

# Branhamism

## How Some Christians View and Distort William Branham's Teachings

by Richard Gan

As a Christian Gospel minister and a believer of the message of William Marrion Branham, I am not surprised to find many articles on the World Wide Web and books written about William Branham, his ministry, and his teachings. I have visited quite a number of websites and have read enough to know that both the denominational Christians and the Branhamites have done gross injustice to the man.

Because of misrepresentations and misinterpretations by the Branhamites, the denominational followers generally put the blame on Bro. Branham as the propagator of false doctrines. Both the Branhamites and those denominational Christians who are against the teachings of Branham have two particular traits:

i) they would quote certain preachers and authors as the authority to support their views, and

ii) they would dwell largely on the semantics of Bro. Branham's sermons. Branham had practically no education. When reading or hearing a sermon of Branham, they would rather choose to "*hear what Branham says*" than "*hear what the Spirit says*". [A Presbyterian friend of mine once complained: "*How could God allow a*

*prophet to have such bad grammar? Even Branham's statements are full of discrepancies?"* Grammar is about ways that words can be put together in order to make a sentence to convey a thought. To understand what the person says, what he tries to impart is more important than his grammar. To dwell on semantics is just unprofitable and foolish.]

This article is aimed at bringing an awareness (to some extent) of the false notions of some of the critics of William Branham on the W.W.W. It does not seek to deal with every criticism written against William Branham for that will certainly take up many pages. As the contents of most webpages written against Branham are more or less similar (either sharing the same sources of information or reflecting each other's views), reference to only a few webpages will suffice to show the general misrepresentations and misinterpretations of Bro. Branham and his teachings.

§ Friends, let us remember that William Branham was human, and humans do forget, make mistakes and have opinions. Of course, when I say that, the Branhamites would jump on me and call me "an unbeliever". The Branhamites hold to "every word" of the prophet. The majority of them believe that Bro. Branham did not make any mistakes and that his "every word" was "*Thus saith the Lord*". Questions put to the Branhamites are usually never answered with the backing of Scriptures because **they don't have the answer. They don't know the Bible.** And they would either avoid the questions or they would (almost always) say, "*Well, now, I am not a prophet. So I don't know. But Bro. Branham said this...*" and they would refer to his sermons and quote his words verbatim. Most of the Branhamite preachers themselves are unable to preach anything without first compiling a list of quotes from 'The Spoken Word' books instead of the Scriptures. When they have no answers for questions put to them they would take the opportunity to either scold you for "*questioning the prophet*" (as they put it) or justify themselves by saying, "*If the prophet didn't preach it, then it's not important. We do not need to know.*" Their cultic spirit and bad attitude have caused not only Christians but also non-Christians alike to brand everyone who believes in the Message of William Branham as "Branhamites" like them.

On the other hand, the denominational Christians, who know better than the Branhamites, choose to search out Branham's "mistakes". Instead of seeking to understand the context of the message, they would nit-pick on his statements and highlight his "errors" so as to scare Christians away from him. They are quick to denounce him as a liar and a false prophet just

because of some discrepancies in his words. An example is the “mysterious cloud” issue. I have read all the arguments about the CLOUD, the timing, the date, etc. One thing is clear, either that cloud was a part of the move of God in Branham's life and ministry or was not at all. If it was not, then Bro. Branham lied. Otherwise, the “time frame” controversy is just one of the many *discrepancies* caused by Bro. Branham's poor memory. (At times, I myself do suffer memory loss of certain important events in my life and of those around me. Some people have photographic memory, some do not and others are even worse off.) Finally, if the cloud had nothing to do with Branham, but was something that NASA or whoever had put up there in space (what a fantastic display!) — why was there the (Hofmann's) FACE OF CHRIST in it? Why did God put it there? (Some believe that the “FACE” was filled in. If so, by whom? A Branhamite? A Joker?) [And why are the Branhamites and the anti-Branham people so taken up with this CLOUD or even the Supernatural Light (halo above Branham's head) more than the Word of God? Why are there all the questions and arguments about the CLOUD? Such things are unprofitable and useless. Just get into THE WORD!]

There are some people who make themselves the judge of William Branham and those who believe in his teachings. They would pass judgment on anyone who believes in him or his teachings even though the person is not a Branhamite. They would want the person to denounce Branham and to call Branham a false prophet. Such people are mostly former Branhamites themselves or those whose lives were badly affected by Branhamism. They are often filled with bitterness in their heart. From my experience with some of them, personally or through the mail, these people can be very “hostile” like most Branhamites. One such man is John Kennah, a former Branhamite, who is set on destroying the Message of William Branham — <http://ourworld-top.cs.com/kennah307/myhomepage/business.html>.

Together with the Branhamites they are in the same boat — with each group rowing in a different direction.

§ § § § § § §

§ On one website – <http://letusreason.org/Latrain6.htm> – the author wrote as follows:

**The mistake of the Branhamites is Branham's as well.** 2 Chron. 20:20 *'Believe in the Lord your God, shall ye be established; believe His Prophets, so shall ye prosper.'* "The Word always has

*and always will come to the prophet first and then to his people."*

This is **not** how the NT operates with the believers. We are given the Holy Spirit to make us all wise in what Jesus said, not in another prophet's words. This was the abuse which became the failure of the Latter Rain Movement. What they have to do is run to the old covenant to prove their point that Branham taught about himself. They, like Branham, neglect to understand that this was changed by God himself, Jesus.

That is not true. **The mistake of the Branhamites is the Branhamites' only. But the problem of William Branham is the Branhamites.**

Because Branham was an O.T. type prophet (messenger) with the spirit of Elijah, he often spoke like one. He often quoted O.T. Scriptures saying that the Word of the Lord came only to the prophets and that the prophets were the interpreters of God's Word. Now, that was true as far as Bro. Branham was concerned but in the N.T., the Truth of God's Hidden Word was revealed to the Apostles. The Apostles were then the interpreters of the Word.

However, the ministry of Bro. Branham did not fall within the Five-fold Ministry of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers. Like John the Baptist, he was a forerunner (of the Second Advent of Christ). He was a messenger sent with a message to call the true worshippers of God back to the Apostolic Faith. But the Branhamites do not understand his prophetic spirit and words. They do not spiritually examine his words. Like those who accused Jesus in His days (cf. Jhn.2:19; Mark 14:58), they do not actually understand what he said even though they quote his words verbatim — *"Say exactly what the tapes say"*. Many simply believe that every word spoken in his sermons are the literal absolute words of God. They believe that Branham's stutter or repetition of words like "and, and, and" are the words of God. They equate them to the Scripture usage of "verily, verily" and "truly, truly".

Truly, they have brought a reproach upon the man of God, his name, his ministry and his teachings. Some even put Branham's books and tapes above the Holy Scriptures. Then there are those who baptize converts and pray in his name. Some even call him "Lord Branham Christ" or say that he was God. Now, Branham did not cause all these. (Some followers even proclaimed that Branham was the Lord when he was yet alive. But he condemned it and rebuked that lying spirit.) Thus, **the mistake of the Branhamites is solely the Branhamites' themselves.**

§ This same webmaster said that “**William Branham Opens the 7 SEALS**”. But I, a Gospel minister and a believer of William Branham, know full well that that is not true. Although as an Asian, a Singapore born Chinese, I have no difficulty in understanding the language of an uneducated hillbilly preacher of U.S.A. When I was listening to his messages on the 7 SEALS, I did not merely hear the words he was saying, even though he used the word “open”, but rather I was hearing what the Spirit of God was saying. Truly, the words of Jesus are true, that many people in “*hearing they hear not, neither do they understand*” (cf. Matt. 13:13).

I know Bro. Branham **did not open** the 7 SEALS. Jesus Christ did. Branham **was only given** the revelation of each of those SEALS. Please visit this website:

[http://www. propheticrevelation.com/revbook/revindex.htm](http://www.propheticrevelation.com/revbook/revindex.htm)

– **The Revelation of Jesus Christ** – (click on chapters 5, 6 and 10) and read for yourself what many true worshippers and believers actually believe concerning the **Seven Seals**.

§ The denominational Christians, especially the preachers, seem to think that they are right in calling Bro. Branham a false prophet just on the ground of his “failed” **PREDICTION of 1977**, which was based upon his seven visions received in 1933. To most non-Pentecostals, the word “predict” is equal to the word “prophesy”. Any sincere and honest person will know that there is a difference between the two words. Not only that, Bro. Branham made it very clear when he related his visions. He said, in different sermons, that his prediction was not from the Lord but his own opinion and that he might be wrong. He said, “*Now remember, ‘predict,’ especially you listening at the tape. I don’t say it will be, but predict that it will end by 1977, that the church will go completely into apostasy and she will be ousted out of the mouth of God. And the Second Coming, or the Rapture of Christ, might come anytime. Now, I could miss that a year, I can miss it twenty years, I could miss it a hundred years. I don’t know where it... But I just predict that according to a vision He showed me, and taking the time, the way it’s progressing*” [Laodicean Church Age, ROJC]. To run down Bro. Branham, many preachers (who practically quoted each other on this issue in their books or on their webpages) would never print out that text of what he said. They are hiding the truth from their readers. Such are men spoken of by the Apostle Paul in 1 Timothy 4:1-2: “*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; **Speaking lies in***

**hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.**” (Obvious exaggeration and distortion of facts are clearly seen in many of the webpages written about the man of God. They are blatant lies. Especially, where there is no real evidence or any written record, the words of these “anti-Branham” people are questionable.)

Could not a Christian (layman or preacher) say what he feels and give his opinion concerning the Coming of the Lord? In addressing the issue of marriages in 1 Corinthians 7, did not Paul give his opinion that all men should remain single like him? Why? *“But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none”* (vv.29). Because he felt that time was running short for the Gospel work before the Lord’s return. When men got married, they would naturally have less time for God’s work.

Now, concerning “the soon return of the Lord Jesus” was Paul’s opinion correct? (It has been about 1950 years since he wrote that epistle.) Yet, a couple of years before Paul had written these words to the Christians in Thessalonica: *“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for **that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time”*** (2 Thess.2:1-6).

As regards the Branhamites’ claims that the Rapture has taken place, and that they have been in the Millennium since 1977, and that the Communion Table (the Lord’s Supper) is to be done away with, Bro. Branham had absolutely nothing to do with them. They are purely the Branhamites’ doctrines, not Bro. Branham’s. Some of them have even misinterpreted Revelation chapter 10 and claimed that the Mighty Angel was Branham. *Foolishness!*

§ **The doctrine of the Serpent Seed** has been driving many Christian clergy up the wall. In disagreeing with this teaching, some webmasters just have to pick on something to show their readers that Bro. Branham

taught it because of certain reasons. A. J. Dager is such a person. On his anti-Branham article –

<http://www.caic.org.au/biblebase/branham1.htm> – he wrote:

In spite of his apparent humility and consecration, Branham had great difficulty controlling a strident, hateful attitude toward women. In his own poor English, transcribed from a sermon, Branham stated, *"But I remember when my father's still up there running, I had to be out there with water and stuff, see young ladies that wasn't over seventeen, eighteen years, up there with a man my age now, drunk. And they'd have to sober them up and give them black coffee, to get them home to cook their husband's supper. Oh, something like that, I said, 'I...This was my remarked [sic] then, THEY'RE NOT WORTH A GOOD CLEAN BULLET TO KILL THEM WITH IT.' That's right. And I hated women. That's right. And I just have to watch every move now, to keep from still thinking the same thing."* [William M. Branham, 'My Life Story']

This attitude toward women may have played a part in the development of Branham's bizarre "Serpent Seed" teaching.

Oh my! What a judgmental conclusion! Bro. Branham was honest enough to relate about his past bad feelings towards "young ladies" who were drinking and flirting with men two or three times their age. He confessed it, *"That's right. And I just have to watch every move now, to keep from still thinking the same thing."* So, why judge him and even conclude that "this attitude toward women may have played a part in the development of Branham's bizarre "Serpent Seed" teaching"? Mr. Dager is not the only one. Others have more or less insinuated the same against Branham and his Serpent Seed doctrine.

§ Phillip Arnn wrote in this webpage –

<http://imagint.com/bereans/pm/wb-branhamism.htm> –

The Serpent's Seed doctrine artificially limits the atonement by race or genetics. While it is true that most of humanity will not benefit from the sacrificial death of Christ (Matthew 7:13-14), Jesus died for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2). Christ's atonement is not limited to a certain family or race of people.

From my understanding of Bro. Branham's teaching, it is not true that "the Serpent's Seed doctrine artificially limits the atonement by race or genetics." Truly, "Christ's atonement is not limited to a certain family or

race of people." Even after Cain, the seed of the Serpent, was rejected of his offering (because he did not believe in the BLOOD), God Himself provided a sin offering right before him (cf. Gen.4:7) just like He did for Abraham with a burnt offering (cf. Gen.22:6-13). But Cain had no desire for God's sin offering. He spurned the offering and walked away from it just like many sinners today who spurned God's only provided way of worship in Christ Jesus.

The same writer further wrote that:

The Serpent's Seed doctrine did not originate with Branham. Branham's version of the doctrine parallels the racist views of some groups within the Identity movement and the speculative philosophies of Sun Myung Moon.

By writing this statement, the writer was hinting that William Branham was a racist. Such a statement seeks to cast Branham as a racist who identified with certain "speculative philosophies".

Of course, the Serpent's Seed doctrine did not originate with Branham. It was there in the Scriptures, way back in the days of Moses. The Pharisees in Jesus' days believed in it. Some Jews today believe it while others don't. And scattered throughout Church History were few Christians who believed it. It wasn't popular because it talked about SEX, and many Christians often act puritanically (but hypocritically) about the subject of sex.

Still on the same subject, but on this webpage –

<http://letusreason.org/Latrain4.htm> – the following was written:

William Branham said that Eve's sin involved sexual relations with the serpent, but the "seed of God" were Branham's followers, otherwise known as "the Bride" or "the New Breed" (The Toronto Blessing, Stephen Sizer, 1990).

The serpent's seed was Cain and all his descendants. They are predestined for Hell. The Godly seed is Seth and his descendants who have been revealed by their call to Branham's ministry. A third group, represented by those still in denominational churches have freewill to choose Heaven or Hell. The Godly seed are the Bride of Christ and will be raptured before Tribulation. Denominations are or eventually will be the Mark of the Beast and those who remain therein will go through the Tribulation. (Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, p. 96).

These passages are truly absurd. The writers are hinting that Branham had taught such doctrines. Their claims are so exaggerated that they make Branham look like a false prophet and a liar. As a Bible Believer and a true worshipper of the Lord I do not believe that Bro. Branham had actually taught such things. I have not read nor heard where he actually taught them. The second passage is most often quoted as if the writers and editors of the book *"Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements"* are absolutely truthful and accurate in their writings. They are not.

The same writer commented:

Branham had a distorted view of woman because of his father which may have led him to misunderstand what occurred in the garden. About his fathers constant camaraderie with young woman he stated, *"I...This was my remarked then, THEY'RE NOT WORTH A GOOD CLEAN BULLET TO KILL THEM WITH IT. That's right. And I hated women. That's right. And I just have to watch every move now, to keep from still thinking the same thing."* (William M. Branham, 'My Life Story' , p.27 (Spoken Word Publications, undated)

This animosity could have been responsible for his "revelation" that allowed for divorce. ( 'All Things Are Possible', p.162)

As well as his fifth vision which he blamed the moral problem of our age, mostly around women. *"God showed me that women began to be out of their place with the granting of the vote. Then they cut off their hair."* The Lord never told believers to obey his law.

The phrases such as "may have led" and "could have been" used in the above passages clearly show that the writers' views are purely speculative. But to undiscerning readers, such words would appear as "have led" and "have been", and would make the opinion fact.

Now, are Christian women allowed of God to cut their hair? The writer wrote that "The Lord never told believers to obey his law." Is that true? What did the Apostle Paul say in his epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor.11: 1-16)? Nature itself (a law) tells us that a man should have short hair and a woman should have long hair. Today we see men sporting long hair and women bobbing hair. Sometimes, if it wasn't for some gender characteristics, you just cannot tell them apart. The world is sick and Christian people are flirting with the disease. Be careful, demonic activities are on

the rise constantly that even Christian men and women are being oppressed until they become moronic.

For the true Biblical teaching on the Serpent Seed, go to:

<http://www.propheticrevelation.com/osindex.htm>

– **The Original Sin & The Serpent Seed** – You won't regret it.

§ Some Christians have accused Bro. Branham of engaging in occult practice because of his teaching on the Serpent Seed, and also about the zodiac and the pyramid being God's first two Bibles. Some even declared that the angel, who ministered to him and who was present with him when the divine gift was operating, was actually a satanic spirit. (These people ought to shut their mouth. Even then they might have already committed the unpardonable sin.)

Now, do these people not know that Job studied the stars? Read the Book of Job. Certainly, the stars have a gospel story to tell. Even the "wise men" knew about it? (cf. Matt.2:2-2). As regards the pyramid, do you understand what the apostles, Peter and Paul, were referring to when they preached about the "headstone" and the "stone that the builders rejected" which became the "head of the corner"? Read 1 Pet.2:6-7 cf. Zech.4:7; Eph.2:20.

Angels are God's ministering spirits. They are God's messengers and they do God's bidding. Why is it so hard for some Christians to understand this when there are many records of their activities in the Bible? For those who find it strange why it was an angel of God, instead of the Lord Jesus Christ, that was present with Bro. Branham during the operation of the gifts, read Genesis chapter 21:16-18. Tell me who was it that made Ishmael a great nation today? Was it really the angel or was it God Himself? Maybe this scripture will enlighten you: "*And when the angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it, the LORD repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It is enough: stay now thine hand. And the angel of the LORD was by the threshingplace of Araunah the Jebusite*" (2 Sam.24:16). There are numerous accounts, both in the Old and New Testaments, of angels "doing" God's works.

§ In his BIBLICAL RESPONSE, Mr. Phillip Arnn penned the most common "conclusive" words on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. (Though other trinitarians use slight variation of words their intended meaning is the same.) He wrote:

The Trinity doctrine cannot be fully comprehended by finite man.

Obviously! (O, what a foolish statement! And how I love it!) How on earth could any sane person understand such a puzzle, such a riddle — The Holy Trinity: Father, Son and Holy Ghost; Three Persons in One! Is that Three Persons in One Person, or Three Persons in One God, or Three Gods in One God, or Three Gods as a United God? Are the Trinitarians expecting to see “an old man”, “a young man” and “a dove” in Heaven? Very hard to comprehend, indeed!

Did not God create Mathematics? If so, is Mathematics so unreliable that **1** could equal to **3**?

When man cooked up such an unscriptural doctrine of a Trinity that he himself could not understand, he has to find an answer to excuse himself. A cheap excuse is to say that **man is finite and God is infinite; therefore we could never understand God.** Another cheap excuse (this one is to frighten people from disbelieving the Trinity) is, **"the Trinity, try to understand it you will lose your mind, BUT reject it and you will LOSE YOUR SOUL"**. If this is true, then the saints of old did not really know their One True God. Or did they? And trying to understand the Trinity you may lose your mind, but to reject it you will NOT lose your soul because it's a false doctrine.

In Ephesians 1:17, Paul said that he did not cease to pray for the Ephesian Christians *“that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him”*. Can we not really have the knowledge of God? Can we not really comprehend Him?

Phillip Arnn's next statement:

However, any other view of the Godhead will not satisfy God's self revelation in Scripture.

That is true, for the "any other view of the Godhead" that "will not satisfy God's self revelation in Scripture" is the so-called doctrine of the TRINITY!

The Trinity doctrine is a false doctrine yet it is accepted by almost all Christians to be true simply because:

- 1) "The Trinity doctrine cannot be fully comprehended by finite man". *So, accept it.*
- 2) The Trinity doctrine cannot be wrong because the fundamental churches have held to it for hundreds and hundreds of years. *So, accept it.*
- 3) The Bible mentions a Father, a Son and a Holy Ghost; they are three but they are one. *So, accept it.*
- 4) "The Trinity, try to understand it you will lose your mind, BUT reject it and you will LOSE YOUR SOUL". *So, better accept it.*

**What idiocies!** Jesus' statement to the Samaritan woman at the well truly applies to all these ignoramuses: "*You worship what you do not know...*" (Jhn.4:22).

Without "*the spirit of wisdom and revelation*" of the Lord God, no man can comprehend God. Friends, God is ONE. He is not Three Persons or Three Spirits in ONE. The Scriptures in many places declare that God is simply ONE GOD and that there is not another God (cf. Isa.45:5-6; Mk.12:32). If there are Three Persons in the Godhead it would be a lie for any one 'member' of the Trinity to solely proclaim "*I am the First and I am the Last; besides Me there is no God*" (Isa.44:6). An Assembly of God pastor once told me that God is One but since God is all powerful He could also show Himself as Three Persons sitting on One Throne. Such is the imagination of carnal man without a true revelation.

Concerning the self revelation of God, Paul wrote: "*And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory*" (1 Tim.3:16). Amen. One God (One Almighty Spirit) Who manifested Himself in the FLESH of Jesus Christ. What could be plainer and simpler! But to go beyond the ONENESS of the Godhead into "any other view of the Godhead will not satisfy God's self revelation in Scripture" because God is not TWO (2-in-1) nor is He THREE (3-in-1).

Connecting with the true revelation of the Oneness of God is the baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Name of God (Elohim) is YAH – Yahweh. Yahshua is His Redemptive Name. There is only One God, He is the Redeemer. Therefore there is only One Redemptive Name. To claim salvation in any other name is no salvation. Likewise, to accept water

baptism in any other name(s) or title(s) is no baptism at all in the eyes of the Lord.

Phillip Arnn wrote:

Baptism in the name of Jesus only may have been the early practice in the Jerusalem church.

Then, let us Christians follow that early practice in the Jerusalem Church because there's where it all started! Amen.

Truly, many Christians are not true worshippers, for "*they worship they know not what*". For a Scriptural understanding of the Godhead and what you worship, go to:

<http://www.propheticrevelation.com/logosfwd.htm>  
**(LOGOS: The Beginning of the Creation of God –**  
A Scriptural exposition on the Godhead)

§ Cohen G. Reckart, an Apostolic Messianic believer, was nit-picking on certain statements of William Branham to try and prove that Branham was a false prophet. By picking on certain statements from all his taped sermons, interviews or write-ups, he is trying to show the world that Branham was teaching certain false doctrines. Like the Branhamites, this is what Cohen Reckart is doing on his webpage —

<http://members.aol.com/acts0412/branham.html>.

He is no different from the Branhamites. However, I would like to answer some of his questions, beginning with this one:

Is it not true that you are not saved unless you have received the Holy Ghost?

Firstly, let me say this: please do not simply quote Bible verses or statements out of context just to prove your point. Any fool can even quote the Scriptures to say that there is no God or that Jesus taught his followers to practise **cannibalism** and **vampirism** (when he told them to eat his flesh and drink his blood or else they would not have eternal life).

I know for a fact that Bro. Branham taught strongly on the Apostolic Faith based on Acts 2:38 since I received the Message of William Branham in 1971. He taught that if a person was not born again of the Word and the

Spirit that person would not be saved. But now this man is telling Christians and me otherwise. He is showing that Branham was in the "look doctrine" because of Branham's first wife. (I wonder from where did Cohen Reckart get his 'facts'.)

Can one have the Holy Ghost and not the signs?

Of course, being a believer of the faith he called Apostolic, Cohen Reckart must contend that there is no salvation without the sign of speaking in tongues as recorded in Acts 2:4. I wonder how many non-Pentecostals would agree with him. As an ex-A.o.G member, I was taught to seek for the Baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. But I know that many Pentecostals don't really speak in tongues. The majority is caught up with impersonation, speaking gibberish. And don't forget, demons speak in tongues too.

What did Branham teach concerning women cutting their hair:

*I [William Branham] say one thing I wished, ...Now, I know my kids has done that too, Rebekah and Sarah, I seen when they cut their hair off in front, like this, ...I don't, I ...but when they got all long, hanging down like this, and just cut the front of it out of their eyes, little kids maybe, I, I wouldn't know whether that'd be wrong. (Conduct, Order, And Doctrine, Q #187. p 1102).*

Unlike many churches which liberally allow Christian women to cut their hair, Cohen Reckart strictly disallow it. But does he also **disallow** "little kids" to cut their hair? Are little girls women?

Cutting the hair of little girls is considered as contravening the Word of God by some believing parents. But Paul, in 1 Corinthians chapter 11, talks about women and not little girls. "Women" in the Bible refers to those of marriageable age. Just as you cannot force your little girls to be water-baptized knowing that it is a believer's Baptism, so you cannot force them to keep long hair even when they are grown-up. It is their faith in God, not yours. Love them, respect them and teach them, raising them up in the reverence of God and His Word. And they will not depart from the Truth.

So a sister then speaks up and ask him:

*Question: "Is it wrong for me to run a beauty shop. I don't believe in Christians [women] cutting [their own] hair, but I cut others and color also.*

Answer: "*Sister dear, I would not know what to tell you*" (Ibid Q #250, p 957).

With these quotes, Reckart shows up as a person who would strongly object to any Christians holding a job that's un-Christian. In this case, I would advise the sister to change her job but I would not say it's wrong if that is all she knows to do. Would Reckart consider a Christian waiting at tables in a hotel serving strong drinks to patrons and guests un-Christian? Would it also be un-Christian to work as a packer in a cigarette factory?

It has been alleged by many that Branham had been a Mason. Some believe he was mixed up possibly in Wicca or influenced somehow by it.

Scary, isn't it? That's one way to scare people away from Branham and his teachings. "It was said that..., It was alleged that..., Some ministers reported that..., etc, etc." It was said (now this is a fact) that fiction is stranger than fact. Fiction is fiction and fact is fact. They don't mix. But to take fiction and present it as though it is fact is tantamount to telling a lie.

§ Lastly, let me say that denominationalism is not of God. God did not create all those thousands of denominations, sects, divisions and groups. The writer of one of these webpages – <http://letusreason.org/Latrain4.htm> – penned the following:

Realistically the reason we have denominations is because God teaches people different things and a certain group will see a particular aspect as their understanding or calling. The denominational issue is not wrong as long as it does not divide and we don't lose fellowship over it. Baptists should be able to get along and work alongside Lutherans and Pentecostals. As long as we are in agreement in the essential beliefs we should all understand we are in the same body of Christ. Much like Israel had 12 tribe which all had a different ministry with the tabernacle yet they were one nation.

Oh, how foolish! I must be blind if that is true. But the Bible tells me that there is only **“one Lord, one faith, one baptism”** (Eph.4:5). Did God really start all these **different faiths** – Methodism, Lutheranism, Presbyterianism, Armenianism, Branhamism, etc. – out of **ONE FAITH**? How could it be that **God teaches people different things** such that **a certain group will see a particular aspect as their understanding or calling**?

This man is saying that God teaches a certain group of people Methodist traditions, to another group God gives them a Baptist understanding of His Bible, to yet another group God calls them to an Anglican faith, and so on. Blind leader! (And how foolish it is to liken the different tribes of Israel to different denominations of different faiths. The twelve tribes did not have different faiths! They had only one faith — *Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD!* The tribes are rather much like different races of people but they all had ONE FAITH.)

Is God playing with His own Word? How could His people come to the unity of THE FAITH if He teaches different things to different people? If all these denominational faiths are the working of God, then surely there is an abundance of faith on this earth. But why did Jesus ask this question: *“When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?”* (Luke 18:8)

**Answer the question, anyone?**



## **PROPHETIC\*REVELATION**

Ghim Moh P. O. Box 333  
Republic of Singapore 912742