

**FALSE TEACHINGS AND FALSE ACCUSATIONS OF
LEONARD SWEET AND RANDY WOODLEY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION TO RESPONSE TO DEAN OF GEORGE FOX
UNIVERSITY**

LEONARD SWEET / RICK WARREN UNHOLY ALLIANCE

THE LIGHT THAT IS IN MOHAMMED IS DARKNESS

LEONARD SWEET CONTRADICTS HIMSELF

**GEORGE FOX PROFESSOR RANDY WOODLEY SLANDERS
GOOD BEREANS**

**LEONARD SWEET DISCIPLE PETER VEYSIE DOES NOT
BELIEVE CHRISTIANITY IS EXCLUSIVE**

WHAT IS LOVE?

IT ALL DEPENDS ON WHAT THE DEFINITION OF HERETIC IS

SUBJECTIVE VS. OBJECTIVE TRUTH

**LEONARD SWEET PROMOTES ANOTHER JESUS, ANOTHER
GOSPEL AND ANOTHER HOLY SPIRIT,
EVOLUTIONIST**

EVOLUTION TO THE RESCUE OF CHRISTIANITY

**WHOM SWEET PROMOTES VS. THE APOSTLE PAUL'S
RESPONSE**

WHAT'S IN STORE FOR RICK WARREN AND LEONARD SWEET OPPONENTS

MARGINAL POINTS ARE CENTRAL PILLARS OF DOCTRINE?

LEONARD SWEET DISCIPLE OF CARL JUNG DISCIPLE

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY, MULTNOMAH UNIVERSITY AND LEONARD SWEET NEVER ANSWER THE QUESTIONS OR REFUTE CHARGES

BE SURE TO BE HOSPITABLE TO DOCTRINES OF DEMONS THAT ENTER YOUR HOUSE?

JOB'S FRIENDS OR GOOD BEREANS?

HIPPIE THEOLOGY AND BOB DYLAN'S THEME SONG FOR LEONARD SWEET'S NEW REFORMATION

BOB DYLAN & LEONARD SWEET'S "TIMES THEY ARE A CHANGIN'" & THE VINEYARD

WHO IS LEONARD SWEET'S PASTOR AND WHERE IS HIS LOCAL CHURCH?

SHIRLEY MACLAINE OR LEONARD SWEET? MORE RESOURCES

CONCLUSION

ORIGINAL LETTER TO GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION REGARDING LEONARD SWEET

June 4, 2010

Dear Vice President & Dean of George Fox University and Seminary: Chuck Conniry,

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your response to my warning letter to George Fox University regarding Leonard Sweet, distinguished visiting professor at your school. I appreciate your measure of kindness and use of Scripture to attempt defend your friend Leonard Sweet. I commend you for that. Having read your response to me, it is almost as though you have obscured if not obliterated the role of watchman on the wall. To to a great extent you quote Scriptures which are certainly true in general for all Christians, but I can't see how the Scriptures you quote specifically refute any of my charges or any charges against Leonard Sweet by myself, Richard Bennett (Berean Beacon), Ken Silva of Apprising Ministries, Warren Smith, Roger Oakland, Deborah Dombrowski of Lighthouse Trails, or Sandy Simpson of Apologetics Coordination Team. In your response, this is what you should be addressing. All of our charges are simply comparing line by line and precept upon precept Leonard Sweet's own published teachings directly with Scripture, exactly what Scripture commands us to do.

The following expose on Leonard Sweet should have been written years ago when I first learned of his collaboration with Rick Warren in 1995 Tide of Change project. I am grateful and indebted to those above named good Bereans and Biblical scholars all of whom I know well, and others, who have preceded me in telling the truth about Leonard Sweet. I should also point out that most of these

online discernment ministries are not just “online” on the Internet, but have written books exposing these false teachers...many have written two or more books. In any case, ODM is a perfectly noble and biblically legitimate calling and discernment of spirits is a Gift of the Holy Spirit. But the letters ODM could just as easily be invoked to describe Sweet and Emerging Church as Online Deception Ministries. But I could remain silent no longer in the face of iniquity when Leonard Sweet writes his own attack accusing good Bereans of bearing false witness against him. If he is going to attack online discernment ministries, that he labels ODM, he should at least have the courage to name names, as the Apostle Paul would require. If it is us that are bearing false witness against Leonard Sweet, then Leonard Sweet needs to prove it and if we don't repent, he should name names and tell our pastors in order to warn our church. I would be happy to tell him who our pastors are and where they are (something he is unwilling to do). But I know who these so called slanderers are, and I am compelled to defend these good brothers and sisters in Christ who have been maligned by Leonard Sweet and his defenders. The Apostle Paul does not warn us about “seducing spirits” in I Timothy 4:1, for nothing, for the reason they are seducing is that they are Leonard Sweet to the taste, but poison in the end for the individual believer as well as the church.

Therefore, I have these things against thee and Leonard Sweet which must stand. I will respond as to why you are clearly in the wrong, as the Apostle Paul would say. I also find it shockingly ironic that Leonard Sweet defender **Michael Newnham aka Phoenix Preacher** would accuse ODM Christians of Inquisition tactics (see: <http://phoenixpreacher.net/?p=1652>), when in fact it is Sweet, Warren, and host of Emerging Church leaders who promote mystic Ignatius Loyola, the head of the gestapo of the Jesuit Order who

launched The Inquisition that tortured and burned at the stake close to a million true Christian martyrs and defenders of the faith against Roman Catholicism...the real heretics.

Before I respond point by point to your defense of Leonard Sweet, I would first like to add a few more comments that need to be said.

LEONARD SWEET / RICK WARREN UNHOLY ALLIANCE

1. Even if Leonard Sweet could somehow be defended biblically, his alliance with Rick Warren alone would completely disqualify him as minister of righteousness. Rick Warren is a destroyer of the brethren. Who is going to pick up the pieces of the dismembered bloodied saints left in the wake of the Warren's Purpose Driven propeller that have been driven out of their churches because they refuse to comply with his Global Peace Plan agenda?

THE LIGHT THAT IS IN MOHAMMED IS DARKNESS

2. If Leonard Sweet claims to be a Christian, then he must mark and clearly label Mohammad as a false teacher. But as a Christian leader, author and speaker, he has an even higher accountability to publicly mark and expose Mohammad as both a false teacher and pillager of multitudes of Jews and saints as well as publicly state that Islam is a false religion and Mohammad an antichrist (though not the antichrist). You should both know that the Apostle John identified anyone who does not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is antichrist. Islam's own Scriptures make it clear that they preach another Jesus. Leonard Sweets published teaching that:

"the union of the human with the divine" which is the "center feature of all the world's religions" (Quantum Spirituality, p. 235). He says it was experienced by Mohammed, Moses, and Krishna. Some of the "New Light leaders" that have led him into this new thinking are Matthew Fox, M. Scott Peck, Willis Harman, and Ken Wilber, all of whom believe in the divinity of man, plus the Catholic-Buddhist monk Thomas Merton. Sweet says humanity needs to learn the truth of Merton's words, "We are already one" (Quantum Spirituality, p. 13)." SOURCE: Friday Church News Notes, April 2, 2010, www.wayoflife.org fbns@wayoflife.org, 866-295-4143)

Therefore it must be concluded that the only light that Mohammad had was darkness. As Jesus said in Luke:

"Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness." Luke 11:35

Furthermore, in addition to Islam promoting another gospel and another Jesus, they promote another holy spirit. Islam teaches that Mohammad was the promised Comforter prophesied by Jesus not the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. So for Leonard Sweet to give any credence to "new light" that is somehow divine in Mohammad is an abomination if not coming very close to blaspheming the Holy Spirit. Sweet's version of light in Mohammad could only strengthen their false view and identity of the Holy Spirit. In this regard, I invite you all to read a former Muslims Palestinian terrorist's commentary on the identity of the Holy Spirit in response to a Muslim:

Dear Ali,

The Holy Spirit in the Bible is not Ahmad as Islam claims, please see the Greek. There is no mention of Muhammad in the Bible.

But since you brought up the Holy Spirit, let me ask you the following: On the one hand, Islam claims that the “Holy Spirit” is not God, on the other hand, it accuses Christians of heresy for claiming that the Holy Spirit is God, yet Islam claims: “Whoever says it [the Holy Spirit] is created (makhluk) is a heretic...” (Ibn Hanbal).

A major dilemma in Islam is that if indeed this Holy Spirit is God, then Islam would have confessed a similarity to Christianity by admitting one of the Godhead of the Trinity. This would be an anathema since Islam is vehemently anti-Trinity.

John of Damascus appropriately challenges Islam: “if Christians are accused by Muslims to have Shirk (associating “partners” with God) then, according to the Qur’an, Muslims should be accused of mutilating God by separating Him from His Word and His Spirit.” This challenge still stands today.

If the Holy Spirit in Islam is an angel, the Bible describes Lucifer as an angel of light proclaiming himself as god. This deification of an angel is not absent from Islam even though Muslims deny this—most are unaware of it—the function of this angelic “Holy Spirit” in Islam is not some small function

—for Islam ascribes to him attributes and acts exclusive to deity. This angel in the Qur'an is even involved in all creation by breathing life into the mother's womb: "But he fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him something of his Spirit. And he gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and feeling (and understanding): little thanks do ye give" (Qur'an, 32:9). "When I have fashioned him [Adam] (in due proportion) and breathed into him of *My Spirit* [Holy Spirit] fall ye down in obeisance unto him" (Qur'an, 38:72). "And (remember) her [Mary] who guarded her chastity: We breathed into her of *Our Spirit*, and made her and her son [Jesus] a sign for all peoples" (Qur'an, 21:91).

If this spirit was not claimed by Muslims to be God, how could it be involved in the act of creating, and how can a created being create?

It is no wonder why Islam is so vague in explaining this spirit angel that Allah kept his nature as a secret—a mystery Muslims need not to question. When Mohammed was asked to explain exactly this angel's true identity: "They will ask thee concerning the Spirit. Say: The Spirit is by command of my Lord, and of knowledge you have been shown but a little" (Qur'an 17:85).

Source: Walid Shoebat, shoebat.com

Walid clears up the confusion. Sweet compounds it. Sweet should be marking Mohammad as a false teacher and warning the saints that Islam is religion that devours the saints. So Sweet is more than a heretic he is a derelict watchman on the wall for not defending his students and churches from this false religion, let

alone glorifying Mohammad in churches or conferences where he speaks or in his writings.

Regarding Matthew Fox possessing this light according to Leonard Sweet, read what Renew America has to say about Matthew Fox:

Leonard Sweet, a founding father of the emerging church, was deeply influenced by Matthew Fox's book *The Cosmic Christ*. This is Fox's "gospel":

- "Mother earth" is being "crucified."
- The human psyche is being "resurrected" through mystical spirituality.
- The "cosmic christ" is healing "mother earth."
- The "messianic spirit" has come to transform mankind.
- All religions will become one, as their common roots in the "cosmic christ" are revealed.
- There will a one-world government, a utopia, and a sexual paradise on earth.

<http://www.renewamerica.com/analysis/hutchison/090518>

So Dr. Conniry, in standing with your friend Leonard Sweet, is this is what you believe? Is this the fruit of the spirit you describe?

LEONARD SWEET CONTRADICTS HIMSELF

3. Leonard Sweet protests that he says he is not divine, yet promotes and quotes one teacher after another that says we are. Have you publicly stated that Mohammed, Krishna, Matthew Fox (Universalist), Carl Jung, Thomas Merton, Barack Obama (who promotes Planned Parenthood infanticide and defiling the body which is the temple of the Holy Spirit), or Rick Warren are false teachers? Or do you stand with Leonard Sweet as does Jeremy Armstrong Managing Editor, Worship Leader Magazine? Whom have you or Leonard Sweet marked as false teachers or heretics?

GEORGE FOX PROFESSOR RANDY WOODLEY SLANDERS GOOD BEREANS

4. Randy Woodley, your colleague and professor at George Fox was both sarcastic and provided no proof of his own very unkind response to this letter where is he states:

"This would make a great advertisement for unbridled ignorance. May I use it in my classes?"

Here is the next correspondence from Randy Woodley to David Flang:

From: [Randy Woodley](#)

To: [Warneveryone](#)

Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 10:37 AM

Subject: Re: Dear professor Woodley

Dave,

I find it interesting that when fundamentalists make an argument they often attribute the judgement of un-christlike motives to their opponent but their own motives are always seen by themselves as "pure" and pointing out "truth." I consider my statement to be one of love in the same way Jesus pointed out the ignorance of the Pharisees, Paul pointed out the ignorance of the Judaizers and the Prophets in the Old Testament pointed out the ignorance of Israel. They were all in the realm of tough love. If you publish my original statement, you'll need to publish this as well. Now, if you wish to have a healthy debate on theology or history please let me know.

Do'hi ("Peace," in Cherokee)

Randy Woodley, Ph.D.

Distinguished Associate Professor of Faith and Culture,

George Fox University and Seminary

4024 N. College St.

Newberg, OR 97132

(503)554-8052

office@EaglesWingsMinistry.com

www.EaglesWingsMinistry.com

"It is not enough to undertake works of charity to alleviate the suffering of the poor; we must transform the structures that create this suffering." ~Archbishop Oscar Romero (1917 – 1980)

"...a concern arose to spend some time with the Indians, that I

might feel and understand their life and the spirit they live in, if haply I might receive some instruction from them, or they might be in any degree helped forward by my following the leadings of truth among them."-John Woolman (1720-1772)

On the Bible in Cherokee translation: "Well, it seems a good book - strange that the white people are no better, after having had it so long." -Chief Yonaguska (1759-1839)

Well Mr. Woodley disqualifies himself as a minister of righteousness on five grounds:

1. He promotes Roman Catholicism by citing Archbishop Oscar Romero.
2. Romero promoted Ignatius Loyola and his spiritual exercise which we exposed in the DVD and my written expose on Mystic Plague.
3. The Pharisees were hypocrites and the Judaizers were false teachers so Jesus Christ and Paul had ever reason to expose them and warn the saints. Judaizers tried to put the people back under the law, so Paul thrice cursed them in Galatians. Rick Warren, Sweet's collaborator puts Christians back under the bondage of the law with his enforced covenants. So it would be Sweet, Warren and Woodley that Jesus Christ would be castigating, not the Bereans who are simply the messengers who sought out Scripture to see if their teachings be true. So Woodley has it quite backwards. Woodley wants to debate, but we have already given him an open door to

debate the charges inviting and appealing to him to refute them from Scripture and reason from Scripture. To date he has done neither.

So we should no longer be debating Woodley since he won't repent upon a second warning and refuses correction, by publicly rebuking him and marking him. Woodley is the one displaying his ignorance of Scripture in full bloom. The Prophets of the OT teach exactly what we are teaching. The Israelites perished for lack of knowledge (ignorance) of Scripture, precisely what Woodley continues to exhibit. Woodley has still failed abysmally to refute a single charge any of us have made with Scripture from against Leonard Sweet.

But he certainly has made a great case against himself, setting a snare that he himself gets caught in, so we will be happy to comply with his wish to publish his latest retaliation as well and include it in the full report on Leonard Sweet and his defenders and collaborators.

Woodley has no problem dishing out "tough love" but can't take it himself.

4. He promotes Liberation Theology another false gospel which pits rich and against poor, white men against black, red vs. white, male vs. female. Even Leonard Sweet opposes Liberation Theology in his critique of Brian McClaren and other Emergent Leaders in his response to Online Discernment Ministries (see: <http://www.leonardsweet.com/response.php>). But this is hypocritical of Sweet, in light of the fact that his Drew Seminary brought in Rev. Wright, Obama's former pastor as a speaker in Spring 2010, a major player in Black Liberation Theology. Here is Leonard Sweet's Drew University Spring 2010 newsletter extolling the virtues of Romero and Rev. Wright:

<http://www.drew.edu/newspost.aspx?id=77940> .

And why is Woodley bringing up Oscar Romero? I wondered why in the world Woodley would introduce Liberation Theology into this conversation, given that we hadn't even been discussing it. Then I discovered that Drew University, where Leonard Sweet is a professor, was promoting both Romero and Rev. Wright in their "god-talk" courses which I read online where they are extolled and not exposed...virtually no disclaimers or warnings about them.

Romero was a major ringleader of Liberation Theology (in spite of his denials), as is Rev. Wright (Black Liberation Theology), Obama's former pastor, and now Obama himself. It is Marxist to the core but clothed in the scarlet garments of Roman Catholicism in the name of Jesus. Woodley has not reasoned from Scripture, but Ron Rhodes has in this demolition of Liberation Theology:

**"Christian Revolution in Latin America:
The Changing Face of Liberation Theology"**

<http://home.earthlink.net/~ronrhodes/Liberation.html>

as has Dr. Anthony Bradley in his article proving that Liberation Theology is religion of victims..written by a black man [Anthony B. Bradley Ph.D.](#):

The Marxist Roots of Black Liberation Theology

http://www.acton.org/commentary/443_marxist_roots_of_black_liberation_theology.php

Liberation Theology helped pave the way for ECT (Evangelicals and Catholics Together) and Jim Wallis' Sojourner.

Our church has Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, Hispanics, Norwegians, white, black and everything in between...a preview of the Wedding Supper of the Lamb. Woodley and his role models polarize

differences instead of bringing unity in Christ and celebrating the diversity of nationalities and people groups...there is only one race...the human race.

5. **Woodley would uses the term "fundamentalist" derisively,** just like Rick Warren who calls fundamentalist Christian enemies of the 21st Century. So Warren, Sweet and Woodley make great bedfellows. Like Ken Silva, Apprising Ministries, and Richard Bennett, Berean Beacon (Richard knows more than anyone about false religions in Latin America, as that is where he spent most of his years as a Roan Catholic priest), I am not a fundamentalist in the denomination, but we are fundamentalists in that we believe in fundamentals in the 1920s declaration:

1. The Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ (John 1:1; John 20:28; Hebrews 1:8-9).

2. The Virgin Birth (Isaiah 7:14; Matthew 1:23; Luke 1:27).

3. The Blood Atonement (Acts 20:28; Romans 3:25, 5:9; Ephesians 1:7; Hebrews 9:12-14).

4. The Bodily Resurrection (Luke 24:36-46; 1 Corinthians 15:1-4, 15:14-15).

5. The inerrancy of the scriptures themselves (Psalms 12:6-7; Romans 15:4; 2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:20).

SOURCE: http://www.eaec.org/bibleanswers/Five_Fundamentals_of_the_Faith.pdf

Conclusion, Mr. Woodley could not have made a better case to alert true saints throughout the world to sound the alarm on His Holy Hill about Woodley, than Woodley himself. He is indicted by his own testimony. But it is good to know who the wolves in sheep's clothing are who masquerade as servants of righteousness. Woodley removed his own mask.

To date, Randy Woodley still has not provided a shred of evidence that I have borne false witness against Leonard Sweet nor a single Scripture to refute me or any other brother or sister in Christ that has confronted him or his teachings. For that matter Leonard Sweet has never responded to any of my emails to him. Ad hominem attacks are the last refuge for a person who can't attack the merit of an argument or provide any evidence, so they simply lash out.

LEONARD SWEET DISCIPLE PETER VEYSIE DOES NOT BELIEVE CHRISTIANITY IS EXCLUSIVE

5. Now let's look at a similar response to the very same letter from another Emerging Church leader who is supervised by Leonard Sweet in South Africa:

On May 24, 2010, at 2:55 AM, Peter Veysie wrote:

James - How on earth did you get my email address and what kind of idiot are you to belittle and judge another brother who is one who loves Jesus and is a major role model to me ???? – get a life bru as we say is South Africa !!!!!

Peter Veysie

Senior Pastor
Ridgeway Ministries.

RESPONSE TO PETER VEYSIE

Dear Peter Veysie,

Your email is public domain on the Internet. Your website is published by other websites and easy to find:

<http://www.ridgewayministries.co.za/who-we-are/team.html>

If you don't want to receive any emails that might disagree with you or any appeals from Christian victims, then you should state that on your website or wherever your email appears. I am preparing an answer for your questions and other responses I have received which I will send out to you and our media database. I think it is legitimate to ask if you believe so strongly in opposing ad hominem attacks on brothers in Christ, then why are you attacking me? It is also apparent from your email that you did not believe in exposing and opposing false teachers. And of course it is perfectly acceptable for Leonard Sweet to mock and belittle Online Discernment Ministries who are simply being good Bereans, obeying the Apostle Paul to study the Scriptures to see if these things (Sweet and Warren) are teaching be true.

Your response is very illuminating and will be very useful it helping us warn the rest of the body of Christ in South Africa and wherever else your name appears. It is indeed tragic that when pastors like you who are supposed to be watchmen on the wall no longer protect or warn the people but attack and

discredit those who are not derelict watchmen on the wall. I will be sure to warn and sound the alarm to the many ministries I know in South Africa and Africa about you. If it is true that your interview stating Christianity is not exclusive where you state: "The sad thing about Christianity often is exclusivity." Source: <http://www.discerningtheworld.com/2009/09/20/peter-veysie-from-ridgeway-ministries-trying-to-bridge-that-gap/#more-6279>, and that you promote the opposite of what Scripture states: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12, then you are a false brother and therefore NOT a Christian, and we are right in marking and exposing you and warning the Church that you are reprobate and apostate.

I am also confident that all of the church and Christians who have been dismembered and bludgeoned by Rick Warren's Global Peace Plan will be comforted by your response as well! Your response is quite typical of Purpose Driven Pastors against any "resisters" who are driven out of their churches.

Sincerely in Christ,

James Sundquist

Now I will respond to your letter with red-colored font.

On May 18, 2010, at 8:34 PM, Chuck Conniry wrote:

Dear James,

I've read through this email (and the ones that have followed up to this point).

I wonder if we can engage each other in the spirit of Christ's love. I pray so...

WHAT IS LOVE?

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

I pray the same. Is that what your Professor Randy Woodley did? Is that what Leonard Sweet did in his response to ODM ministries or when he contacted Lighthouse Trails, or his complete failure to ever respond to me? Is this the report you get back from churches hijacked by Rick Warren's Purpose-Driven Global Peace Plan? Where is the compassion from Leonard Sweet and Rick Warren for all of these victims and refugees? The Bible describes Christ's love as obedience to Christ's commands. Here is an example of the latest of what can happen to a church who will not change. This CBS News Story is the most recent in a parade of churches which have been hijacked in the name of Jesus. This story is about an seizure of a local Assemblies of God Church in the Bronx, NY near us. This denomination is among many which have been completely subsumed in Rick Warren's teachings (Leonard Sweet's collaborator):

“Watch this CBS news broadcast from NYC. They padlocked one of the largest AOG Churches in New York!

<http://wcbstv.com/video/?id=142451@wcbs.dayport.com>”

CHUCK CONNIRY:

Len Sweet is a close friend of mine, so it troubles me to see him accused of being a heretic. I know him to be a person of deep faith, with a strong commitment to Scripture.

IT ALL DEPENDS ON WHAT THE DEFINITION OF HERETIC IS

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

What should trouble you is not that someone calls him a heretic, but whether or not he is a heretic. If you are truly his friend then you would stop him from promoting false teachings and teaching at your a University. "The wounds of a friend are better than the kisses of the enemy." Mormon and Jehovah's Witness and Roman Catholics (whom Sweet and Rick Warren extol) also claim commitment to Scripture. I know many Catholics who are friendly. But are we truly their friend if we do not tell them the truth that their religions are false? I am sure Paul was a friend of Peter's. But that did not stop him from confronting him and opposing him publicly to his face.

CHUCK CONNIRY:

Our differences, James, are based largely on interpretation. I do not question your love for Jesus Christ...and I hope you do not doubt my love for him.

SUBJECTIVE VS. OBJECTIVE TRUTH

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

So weren't the Judaizers differences with the Apostle Paul simply a matter of interpretation of Scripture? One as good as the next? Any interpretation wise in one own eyes is a valid as the next ? If that is true that subjective interpretation vs. objective interpretation is the standard, then no one could be called a false teacher. There could be no such thing as sound doctrine to refute anyone. If that is the case, then why did Paul curse them three times in Galatians?

After all many of them also would have claimed a religious zeal (as Paul even conceded) and commitment to Scripture. And doesn't Peter state that Scripture is not open to private interpretation?

2Pe 1:20 “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.”

Furthermore, in Sweet's case, it is not even often a matter of interpretation of Scripture but Sweet completely inventing and vain imagination what Scripture states. Now he plans to launch still another translation of the Bible. God help us if he infuses the ideas we quote into his translation.

As to whether or not I doubt your love for Jesus. I certainly pray that it is so. However, you systematically dismantle my confidence

because you of your indefensible statements defending Leonard Sweet. But Sweet is not the only false teacher you promote and finance at your University. Richard Foster and Dan Kimball are two others, to say nothing about the fact that you promote Psychology there

CHUCK CONNIRY:

The Apostle Paul's words come to mind: "Some, to be sure, are preaching Christ even from envy and strife, but some also from good will; the latter do it out of love, knowing that I am appointed for the defense of the gospel; the former proclaim Christ out of selfish ambition rather than from pure motives, thinking to cause me distress in my imprisonment. What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and in this I rejoice (Phil. 1:15-18a).

LEONARD SWEET PROMOTES ANOTHER JESUS, ANOTHER GOSPEL AND ANOTHER HOLY SPIRIT, EVOLUTIONIST

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

I am glad you cite Scripture. But first let me say that I never accused Leonard Sweet of preaching out of strife or envy or impure motives. But Sweet is preaching "another Jesus" (Christ) and another gospel. Paul would certainly not have countenanced that.

The key in that verse you quote is whether or not Christ is being preached. And even if by some herculean stretch, that Sweet is preaching Christ crucified and him only, the very term Christ-Consciousness and Cosmic Christ (Matthew Fox) are welcome buzz words used in the New Age which I well remember in my encounter with Theosophy and my discussion with my friend Warren Smith, a

former New Ager and author of can attest to in his book:
The Light That Was Dark: From the New Age to Amazing Grace
<http://www.newagetograce.com/books.htm>

Leonard Sweet extols Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. but here is some examples of what Chardin teaches:

What I am proposing to do is to narrow that gap between pantheism and Christianity by bringing out what one might call the Christian soul of pantheism or the pantheist aspect of Christianity.¹ **Pierre Teilhard de Chardin**

Now I realize that, on the model of the incarnate God whom Christianity reveals to me, I can be saved only by becoming one with the universe. Thereby, too, my deepest ‘pantheist’ aspirations are satisfied.² **Chardin**

I believe that the Messiah whom we await, whom we all without any doubt await, is the universal Christ; that is to say, the Christ of evolution.³ **Chardin**

“[Pierre Teilhard de Chardin] is twentieth-century Christianity’s major voice.”⁴ **Leonard Sweet**

1. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Christianity and Evolution* (Harcourt, 1969), p. 56
2. Ibid., p. 128.
3. Ibid., p. 95.
4. Leonard Sweet, *Quantum Spirituality*(Dayton, OH, Whaleprints, 1994), p. 106

Source: <http://www.lighthouse trailsresearch.com/blog/?p=4332>

Chardin was a Roman Catholic Jesuit. (Sweet is promoting at least three Jesuits philosophers). Jesuits were the gestapo of the Inquisition, responsible for genocide of death of millions of true Christian voices, confirmed by the very vows they had to take.

Chardin was also an evolutionist...the antithesis of Christianity:

"(Evolution) is a general postulate to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must henceforward bow and which they must satisfy in order to be thinkable and true. Chardin

Source: <http://www.icr.org/article/evolution-new-age/>

Chardin is completely wrong. It is not to Evolution we must bow. It is the name of Jesus that every knee must bow. Hear what Dr. Henry Morris, Founder and President Emeritus of Institute of Creation Research has to say about Chardin:

“Teilhard de Chardin, now considered in effect to be almost the "patron saint" of the New Age movement with his strong pantheistic evolutionism. Teilhard was involved in the controversial discoveries of both Piltdown Man and Peking Man.” <http://www.icr.org/article/evolution-pope/>

Piltdown Man and Peking Man were hoaxes. Now Leonard Sweet has joined the man-made global warming hoax..perhaps the greatest one of the 21st Century. Instead entertaining so-called man made global warming, Leonard Sweet and Rick Warren need to be warning about God-made global warming:

"The first angel sounded, and there followed hail and

fire mingled with blood, and they were cast upon the earth: and the third part of trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up." Revelation 8:7

“Evolution was, to all intents and purposes, Teilhard's "god," and his goal was globalism, a unified world government, culture, and religion, with all religions merged into one.”

Source: <http://www.icr.org/article/evolution-pope/>

For more information on the oxymoron of Creation Evolution, see my article:

University of Oregon: Friend of Darwin, Enemy of the Gospel:
<http://www.resistnet.com/forum/topics/university-of-oregon-friend-of>

The fact is that Chardin was not even a good Catholic for he was almost thrown out of the Jesuit Order because his bizarre view of original sin did not even comport with Roman Catholic doctrine. Ironically his belief in evolution paved the way for the Pope himself to embrace evolution. So for Leonard Sweet to say that Chardin is twentieth-century Christianity's major voice is an both untrue, absurd and an abomination. But he certainly would qualify as one of the 20th Century's greatest heretics! Why doesn't Sweet select a non-Roman Catholic Evangelical Orthodox Christian as the 20th century's major voice.

So, do you still stand with Sweet?

The Apostle Paul said:

1Cr 14:8 "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

The terms that Leonard Sweet uses are confusing at best and you know who the author of confusion is, I pray.

CHUCK CONNIRY:

What I appreciate about Paul's statement is the clarity with which he embraces his highest priority — the preaching of Christ. Elsewhere he writes, "For though I am free from all, I have made myself a servant to all, that I might win more of them. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though not being myself under the law) that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (not being outside the law of God but under the law of Christ) that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people, that by all means I might save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel, that I may share with them in its blessings" (1 Cor. 9:19-23).

WHOM SWEET PROMOTES VS. THE APOSTLE PAUL'S RESPONSE

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

Once again, I am glad you cite Scripture. But not once did Paul corrupt Christ's teachings to win the lost. Not once did Paul, or any other Apostle for that matter ever present the demon-possessed, the demonically-inspired, the atheist, the spiritists, the mystics, and the necromancers favorably to the people, as Leonard Sweet and Rick

Warren his collaborator and admirer have done. I should also point out that though Paul personally put himself temporarily under the law with a vow, he also eternally damned the Judaizers for compelling the Jews to be put under the law. And he demolishes the righteousness under the law in Romans. Paul did not become a Greek Philosopher in order to win the Greeks. He made it perfectly clear in his writings that Greek Philosophy was also a false religion. So would Paul become an evolutionist in order to save an evolutionist as Roman Catholics and much the liberal church has done?

CHUCK CONNIRY:

For his part, the Apostle Paul recognized the importance of contextualizing the gospel for each audience. He never compromised the essence of the gospel, but he freely nuanced the message in whatever ways he deemed necessary to connect with those who desperately needed the salvation offered through Jesus Christ alone. Paul tolerated (even celebrated) the preaching of Christ from those whose motives were less than pure. How much more would he have appreciated the preaching of Christ from pure hearts...even if those preachers and teachers ended up presenting the gospel in ways that he would have never imagined in his lifetime?

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

I was waiting for the term "contextualizing the gospel". This sounds like it is straight from Fuller Theological Seminary and fits right into Warren and Robert Schuller and Willowcreek methodology.

I invite you to read:

<http://apprising.org/2009/09/22/contextualization-or-removing-context-and-content/>

Once again you harp on motives...which I never addressed regarding Sweet. But in any case it is a straw man argument because it presumes the Christ is being preached in the first place.

CHUCK CONNIRY:

The Apostle John writes, “Anyone who claims to be in the light but hates his brother is still in the darkness. Whoever loves his brother lives in the light, and there is nothing in him to make him stumble.

But whoever hates his brother is in the darkness and walks around in the darkness; he does not know where he is going, because the darkness has blinded him” (1 John 2:9-11).

WHAT'S IN STORE FOR RICK WARREN AND LEONARD SWEET OPPONENTS

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

I certainly agree with this Scripture. But what did I write for you to suggest or imply that I hate my brother, particularly in light of the fact that you are confident that I love the Lord Jesus Christ? As Paul would say, "I am now therefore the enemy because I tell you the truth?" I am glad you quote John's Epistle, for one of them contain both the warning about antichrists as well as marking Diotrefes who did to Christians exactly what Rick Warren (Leonard Sweet collaborator) does and prescribes in his Purpose Driven Blueprints

for resisters and Fundamentalist Christians he calls enemies of the 21st Century. Where is the love of the brethren there? Was Paul unloving for marking Philetus and Hymenaeus? Was John unloving to mark and expose Diotrephes?

CHUCK CONNIRY:

It is easy to love those we deem loveable, either because we agree on every point of interpretation we see as fundamental to the faith or because we find the person generally likeable.

MARGINAL POINTS ARE CENTRAL PILLARS OF DOCTRINE?

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

I am not opposing Leonard Sweet for marginal points of interpretation, but for corrupting central pillars of the faith.

CHUCK CONNIRY:

One can live in the flesh and manage to do that. One can also live in the flesh and hate and anathematize those he or she finds unloveable for the same corresponding reasons. Those who claim to be followers of Christ sometimes do this — with a sense of self-absolution — by categorizing such people as heretics, even though the love of Christ is manifest in their lives, and the fruit of the Spirit is evident in abundant measure. None of that matters to those walking in this darkness. “Doctrinal purity is what matters,” they claim. “We must defend the Truth!” They forget that Jesus did not die for principles; he did not die for “truth.” Jesus died for lost people, which includes all of us (Rom. 3:23) — lost sheep upon

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

Doctrinal purity or sound doctrine is not my subjective opinion, it is what Scripture commands. If truth is that disposable then why did Paul say “I am now therefore the enemy because I tell you the truth”? And why did the Apostle John say:

“And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” John 8:32

“My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth.” I John 3:18

I exhort you to read Dr. John MacArthur's book:

[The Truth War: Fighting for Certainty in the Age of Uncertainty](#)

I don't know of any of the writers making charges against Leonard Sweet who are doing it for “self-absolution”. They are doing it because they are commanded to do so biblically, irrespective of how they personally feel about it. What part of Paul, Peter, Jude and John's words did you apparently miss in making that statement suggesting that we are not required to contend for the faith, expose the deeds of darkness, mark and expel false teachers and wolves in sheep's clothing from our midst? Were Paul, Peter, Jude and John doing so for self-absolution? You say that Leonard Sweet manifests the fruit of the spirit. But Jesus Christ says that it is what comes out of the mouth of man that defiles him. What comes out of the mouth of Leonard Sweet is his published teaching. False teaching can hardly qualify as fruit of the spirit. But it certainly would qualify as fruit of another spirit. A thorn bush can not produce figs. And if you are that concerned about the lost, then why would you stand by Leonard Sweet who promotes the lost? Why would you or Leonard

Sweet want to introduce the lost to another Jesus? Mohammed and Krishna are lost for Eternity, so what possible light could they have to offer has Mr. Sweet postulates?

CHUCK CONNIRY:

We demonstrate the truthfulness of the gospel by our love for one another (John 13:35; 17:22-23). When we show hatred and contempt toward one another...

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

Again you begin with a false or presumed premise that Leonard Sweet is even a brother in the first place. Why wouldn't you say these same things to Paul, Jude, Peter, and John, who named names?? I am simply agreeing with them and obeying what they commanded us to do with people like Leonard Sweet who is masquerading as a servant of righteousness. Jesus Christ himself even described many coming in his name but he responded with “depart from me you wicked and accursed, I never knew you.” So who was he talking about?

CHUCK CONNIRY:

each of whom claims faith in the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and who together trust in Jesus’ death on the cross as the atoning sacrifice for sin...and who share in the Blessed Hope of Christ’s return and the dawn of everlasting glory — we deny by those very actions the truth we claim to defend.

LEONARD SWEET DISCIPLE OF CARL JUNG DISCIPLE

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

The Apostle Peter agreed with all of these tenets of the faith too. Yet

Paul still publicly confronted him. The Roman Catholic Church would agree with those tenets, though redefining them, but it remains a false apostate religion of works and necromancy. If Leonard Sweet whom you stand with believes this, then why does he admire and promote **Joseph Campbell** and others who do NOT believe in the physical resurrection and ascension of Christ instead of marking them as false teachers? Here what Joseph Campbell has to say about Christ's physical ascension:

The Power of Myth, an outgrowth of the PBS series, he responds to Moyers with the following statements:

We know that Jesus could not have ascended to heaven because there is no physical heaven anywhere in the universe.

SOURCE: Campbell, J., with Moyers, B., *The Power of Myth*, Doubleday, New York, p. 56, 1988.

Joseph Campbell celebrates myth, the Apostle Paul demolishes the strongholds of myth. So why aren't you?

CHUCK CONNIRY:

Paul states that “God demonstrates his own love for us in this: While we were still sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:8). Then in the next two verses he adds, “Since we have now been justified by his blood, how much more shall we be saved from God’s wrath through him! For if, when we were God’s enemies, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son, how much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved through his life!” (vv. 9-10).

[GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY, MULTNOMAH UNIVERSITY](#)

AND LEONARD SWEET NEVER ANSWER THE QUESTIONS OR REFUTE CHARGES

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

You keep bringing out more Scripture which I heartily agree with. But how is this relevant to any of our charges against Leonard Sweet? I am still waiting for a single Scripture that refutes our charges. We all used Scripture as good Bereans to test the spirits and search them to find where in the world Leonard Sweet came up with his philosophy. Had you done so, you should agree. If you don't, then sadly you too become his accomplice.

CHUCK CONNIRY:

No matter how strenuously we try this side of eternity to get everything “right,” we won’t. But “walking in the light” is not sinless perfection, it speaks of the general tenor of one’s life — a life forever imperfect through its own efforts...but perfected by Jesus’ atonement (cf. Rom. 8:1-4; 1 John 1:5-10). If God loved us when we weren’t even trying, *how much more* shall we be saved from God’s wrath through Jesus’ atonement now!

To imitate God’s love is to give one another the benefit of the doubt and extend to each other the hospitality of open hearts and listening ears.

BE SURE TO BE HOSPITABLE TO DOCTRINES OF DEMONS THAT ENTER YOUR HOUSE?

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

NO IT DOESN'T. Paul warned us about heaping upon ourselves teachers with itching ears. We are not to even let them into our house, let alone our house of God, or pulpit or stumble the least of these my little children.

2Jo 1:10 If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into [your] house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.

Shouldn't we let them in...be more hospitable? After all none of us gets everything right. Paul should have left Peter alone, after all, look at all the good Peter had done. To imitate God's love, Paul should have given Peter the benefit of the doubt...cut him some slack, right? Of course not. If Paul spared not Peter, and God is not a respecter of persons, how much more should the benefit of the doubt not be given to a clearly false teacher that he might lead away that many more unsuspecting disciples.

CHUCK CONNIRY:

It also means erring on the side of mercy, as a matter of course, rather than judgment. As Scripture attests, “mercy triumphs over judgment” (James 2:13b).

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

But mercy is NEVER at the price of judgment. Jesus Christ certainly taught against hypocritical judging. But most of the New Testament is a blueprint for how to judge false teaching and what to do with false teachers. Without judging there would be no such thing as church discipline. Please cite one Scripture in which any Prophet of the Old Testament or Apostle in the New Testament in which they were merciful to a false teacher? Now certainly were they to have repented publicly, mercy would have been shown them. But we are never to remain silent in the face of iniquity. Where in Scripture do you find this advice as to how we are to imitate God's love? What manual of church discipline are you following?

CHUCK CONNIRY:

As Job sat amid his judgmental friends, who called into the question the veracity of his faith, he proclaimed, “But as for me, I know that my Redeemer lives, and he will stand upon the earth at last. And after my body has decayed, yet in my body I will see God!” (Job 19:25-26).

JOB'S FRIENDS OR GOOD BEREANS?

JAMES SUNDQUIST RESPONSE:

I am staggered that you would compare Leonard Sweet to Job. First of all, it assumes that Sweet is a Christian vs. a Christ-Consciousness or Cosmic Christ New Ager that promotes a trainload of false teachers. Secondly, it compares Job's friends to Good Bereans who are simply obeying Scripture...fatally flawed analogy. All of the Bereans who confronted Leonard Sweet in the articles I sent you and myself agree with Job's words and all sing “I know that my redeemer

lives” and I recorded a classical guitar instrument of that very hymn. We all side with Job. None of us would take Job's friends side. But Job would not side with Leonard Sweet, based on his teachings.

CHUCK CONNIRY:I stand alongside my friend, Len Sweet, and sing, “I know that my Redeemer lives....”

Faithfully,
Chuck Conniry
Charles J. Conniry, Jr., PhD
Vice President and Dean
George Fox Evangelical Seminary
George Fox University
12753 SW 68th Avenue
Portland, OR 97223
VOX: (503) 554-6152
FAX: (503) 554-6155

HIPPIE THEOLOGY AND BOB DYLAN'S THEME SONG FOR LEONARD SWEET'S NEW REFORMATION

JAMES SUNDQUIST:

If you stand with Leonard Sweet, then you are self-indicted and deceived and render yourself an accomplice. As Vice President and Dean of George Fox University and Seminary, you should be the chief of watchmen. When the watchmen are derelict on duty, who remains to guard the city? “When the foundations be destroyed what do the righteous do?” Worse your unholy alliance with him will continue to hurt him as well as students you subject to him.

You can not serve two masters. You seem so alarmed that I would call Leonard Sweet a “heretic”. I am only surprised that you are surprised. You should be disturbed that Sweet is a heretic not the messengers who rightfully point it out. “Heretic” means to cause division (from sound doctrine) which is precisely what Leonard Sweet has done and by changing the incorruptible Word into corruptible and warning us that we need to change according to Bob Dylan's song? Bob Dylan had a supposed temporary conversion to Christianity but was never a member of a local church let alone an elder in the faith, then toys with becoming a Lubavitch follower and financial supporter...a Jewish sect that promoted Rabbi Schneerson as the Messiah. So Bob Dylan, is now the leader and poster child of a new Reformation in Christianity and Leonard Sweet's billboard for change?! What an example! I am not sure which is worse: Leonard Sweet invoking Bob Dylan' song lyrics as a coat of arms symbol for his new religion or Rick Warren launching his Global Peace Plan with Jimmi Hendrix's song “Purple Rain”. By the way the Dylan's *Times They are a Changin'* was written BEFORE his conversion to Christianity as a counter-culture political protest statement. It was hippie theology at its finest, but hardly a template for a new Christian Reformation. I sure hope and pray Sweet does not blend this into his new Bible version.

But Leonard Sweet is not alone in touting the banner of Dylan's song to transform the church. North American Professors of Christian Education have done so in this article for their national convention:
DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL
MINISTRY LEADERS FOR A
CHANGING CHURCH

Kevin E. Lawson, Conference Vice-President

SOURCE: <http://www.napce.org/archives/NAPCESummer05.pdf>

BOB DYLAN & LEONARD SWEET'S
“TIMES THEY ARE A CHANGIN” &
THE VINEYARD

So what does Mr. Sweet hope we will do if we also take up Dylan's banner? Go to his church? Even when he was supposed to have become born again, I never saw him once at the Vineyard Fellowship at a church service. When did his profession of faith manifest itself in ongoing fellowship and praying with the brethren of this or any church? I know many brothers and sisters in Christ who did attend at that time who never saw him either which I can supply you as witnesses. Or would Mr. Sweet like us to attend his church, if indeed there is one near Madison, New Jersey, for you certainly can't easily locate it on any search on the Internet. He has written 30 books and 1200 sermons, many of which address the topic on how to do church and he taught seminars on the subject, yet where is his own local church? Wouldn't it be reasonable to expect to find some of those sermons online at his own church? I hope he not telling us how to do church then doesn't have one where he is a member and accountable. I had hoped to bring the evidence in this document to elders and members of his local church, but if it exists, it has been extremely difficult to track down. And since he is Professor of Evangelism at Drew University in Madison, New Jersey, I would think he would be eager to make it more apparent what local church he attends, so he could send those he has evangelized to, in order that they could be disciplined. If we take up Dylan's change banner, do we seek Dylan's counsel as an elder in the faith at his church or Sweet's? With the multitude of Godly counsel available out there, Dylan's “Times They are a Changin” is the best Sweet can come up with? If we are not lay hands on a man quickly (for Christian

leadership), why has Leonard Sweet picked a brand new Christian, who wrote his counsel BEFORE he was even a Christian? Is Leonard Sweet asking us to now take up the counsel of the ungodly? Then threaten us if we don't go along with Bob Dylan's recipe for change? Are there more instructions from Bob Dylan for Sweet's church revolution? Leonard Sweet—a so-called leader and expert in the field of ecclesiology gets his theology from a protest song? What other Kool-Aid has he been drinking? Are we going to take more spiritual direction from Leonard Sweet from still another famous song by Bob Dylan: “The answer my friend is blowin' in the wind”? Or are we going to get it from God's direct revelation of Scripture itself?

Regarding Bob Dylan's conversion and Vineyard Christian Fellowship connection. I attended it for years when Keith Green was there in the San Fernando Valley in California. He and a mutual friend Wendall Burton and others from the Hollywood Free Theater used to go out to Chino to minister and sing for the inmates in the prison there. Keith once asked me if he could play on piano on my record album Freedom Flight later released by Lamb & Lion Records. Keith wrote the Catholic Chronicles (available at:

<http://www.theboc.com/freestuff/keithgreen/catholicchronicles/index.html>

and would NEVER have countenanced Sweet's promotion and parade of Roman Catholic mystics and other Emerging leaders he cavorts with. Ask Melodie Green, Keith's wife at the time before his death at Last Days Ministries what Keith's view of Roman Catholicism was. Keith used to publicly in Vineyard meetings speak out against any false prophecies. So were Leonard Sweet or any

other Christian promoting Roman Catholics speak there, Keith Green would have never remained silent, but have opposed him face to face. I know, I was there and watched him do it in Burbank, California at the Vineyard on a Friday night. When Kenn Gulliksen was pastor of the Vineyard it was biblically solid before John Wimber took it off of the apostate cliff and introduced the Toronto Blessing. So Sweet would not have been allowed to speak at this Vineyard. What changes does Sweet have in mind in order to launch his New Reformation with

Dylan's “Times They Are a Changin” theme song? Here are those lyrics:

<http://www.metrolyrics.com/the-times-they-are-achangin-lyrics-bob-dylan.html>

An Christ crucified would be where in those lyrics? The Gospel would be where in those lyrics?

Where in the church would Leonard Sweet have us put those lyrics? In the prayer book? Add it to the rubric liturgy in the Methodist Church? All Purpose-Driven Churches? And what is there in Dylan's song that Sweet would have us change into, as there is certainly nothing evident in Dylan's song? Sweet and Rick Warren say this change will be enforced. But how do you enforce the change when we are not even told what change is written in Dylan's decree? If we don't change, does Sweet suggest a New Inquisition...follow in Loyola's example...another of his Jesuit role models? How does he plan to exercise church discipline to any Christians that oppose him or refuse to change. We certainly know what his collaborator Rick Warren does with “resisters” which I

document in my books on him and how he uses Dan Southerland's blueprints against Christians. These bludgeoned saints have no appeal process when they are driven out of their churches! And what if Purpose-Driven refugees are trying to get counsel or are trying to find a new church? They can't very well go to Leonard Sweet, because he has already thrown his lot in with Rick Warren. And even if people want to change voluntarily, we are still left clueless what the blueprint is we must comply with in Dylan's song. Christians and non-Christians should be concerned about the “change” described in the Bible not change described in Dylan's lyrics. The change being born again! The change that counts is becoming a New Creation. Once saved they should concern themselves with the “change” described in this Scripture when Christ physically returns in Glory:

1Cr 15:52 In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

Sweet's role models who possess the New Light such as Mohammad, Krishna, Thomas Merton and a host of others will not be changed into incorruptible bodies but will perish eternally in the Lake of Fire who are deceased. And those who are alive will suffer the same fate if they do not repent.

WHO IS LEONARD SWEET'S PASTOR AND WHERE IS HIS LOCAL CHURCH?

As if it is not enough of a problem to track down Bob Dylan's church, I found it virtually impossible to find Leonard Sweet's local Church or pastor, upon an exhaustive search on the Internet and

dialogue with his close friends and colleagues. Leonard Sweet offers no help. How bizarre is it that The Church Report states: “he was voted "One of the 50 Most Influential Christians in America" (www.thechurchreport.com)”, yet not report which local church he is in? Remember this is a “church report”. I even wrote a gentleman who is doing his doctoral dissertation under Leonard Sweet. He was very kind, but didn't know either. I asked the VP and Dean of George Fox where Sweet also teaches if he knew. He either doesn't know, or won't tell. I twice asked the bishops and UMC Church leaders of Northern New Jersey district and West Virginia Districts (Bishops Sudarshana Devadhar, Bishop Lyght, and Rev Paul Mathew Maliel, Rev Robert E Costello, Rev Renee L Mccleary and Rev Sung Hoon Ah) of the United Methodist Church who ordained him as well as his own booking agent. No response...totally stonewalled. This doesn't surprise me because the United Methodist Church promotes Yoga at its churches. They have become so apostate that you have to wonder if there is even such a thing as a false teacher to mark in this denomination. Is there any such thing a “unsound doctrine” with this organization? Leonard Sweet, who supposedly upholds church standards has made it almost impossible to carry out Matthew 18 should anyone have an offense against him. You could try to exercise Titus 3:15 to warn him and his local church, if indeed it even exists, or could find it, but his UMC denomination is in cahoots with him as are Drew University and George Fox University.

It is customary standard operating procedure for a church to obtain a letter of recommendation from the pastor of a church before inviting or a speaker to come to preach at your own church. The pulpit of a church is a sacred trust. It should never be surrendered without these kind of credentials. I used to tour in concert ministry for years

around the country. I was almost always, and rightfully so, asked as one of the first questions: “who is your pastor and where is the church that you are a member and accountable to?” I willingly provided a letter or immediately offered the name, local church, and telephone number. I asked for such a letter for Leonard Sweet's booking agency and received no response. I find this staggering. I invite you to do the same before you ever surrender the pulpit of your church or conference to Leonard Sweet. In fact you better do it if you want to protect your flock. Here is Leonard Sweet's Spirit Venture booking agency website and email:

http://www.leonardsweet.com/book_leonard.php

If Leonard Sweet is one of the top leaders in how to do church and leading expert on future of the church, there should be a host of Christians wanting to make pilgrimage to his church to witness first hand how it should be done. He writes a book entitled: *So Beautiful: Divine Design for Life and the Church.*, yet try to find his church!!! If Sweet has published hundreds of sermons, shouldn't we be able know where the church is where he has preached some of them? Is this an unreasonable request? The Apostle Paul certainly did not think so. Paul held the local church in the highest esteem and set forth standards for elders and deacons in the local church. Which of the qualifications of elder or even deacon, does Bob Dylan meet, for Sweet to take his instructions and counsel from his song to virtually name his campaign after his song? And where is the record of even Dylan himself knowing about this?

I would think Leonard Sweet would welcome all of those who want to learn how to do church better and make his local church location well known, like Rick Warren's church, or Pensacola Revival, or

Holy Bromption Church (Alpha Course) in the United Kingdom. I can't think of any pastor (true church or false church) that well known that doesn't make known where his church is located. It is all the more amazing, not to have it more publicly available, when how to do church is one's specialty. Like Obama, who doesn't have to produce a birth certificate to prove he is a natural born citizen, required by the U.S. Constitution to become President, Leonard Sweet can become one of the top leaders in post-modern church, but does not have to produce the identity of his own local church or pastor?

The Bible instructs us to submit to those in authority over us. Is Sweet telling us that we need to submit to the authority of Dylan's lyrics he cites? Since when does Sweet or Dylan speak authoritatively to Christians worldwide?

SHIRLEY MACLAINE OR LEONARD SWEET?
MORE RESOURCES...THE BEST ONES ARE LEONARD SWEET HIMSELF

If you still don't have enough published quotes by Leonard Sweet in his QUANTUM SPIRITUALITY book, to biblically mark him and separate from him, here is more evidence:

Unitary thinking, the highest level of understanding reality, opens us up to a wider sensory realm and mystical dimension of the divine; it also heals the divisions that separate us from one another and life's highest values. 2. Wholeness unites, not eliminates, opposites, bringing them into dynamic balance—the coming together of earth and water, air and fire, through the merger of the Antaeon sensibility (Antaeus

the hugger of the ground, from which came his strength) with the Herculean sensibility (Hercules the master of air and fire, who defeated Antaeus by lifting him off the ground.) 3. The discovery of the euphoric state of wholeness will prove to be the highest form of ecstasis. (Leonard Sweet, Quantum Spirituality, pg. 250)

Spirituality refers first of all to the universal gift of aliveness that exists within all religions and outside of religions. It breathes out the air that “inspires.” Those who have been inspired with aliveness by the kiss of God will “con-spire” to kiss others into coming alive to the spiritual dimensions of existence. “In-spire” means to breathe in. “Con-spire” means to breathe together. “Conspiracy” enters by the same door as “spirituality.” A world gagging on smog and smut needs a breath of fresh air. The New Light movement begins as a fresh air conspiracy of “aliveness.” But it is more than that. Spiritual consciousness can be something greater than aesthetics or aliveness. The Bible tells us that the human species has been twice kissed by the divine. (Leonard Sweet, Quantum Spirituality, pg. 253)

As a cosmion incarnating the cells of a new body, New Lights will function as transitional vessels through **which transforming energy can renew the divine image in the world**, moving postmoderns from one state of embodiment to another. (Leonard Sweet, Quantum Spirituality, pg. 38)

Postmodern culture is hungry for the intimacy of psychospiritual transformations. It wants a “reenchantment of nature.” It’s aware of its ecstasy deprivation. It wants to know God “by heart.” **It wants to light an inner fire, the circulating force of divine energies flowing in and flowing out. The primal scream of postmodern spirituality is for primal experiences of God.** (Leonard Sweet, Quantum Spirituality, pg. 56)

Through the synergy of the divine-human exchange of energies, an unbelievable field of healing and transforming energy is rounded up and released in the universe. **Humans are constructed out of mutually attracting energy particles with positive and negative charges.** Negative or neutral charges too often dominate human contacts. Positive charges in the church are about as rare as “strange matter”--positively charged lumps of quarks know as “quarknuggets”--is in the quantum world. **“Consciousness is catching,”** psychologist/medical scholar/professor **Frances E. Vaughan** reminds us. **Destructive, negative, constricting states of consciousness are caught as readily as creative, positive, expanding states of consciousness. All energy states are contagious.** (Leonard Sweet, Quantum Spirituality, pg. 62)

A surprisingly central feature of all the world’s religions is the language of light in communicating the divine and symbolizing the union of the human with the divine: Muhammed’s light-filled cave, Moses’ burning bush, Paul’s blinding light, Fox’s “inner light,” Krishna’s Lord of Light, Böhme’s light-filled cobbler shop, Plotinus’ fire experiences,

Bodhisattvas with the flow of Kundalini's fire erupting from their fontanelles, and so on. Light is the common thread that ties together near-death experiences as they occur in various cultures. (Leonard Sweet, Quantum Spirituality, pg. 146)

Leonard Sweet exposed by Brannon Howse :

**[Rick Warren's Church is Teaching The Same Thing As Oprah?](#)
[From Brannon Howse at Christian Worldview Network:](#)**

Best Selling Christian/New Age Author Leonard Sweet will be speaking for [Rick Warren's church this April of 2008](#). For those of you who did not think Rick Warren was part of the Emergent Church movement, time to think again. Leonard Sweet is an Emergent Church, New Age, New Spirituality as you can get. In his book, Quantum Spirituality, Sweet states:

"The power of small groups is in their ability to develop the discipline to get people "in-phase" with the **Christ consciousness** and connected with one another."

Here are some more quotes from Leonard Sweet's Book Quantum Spirituality:

“Austrian/American physicist Wolfgang Pauli perceived, are the traceable connections that exist between ourselves and others or objects, and the underlying holism of the uni-verse. Transcendent state of consciousness” (Quantum Spirituality p.234)

“New Light embodiment means to be “in connection” and “in-formation” with other Christians...The church is fundamentally

one being, one person, a communion whose cells are connected to one another within the information network called the Christ consciousness” (Quantum Spirituality, p. 122).

“Postmodern missions must have a geomantic imagination and geomantic design. What I am calling a geomantic style of evangelization will ensure harmonious habitation patterns as the gospel interconnects and interacts with all life-and landforms. (Quantum Spirituality, p.168)

LEONARD SWEET exposed by Sue Winter:

Leonard praised and endorsed Rick’s PDC book on the inside cover. (E p. 2 and O p.6-7)

And Rick praised and endorsed Sweet’s book Soul Tsunami on the front and back cover encouraging the reader to use Sweet’s methods to communicate with God. Sweet uses such things as labyrinths and meditation centers. (*6 p.158) Sweet and Warren, it’s like “you scratch my back and I’ll scratch yours”.

Sweet favorably references Carl Jung. (Jung practiced astrology and channeled two spirit guides [demons] called Philemon and Ka. More on this further on. O p.10)

Sweet’s books and writings are found in Rick Warren’s Ministry Toolbox as well. (O p.7)

Sweet thanks Matthew Fox and other mystics for helping him find the “New Light” and he further states that the “old teachings” of Christianity must be replaced with the “New Light” which comes from the ancient teachings of the Desert Fathers which include “a channeling of Christ energies through mind-body experience.” (*6 pps. 158-159) By telling us to follow Sweet just where is Rick Warren taking us? God’s Word does not tell us that Jesus is an “energy” to be channeled through us, but the New Age embraces this “cosmic” force of “Christ” instead of the person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Sweet teaches that humans and creation are one. By accepting the “New Light” earthlings will then know the truth that Thomas Merton revealed, “We are already one...And what we have to recover is our original unity.” Why would Rick promote such unbiblical garbage on his website for pastors? (*6 pps. 159-160)

Rick Warren and Sweet did an audio tape series together called “Tides of Change”. (O p.7)

Leonard teaches *interconnection as a world view* in that “The church is fundamentally one being, one person, a communion whose cells are connected to one another within the information network called the Christ consciousness.” And that “...the gospel interconnects and interacts with all life-and-landforms.” (O p.6) “Google” *Christ consciousness* and see that this is NOT Biblical Christianity!

Sweet writes that “the church...must be first Christianized... with alterity of rituals by which they (postmoderns) can turn and tune to one another and feel connected to the cosmos. (Quantum Spirituality p. 137 and O p.7) Seriously, “connected to the cosmos”??? “Google” *interconnection to the cosmos* to find out where Sweet, and evidently rick, want to take us. You don’t want to go there if you know the Lord Jesus Christ as your Savior.

Sweet praises Jesuit philosopher Karl Rahner and quotes him favorably in his book Quantum Spirituality (p.76), where he says, “The Christian of tomorrow will be a mystic, one who has experienced something or he will be a nothing....We need a new feeling of what it is to be ‘I’ “ (O p.8-9) Dear reader, are we supposed to base our relationship to the Lord on feelings...on experiences in place of knowledge of God through His Word? Is this the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ and of God’s Holy Word? NO!

Sweet, like Schuller and Rick Warren, employs many favorable quotes in his writings from people hostile to or at odds with Biblical Christianity like Pierre Teilhard de Chardin who writes, “I can be saved only by becoming one with the universe.” (O p.9)

Remember that Warren and Sweet promote each other’s books.
Birds of a feather...

SOURCE: By Sue Winter B.S., M.Ed. (another good friend of mine)

Roger Oakland has written a book entitled: Faith Undone which is a comprehensive proof of Leonard Sweet and other Emergent Leaders false teaching:

Leonard Sweet names Ken Wilbur as one of his role models as one of his "New Light" teachers:

"Here a just a few of these spiritual activities that Wilbur promotes: yoga, Zen, centering prayer, Kabbalah, TM, tantra (Hindu-based sexuality), and kundalini yoga" SOURCE Faith Undone, Roger Oakland, pp 30-33, 110, Lighthouse Trails Pub., 2007.

CONCLUSION

I tried to warn you. Leonard Sweet and his Emerging Church colleagues have put an axe to the root of the tenets of Orthodox Christianity. But one day the Lord Himself will put an axe to the root of the entire Emerging church and those promoting the mystic plague. In the meantime, since the watchmen who should be warning and protecting the church won't do it, I warn as many as I can in our media and broadcast alerts about Leonard Sweet, as many pastors and Bible-believing brothers and sisters in Christ are already doing. But I had hoped that I would not have to include you and George Fox University as a collaborators. Emergent Church leaders like Leonard Sweet are destroying the foundation of Christianity, so what will the righteous do? It is no wonder then that Scripture prophesied about people like Leonard Sweet in describing a Great

Falling Away in the Last Days as described in these passages:

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

I Timothy 4:1

“But there were also false prophets among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you. They will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the sovereign Lord who bought them—bringing swift destruction on themselves. Many will follow their shameful ways and will bring the way of truth into disrepute. In their greed these teachers will exploit you with stories they have made up. Their condemnation has long been hanging over them, and their destruction has not been sleeping.” 2 Peter 1:21-2:3

So I must stand by my statement that Leonard Sweet is a heretic, in accordance with this (and many other) Scriptures:

"A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject;" Titus 3:10

Leonard Sweet is touted as one of the leading futurists in this generation. But remind him of his future and anyone who follows him, unless he repents of his teachings!

I have had many people tell me that I am wasting my time confronting these false brethren and that I won't change them. Well it is probably true that they won't change and repent. But I am compelled to expose their deeds of darkness for three critical reasons:

- 1) I am commanded to do so from Scripture whether they listen or fail to listen.
- 2) I do so to alert those that have ears to hear.
- 3) To equip the saints to do the work of the ministry.
- 4) To bring the Balm of Gilead to wounds of the saints of churches who have been destroyed by Purpose Driven, Emerging Church and Mystic Plague

END OF COMMENTARY

Original Letter to George Fox University regarding Leonard Sweet

On 5/18/10 9:24 AM, "James Sundquist" <rock.salt@verizon.net> wrote:

Dear President Robin Baker, Dean, Faculty and Administration of George Fox University and fellow defenders of The Faith,

Please be alerted to the following news release concerning **Leonard Sweet vs. Scripture:**

<http://www.deceptioninthechurch.com/leonardsweetquotes.html>

&

<http://www.crossroad.to/Quotes/Church/post-modern/leonard-sweet.htm>

Also, I invite you to hear **former Roman Catholic priest (22 years) Richard Bennett, President and Founder of Berean Beacon video exposing Leonard Sweet and Emerging Church:**

http://www.bereanbeacon.org/audio/Hazards_unfolded_by_Emerging_Church_leaders.mp3

Richard Bennett, who also taught at Multnomah Bible College (now also becoming increasingly mystical) will be sounding the alarm on His Holy Hill later this month when he releases his DVD on the **Mystic Plague** in the Church. Having been a Roman Catholic priest for 22 years, he knows as much as anyone about the false teachings

of the very Roman Catholic mystics that Leonard Sweet so admirably quotes. Richard Bennett is shocked that Christians leaders would promote the very heretics he just escaped from.

I also invite you to consider Pastor Bob DeWaay's new book comparing Emerging Church to Scripture at: <http://cicministry.org/>

In Leonard Sweet's response (<http://www.leonardsweet.com/response.php>) to online discernment ministries who are simply good Bereans searching the Scriptures to see if "these things (Sweet's teachings) "be true", Leonard Sweet attacks these defenders of the faith, but gives absolutely no Scriptural refutation, as the Apostle Paul requires, and ODMs have done, as I document in the websites enclosed in this letter. I remind Mr. Sweet that slanderers and those who bear false witness against a brother will not enter the Kingdom of God.

In this response Leonard Sweet uses Colossians Chapter 3 to defend his own teaching and philosophy. But Colossians refutes the very Colossian Heresy that Sweet espouses:

“See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ.” (**Colossians 2:8**)

In other words mixing Eastern and Western philosophy, exactly what Sweet's Cosmic Christ (and Rick Warren) and many Emerging Leaders promote. Many scholars confirm that gnosticism,

mysticism and a higher spiritual formation experience and its variations is what the Colossian heresy was referring.

See:

<http://cicministry.org/commentary/issue69.htm>

Sweet further states in his response to defenders of the Faith:

"Jesus did not come to make us divine. Jesus came to show us how to be authentically what God made us to be--human. Because of the culture in which we live, I have encouraged the daily ritual of starting the day by standing in front of a mirror and saying: "God is God and I am not.""

It is true that God did not come to make us divine, but which Scripture (that Sweet can't cite) teaches that Jesus came to teach us how to be authentically more human? This is completely heretical! Jesus did not come to teach us how to be more human but appease his Father's wrath through the

substitutionary atonement, and to crucify the old human (man) and become a New Creation, that many of Sweet's friends and colleagues renounce in the

Emerging Church Movement.

Leonard Sweet may very well be friends with his fellow Emergent Church leaders such as Brian McLaren and others like Rick Warren and Richard Foster (another Carl Jung promoter), but Scripture

states:

"know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4

So Sweet should not be simply critiquing Brian McLaren, rather exposing his deeds of darkness and publicly marking him and other mystics as a false teachers not quoting them and promoting them and repenting of the promoting them himself and stumbling countless children of the Most High God!

Finally, Leonard Sweet gives thanks for being introduced to Joseph Campbell ("Power of Myth") disciple of occultist Carl Jung [whom Rick Warren -- a collaborator with Leonard Sweet] promotes in his SHAPE Personality Temperament Divination Profiling that I documented in my own book **Who's Driving the Purpose Driven Church (Published by Southwest Radio Church swrc.com <<http://swrc.com>>)**, also published in **The Conservative Theological Journal at Tyndale Theological Seminary** and the **Journal of Biblical Apologetics**, and now posted on

Youtube at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-qW6aroPRx8>

I find it ironic that Leonard Sweet and his colleague Rick Warren would BOTH threaten whom Rick Warren call "resisters" and "enemies of the 21st Century" and Sweet himself says **"change of be changed...Reinvent yourself for the 21st Century or die."** (*Leonard Sweet, Soul Tsunami: Sink or Swim in the New Millennium Culture (Zondervan, 1999), p. 74-75*). If you want to find out what happens to saints in churches who do resist these

change agents? Read the case studies in my second book *Rick Warren's Global Peace Plan vs. Scriptural Teachings on Peace at theperfectpeaceplan.com* <<http://theperfectpeaceplan.com>> .

Both Rick Warren and Rick Warren are bitter/sweet as Scripture records sweet to the taste but bitter to the victims:

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!"

Isaiah 5:20

Sincerely in Christ,

James Sundquist

Director

Rock Salt Publishing

<http://www.voiceoftruthradio.com/james.htm>