of letters from staff members who complained of unjust treatment and unethical behavior on the part of Hanegraaff. He exited in July of 1990.

Robert Claypool was a security chief for CRI. He was released by the board of CRI after he began to investigate into the financial irregularities of Hank Hanegraaff. This was started after several employees began complaining. He left in July of 1990.

Dan Kessler, David Anderson and Denise Lee were correspondence research assistants and Dan Kessler was interrogated by Hanegraaff concerning his brother, Jerry's, letter of resignation. All 3 later resigned in August, 1990 to avoid anticipated firing.

Dennis Green, director of marketing, he had confronted Hanegraaff for failure to pay for an ad in the Christian Research Journal that was to promote "Personal Witnessing Training" material. He also spoke to Hanegraaff about fulfilling the deferred compensation contract that he had agreed upon for Dennis. He resigned in December, 1990 because he believed the struggle with Hanegraaff would adversely affect his career.

Janice Seaver, she was fired for talking too much in 1991.

Dan M., he was fired without cause in 1991.

Robert Bowman, who was a researcher and special projects editor, he was let go after he complained that Hanegraaff was putting his name on CRI

perspectives that he had written. He was told he was being let go due to financial problems of the ministry. He was the only one let go during the crisis. He later found out that during the months CRI had the highest month of contributions in CRI history to that date, that was the month before he was let go. He was fired in January of 1992.

Perry Robinson, correspondence processing accounts receivable specialist, he was finally suspended and then fired in February of 1992.

Russ Hooper, Michael Williams and Wallace Helms, were the entire correspondence processing department. They were fired for insubordination and gossip. They asked many questions about financial improprieties involving Hanegraaff's upcoming book. They also asked why free or low cost material was suddenly banned and people were told to wait for his forthcoming book "Christianity in Crisis." They also voiced concern for his lack of theological training. They were let go in October of 1992.

Mike Stevens, who was CRI director of media, he had delivered several negative critiques of Hanegraaff's handling of the Bible Answer Man program after Hanegraaff took over full time behind the microphone only a few months after Craig Hawkins was fired in June of 1990. He was fired in October of 1992.

Mary Cook, shipping department coordinator. She sent a complaint to the board over financial abuses and the size of Hanegraaff's salary. She was fired in July of 1993.

Anna Kingsbury and Robert V., correspondence research assistants. Kingsbury had asked questions about CRI's departure from ECFA. There was an attempt to fire him for too many jokes. They ultimately resigned just to avoid further negative personal actions.

Brad Sparks was a scientific assistant to the president. He criticized Hanegraaff's video performance in a failed attempt to ?? in February of 1993. He questioned Hanegraaff on December 2, 1993 about Kingsbury and V.'s forced departures. He was terminated on March 4, 1994.

Miriam Takahashi, she was a librarian. She was told of her termination on that same day at 9:45 in the morning.

Joan Moore, executive assistant researcher. She was fired because she leaked information about the impending mass firings on March 4, 1994.

Rich B., correspondence research assistant, fired at 2:00 PM on March 4, 1994.

Ed Hammond, correspondence research assistant. He was told of his firing at 2:00 PM on March 4, 1994.

Donny Bergeron, customer service representative. He had resigned effective March 8, 1994, but he was moved up to March 4, 1994 by the administration.

Jim Sawyer, customer service representative. He was yelled at by a supervisor, Terrell B., for discussing the day's mass firings. He quit in protest the same day.

B. G. O. and Steven Ross, they were demoted from research assistant positions in research and executive departments to positions in correspondence processing in March of 1994.

Ellen Grisby, she was demoted from the position as Hank Hanegraaff's executive secretary to department representative in March of 1994.

Robert Lyle, the vice president for research. He was fired 3 days after the mass firings of March 4, 1994.

Naomi Merchant, she was executive assistant to the president but due to demotion of Grisby, she was given extra work. She quit in April of 1994.

These type of magnitude of firings and demotions were unprecedented under Walter Martin, however, even in the first few weeks and months as we have just seen with the compiled list of former employees after Hank Hanegraaff took over, many employees began to see financial abuse in an incredible heavy-handed approach in the misuse of power. Both are indicative of a person who was not called to Christian ministry but saw CRI and ?? as a fantastic opportunity to create his own personal fiefdom.

There seems to be another motive for getting rid of most of the research staff. At the time Hank Hanegraaff became president, researchers were required to have a minimum of a 4 year degree. Since Hanegraaff had never finished his degree at Calvin College, he may have felt threatened by their combined knowledge of world religions, cults and apologetics. Knowing he had nowhere near the grasp of information that the president of the largest cult apologetics ministry would need to be considered competent. Since he took the reins of power in such an unethical manner, it appears he may have begun to entertain the notion that some of that would begin to identify his vast reservoir of ignorance and plan their own coup. His statement to Craig Nelson in early February, 1990 concerning Craig Hawkins, quote, "Craig Hawkins is a wolf in sheep's clothing. He's power hungry," bears this out.

His former paranoia is indicative of a man who has a guilty conscience. He assumes others will do to him what he knows he has already done. Hank Hanegraaff will probably claim that with any change of leadership you will see a change in personnel. While this is true, in an organization like CRI whose very reason for being is to inform others concerning the cults and how to respond in love to this large mission field, it would be ineffective if you strip it of its most experienced and gifted researchers. It would be like the new president of a software company on his first day firing everyone who worked in the plant that bottled the beverage; he would severely impair his company from providing the product for which it exists. A good president would find creative ways to work with the talent and keep them happy so they would continue to work for which the organization is known. Rather what CRI was saddled with was a petulant immature president who was still controlled by his most irrational hunger for wealth and self-aggrandizement.

During the first few months and after the wave of firings began, many employees wrote heart-felt letters to the CRI board asking for help and intervention. The following are excerpts from 3 of the letters that were written expressing their deep concern for what was happening at CRI.

The first letter is from Dan Slazenger, former research coordinator. Now these are excerpts of his letter.

"As I stated above, I felt the position of CRI research department coordinator, I held a position of research department coordinator previous to my departing CRI. Given the fact that I held a responsible position at CRI and not wanting to perpetuate rumor or misinformation regarding Hank's position or agenda, I refrain from addressing questions or giving my own personal opinions to those coming to me with concerns, however, questions kept coming from individuals pulling me aside or coming to my office regarding Hank's qualifications, etc. After several weeks of this, I began to see there was much greater concern on all levels of ministry, never mind my own personal questions and opinions than I first suspected.

The executive committee, Elliott Miller, Rich Paul, and Paul Cardin, advised me to go directly to Hank and share with him all that had happened the previous couple of weeks. I immediately went to Hank and June Huckabee was there also. I began to share the aforementioned concerns. Hank got very upset, raising his voice at me, asking what right I had to question his credentials. He then questioned my background in education, though at the time I had a Master's degree, and insisted he could debate with the best there was on the subject of creation and evolution and other issues, and that he had memorized all of Walter Martin's tapes and read over 16 books on the New Age Movement.

When questioning his lack of formal education, Hank responded by saying I was arrogant and prideful to even bring up the subject. Hank then insisted that I name the individuals who raised questions and other concerns. I felt uncomfortable in doing so and asked that they remain unknown until a later date. Hank insisted that I name names and so I gave him an example regarding one individual sharing briefly his concern. I realize now I probably should not have mentioned this person, but as was the case in most instances, Hank had a rather forceful and manipulative way of getting what he wanted.

After an hour or so, Hank asked me to leave and said that he would call me back to his office later that morning. Once again, about mid-afternoon of the same day, I was called back into Hank's office. This time he told that several individuals recommended dismissing me because of my attitude problems. Hank told me that he was told that I had a long history of divisiveness and failed to submit to those whom I was accountable to. In spite of all of these allegations, Hank stated he was willing to give me another chance to work it out and, therefore, allowed me to continue on with CRI.

After a couple of hours or so, Hank was interrupted by a phone call regarding his seminar tapes. He got up and left to take care of his business and finally came back to the meeting. He immediately stated that it would be to the best interest of CRI and for me to part company and go on my way. I broke down and cried. He said he would do anything he could to make my departure smooth and painless as possible and that he would be more than happy to write me a letter of recommendation. I was told I could pick up my books and other belongings later, not at that time. I left CRI that day devastated.

From the first time I came, I was made aware of Hank Hanegraaff's possible involvement with CRI. I had personal reservations whether it would be to the best interest of CRI to bring him on except in an executive administrative capacity. It had been communicated to the research staff that he would function in this role, however, after Hank shared his own objectives in a company meeting, it became quite clear that he was going to integrate his own ministry, PWT, with CRI's ministry. At first, it seemed there might be some merit to what he was saying, however, in reality what he was really saying was CRI would become his ministry. Indeed, since Dr. Martin's untimely death, that's exactly what has happened, what it has become.

Hank has no formal education. One would think that a person holding the position of president of an apologetic and countercult ministry would possess at least a BA or MA degree in a field relevant to CRI's area of

ministry. Though many in the research department hold BA or MA degrees, the credibility both academic and spiritual of CRI suffers when its own president and leader lacks any formal education. This leads me to my second point: Hank's depth of knowledge to include his critical thinking abilities on the cults, the occult, apologetics and theology is lacking. This is evidenced by statements he has made to the research staff as well as on the radio program on BAM. Hank's burden calling to reach cultists for Christ as I understand Hank's background, he has primarily developed a ministry who teaches people how to memorize basic information related to the Bible.

To my knowledge, he has never been interested in countercult studies, at least on a level that Dr. Martin and the CRI staff have been. What has his personal experience been with reaching out to cults and the occult before coming to CRI, moreover what has his burden been particularly as it relates to the ministry of CRI? Those of us on the research staff have years of countercult apologetics ministry before coming to CRI based on a special burden and calling to reach those lost in the cults for Jesus Christ.

Hank consistently demonstrates conduct unbecoming Christian leadership. When confronted by concerns, questions or comments regarding his credentials or decision making, Hank exhibits anger, verbal outbursts, endless self-defense, manipulation of others' words and self-aggrandizement. These are not marks or characteristics of sensitive, humble, Christian leaders. Hank's ego building and self-serving motives are spiritually unhealthy to a ministry which prides itself on doctrinal and spiritual discernment. Need I say more on this?

Hank Hanegraaff is not an apologist, theologian, nor an expert on the cults or the occult. Hank Hanegraaff in my opinion is a lay evangelist pretending to be what he is not. He should be exercising those gifts God has bestowed on him in his respective ministry or field of ministry. Hank Hanegraaff needs to be removed from the ministry of CRI. He should not be allowed to pontificate on matters of faith or doctrine as he is clearly unqualified to do so, neither should he be allowed to perpetuate the wrongdoing he has brought on many others since my departure."

The next letter, an excerpt from Richard B., who worked in the shipping department.

"I have worked at CRI in the shipping department since September of 1989. During this time of 9 months, I have never been reprimanded in any way by the administration so I am not seeking revenge by saying that Hank Hanegraaff is unfit spiritually and emotionally to be president of CRI. I base this accusation primarily not solely on the evidence which suggests that Hank Hanegraaff may be consumed with the love of money.

Hank has been and is concurrently using CRI for his own personal gain. He does this by using CRI as a means of advertisement and distribution of "Personal Witness Training, Memory Dynamics" materials.

I have personally been involved with Hank's PWT seminars as worship leader but must now refrain from any further involvement. Hank has used CRI to purchase a large quantity of PWT materials irregardless of the small amount of orders for them that we receive. This is the most unethical action I have personally seen. My knowledge of it began with the writing of a purchase order #3696. On PO 3696, you will see 50 manuals and 50 tapes PWT/001. Ordered at the bottom you will see 50 manuals and 50 tapes PWT/001 to be ordered at a later date. This second order is not based on need as a result of sales. The second order will be made only because of pressure exerted by Hank, Cathy and Jane Huckabee on our shipping department head, Mary Cook, whose job is to decide what and how much we order.

I am foreman of shipping and know our stock needs. We do not need more PWT materials, we can't even sell what we've stocked. We have received very few orders for PWT materials. Jane demanded we order a 100 PWT/001 bringing the total PO bill to approximately \$6,000 and promised Cathy H full payment before we ever received stock. Jane and Hank because of their position at CRI can tell CRI what to buy from PWT/MD. This may not be illegal but perhaps is unethical especially in a Christian ministry where funds are so precious.

I told Hank many employees were becoming despondent. I said, 'Hank, you can't run a ministry like a business,' to which he said, 'You're wrong,' and accused me of overspiritualizing the situation.

Finally, the most painful occurrence at CRI has been the mass exodus of godly employees who truly love CRI. Many left frustrated, spiritually drained and bitter, and now there is an overall feeling of fear, distrust and darkness each day at the ministry. I love Hank and Jane and Scott as part of my family in Christ but I can no longer stand by and watch power be used in such an unrighteous and insensitive way.

The broken hearts of employees and my own personal experiences, letters from supporters and the Holy Spirit in prayer bring me to this conclusion that Hank Hanegraaff should be removed as president of CRI. The reality of the situation at CRI is painfully obvious to anyone who has eyes to see."

This next letter is an excerpt from Michael Stevens. He was a former director of broadcast media. This is what he says.

"Within a few short months after Craig Hawkins departed the ministry, Hank decided to go on and host a live broadcast daily instead of just on Wednesdays. This was shortly after he told me personally that when he would listen to the Bible Answer Man hosted by Paul Cardin, Rob Bowman, Ken Samples, et al, he realized that he could answer 9 of every 10 questions that he would hear on the show. This comment made me very nervous as I know what it is like dealing with everything from alleged contradictions to logic to different theological viewpoints to cultists knowing how to manipulate Scripture, but sure enough, Hank was so confident that everything could easily be handled by giving a bottom line response or a pat answer of some sort.

Never did a BAM broadcast go by without Hank rewording a caller's question to enable himself to answer the reworded question. Hank would usually ask, 'Does that help?' or something along those lines and the response by the caller was often something like, 'Well, actually,' to which Hank would say, 'Well, stay on the line and we'll send you out some information,' and not ever really answer the question probably due to ignorance. I still listen to the broadcast almost on a daily basis since KWVE 107.9 FM where I now work carries it. Sure enough, this pattern has not changed at all, in fact it has worsened, in my opinion.

There was also 2 other unfortunate things that happened on the Bible Answer Man program quite regularly. The first is this: Hank would walk into the studio, briefly scan the pre-screen caller sheets and then scramble to work to find a quick fix answer. Sometimes he would ask Ron Rhodes or Bob Lyle what this word meant or what this cult believes. Some of the questions to which Hank had no answer were frighteningly simple. I must say that he didn't always do this. The sad fact is that when he didn't, the answer would often be wrong.

The other occurrence which was particularly disturbing was when Bob Lyle or Irwin D. or someone was assigned to watch to watch pre-screen caller sheets and provide written responses for Hank to read on the air, sometimes it was a CRI Perspective which someone else wrote, sometimes it was a CRI drawer item or statement, sometimes it was something scribbled by hand. He was able to develop a technique which he would purposely stumble every few words to give the allusion that the answer was at the top of his head. He would often say, 'If my memory serves me correctly,' when citing a Scripture reference or a date or a name or something when he was actually reading off the paper for the purpose of convincing the audience that his answers were truly from memory.

This happened daily. I even have plenty of witnesses to this fact who still work there. This is not the Bible Answer Man in the true sense of the word. The true Bible Answer Man should be a man who knows the

answers from the Bible, but none was more embarrassing than when lay Mormon, Richard Hopkins, turned Hank into a theological pretzel while standing in the hallway of CRI after debating Robert Morey. Here was Hank Hanegraaff, president of the largest evangelical countercult ministry on earth, being led around on a leash by some self-proclaimed elitist apologist who doesn't even do this sort of thing full time.

One example, while speaking of Colossians 1:15 and 16, among those who deny the deity of Christ, Hank boasted with much arrogance to Mr. Hopkins that he had memorized the verse. Richard's very polite response was, 'Yes, I not only memorized the verse but I studied it in the Greek,' and then went on to prove his point. Once again, Hank was left speechless and at a loss of what to say, but sure enough, Hank, well, you know.

Another example of Hank's insecurity and immaturity was a time when he had Bob E. of the Religious Information Service in Long Beach, California as a guest on the Bible Answer Man program. Bob's forte is Iglesia ni Cristo, a growing Arian cult who originated in the Philippines. The focus on the broadcast was on this religious group but somehow Hank steered some of the callers' questions back to talking about the Word Faith Movement, his favorite subject.

I handed him a note during the program which suggested that he stick to the topic at hand and to keep his comments about Word Faith to a minimum. Little did I know this was a big mistake. After that day's broadcast, I noticed Hank stomp up to his office with a body language that resembled a spoiled little child who didn't get what he wanted. Concerned, I followed him up to his office and inquired about the apparent problem. Hank's response, 'Look, if you don't want me on the broadcast, just tell me. You and Craig Hawkins and everybody else are all alike. Hank, you don't know nothin' about no cults. Hank, you don't know theology. Hey, Mike, do what you want. Why don't ya just host the show yourself?' He said all this without ever looking me in the eye. I could not believe my eyes and ears.

Another such instance which surprised me was when Hank made a very unfavorable remark regarding the abilities of others on staff. When speaking on the topic of seminars, he stated with much confidence that he was the only person in the organization who could give a seminar. Having studied under the B.'s and been quite impressed with their teaching abilities, I was puzzled by this remark. I said, 'But what about Jerry and Marion?' Hank's response with a smirk, 'Let me say that again, I am the only one on staff who can give a decent seminar.'"

Now, at the end of these letters and we literally have a dozen or more of them, we saw many of these letters had similar type phrases in them.

Words like: paranoia, lover of money, arrogant, underqualified, uneducated, not called to this type of ministry, angry outbursts, manipulative. These were words repeated over and over in these letters. It just comes up regularly in all these letters from these former staff members who were concerned about Hanegraaff as the president of CRI.

Now these are obviously not words that you want identified with a Christian leader who is supposed to be humble and loving and giving as a Christian leader, but these are the words of a person who really has no place in Christian ministry. And besides the fact that this information should show you rather emphatically that Hank Hanegraaff had no place becoming the president of CRI, he was not hand-picked by Walter Martin in any sense of the term, but not only that, but since his becoming president in 1989, we have seen several scandals erupt at CRI. This one, the massive firings, problems with original staff that Martin had hired, this was a problem. Then the second scandal I want to highlight took place in the year 2002 when a young woman who worked in the correspondence area stumbled over some receipts that indicated that Hank Hanegraaff was being given gifts, financial monies towards personal purchases that had nothing to do with CRI. She began to stay late at night and actually photocopy these receipts that she kept coming in contact with and then she kept a list of them at her house, but she came across receipts in excess of tens of thousands of dollars. One was for flooring in excess of \$9,000 for the Hank Hanegraaff house. There were purchases of personal computers for his children. There was mention of a country club membership for Hank Hanegraaff that was paid for CRI with CRI funding. There is also the purchase of a \$60,000+ Lexus sports car that was given to Hank Hanegraaff. That's a luxury vehicle to be driven by him using CRI funds.

Now it wasn't until the LA Times and the Christianity Today newspaper or magazine broke these stories on a national level that Hanegraaff paid the money back and he referred to these as naive accounting errors, that they were just simply errors that were really not meant to have been performed but they were just accidents. I've always been interested in figuring out how do you accidentally go out and buy a \$60,000 sports car for the head of your ministry?

So that was a major scandal in 2002 that really showed that the financial ends of the ministry was really what Hanegraaff was trying to get out of CRI, and that he really really was not intending to be the minister of CRI the way that Walter Martin had intended to be the minister of CRI.

Now the final scandal that I just want to reference which was very interesting was in 2005 when a letter was reported on his website, a fundraising letter was reported on the CRI website written by Hank Hanegraaff about a supposed loss of mail that CRI, that had happened to

CRI because the post office had supposedly lost mail for up to 90 days and they needed to have an infusion of cash immediately because of this oversight by the US Post Office in Rancho Santa Margarita.

Here is an actual copy of the letter that was sent out to one of his supporters and this is what the letter actually said from Hank Hanegraaff.

"I never imagined having to send an urgent memo like this to you. A bizarre error by the US Post Office has cost the Christian Research Institute and Bible Answer Man broadcast an unknown amount of income at a time when we could least afford it. We don't know how much we lost but we know it was substantial, perhaps in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Here's what happened. Over the last 3 month, a time when our ministry receives 17% of its yearly income from supporters, newly hired US Post Office employees in Rancho Santa Margarita accidentally routed CRI envelopes with contributions and requests for materials to the wrong PO box. To make matters worse, the business to which the envelopes were sent, threw many of the envelopes into the trash. Only by God's grace did we discover this error before more damage was done. Praise God for his intervention!

Our local US Post Office has accepted full responsibility for this error and has fixed the problem. You can be assured that all mail is now being handled correctly. We bear them no ill will and believe this was an honest mistake by novice postal employees, but much has been lost. Here is what I'm asking you to do."

So then they go on and talk about how to replace the money. Now, I looked into this situation of this lost letter. I thought this was very odd when I first saw it on their website, and a friend of mine, Bill Alnor, also looked into it, and we actually both contacted the post office there in Rancho Santa Margarita independently of each other and I was told by the acting post office manager that they had never lost that quantity of mail that CRI had claimed. In fact, there was 30 pieces of mail that were delivered to a company called "On Target Marketing" in Southern California for one day that belonged to CRI, but that mail was promptly returned to CRI by "On Target Marketing," and that was the extent of the loss. There was no 90 day mail loss.

In fact, when I talked to the acting manager of the Rancho Santa Margarita Post Office, he said that we had never officially apologized to CRI because this mail had not been lost for 3 months, it had only been lost for about 1 day. There was only 30 pieces so there was no official apology. He didn't know what I was talking about, in fact, and there was a US

postal investigation that was instigated because of this supposed lost mail situation and the US Post Office investigatory branch, after looking into the process, found that there was never any lost mail that was caused by this problem at the post office and that CRI was never in any danger of losing 3 month's worth of contributions.

But again, this is just another financial problem that keeps coming up at CRI because Hank Hanegraaff really does not deserve to be the president. He was never meant to be the president and his need to squeeze money out of people, becoming an apparent problem which has really been going on over the last 9 or 10 years. But again, since his taking over in 1989, it's been shown clearly here that he has changed the vision of CRI. A lot of the things that we talked about Walter Martin being the president of the CRI journal, that's been taken out. The fact that you can barely even find any mention of him on his own website any longer, Walter Martin's website. The idea that even though he talked in glowing terms at his funeral, he no longer ever hardly mentions Walter Martin as the president of CRI.

So, again, we just see that Hank Hanegraaff never really was intended to be the president of CRI. These scandals kind of show the true heart of the man. He really does not belong at the helm of this ministry. And I would ask two things of people who listen to this broadcast. If you are currently supporting CRI financially, I would ask that you stop doing so until the administration of that organization changes to a more godly administration because the more money that's poured into CRI, the longer it's going to take for the administrative change to take place, if at all. Now if you want to give to another Christian countercult ministry, there are many good ministries out there that are in desperate need of your money.

Secondly, I would also state that if you are currently writing for CRI Journal or helping them with some of their publications as a paid individual for this, that you discontinue writing for them because you're just, again, further giving them credibility in this area, and since they don't have their own people to write any longer except for Elliot Miller and Hank Hanegraaff, it really would help if they had less writers to choose from because it will, again, further erode their ability to do their job under the Hank Hanegraaff administration.

These two things need to be implemented immediately to help this ministry overcome because we don't want to see the Christian Research Institute cease to exist as an organization, what we need to see is the corrupted administration of Hank Hanegraaff taken out and a godly administration put in its place so that CRI can again go back to being what Walter Martin, the founder, had intended, a ministry that not only helps build a church's ability to combat false doctrines and false teachings, but

be able to more effectively share the good news of the Gospel with those individuals who are lost to the kingdom of the cults and the occult and this is what we hopefully, this presentation will aid you in doing, giving you a better sense of how to help CRI become the ministry that it was always intended to be.

Thank you.

Larry. If we as mortal men can find all this dirt on Hanegraaff, what is God going to do to him on judgment day? Jesus said few would be saved, that's in Matthew 7:14, and claiming to be a Christian with many wonderful works is not a guarantee of salvation, that's Matthew 7:22-23. Hanegraaff is in this ministry he does for the money he can make. See 1 Timothy 3:3 and also 1 Timothy 6:10, etc. Hanegraaff's love for money throughout his life is undeniable as well as his lack of love for the brethren, 1 John 3:14. 1 Corinthians 2:15 says, "But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." Jesus said, "Ye shall know them by their fruits," Matthew 7:16.

Hanegraaff clearly looks like a fake Christian to me and a fake Bible Answer Man. Proverbs 6:16-19 looks like a better description of Hanegraaff. "There are six things that the LORD hates, seven that are an abomination to him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked plans, feet that make haste to run to evil, a false witness who breathes out lies, and one who sows discord among brothers."

For someone who is supposed to be running a discernment ministry, Hanegraaff shows a complete lack of discernment. As researcher Jay Howard has already reported, Hanegraaff was brought into the ministry not for his Christian apologetic abilities but for his ability to raise money for the ministry and as mentioned, his car chauffeuring and taxi services to drive Walter Martin around. Thus I believe it is safe to say that Hanegraaff has been lying to the public during the entire time being the hand-picked successor of Walter Martin. Of course, we know liars are condemned in Revelation 22:15, "Outside are the dogs and the sorcerers and the immoral persons and the murderers and the idolaters, and everyone who loves and practices lying."

Hanegraaff has proven to be an unrepentant deceptive liar over many decades thus demonstrating he is a fake Christian, an unregenerate sinner, and a wolf in sheep's clothing. Matthew 7:15, "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

If you like our YouTube channel, please subscribe by clicking on the subscribe button and then by also clicking the bell above to get an automatic update whenever we produce another YouTube video for our CAnswers TV channel. Please share our videos with your friends and relatives. May God bless you. Only one life will soon be passed, only what is done for Christ will last. See related videos by tapping or clicking screens.