

# *Alpha's Godfather:* *Unearthing the Core of Sandy Millar*

*By Dusty Peterson*

## **INTRODUCING THE MAN**

*All I Want Is You*. That's the title of a book published in 2005. It is a volume of "collected anecdotes and stories from ... Sandy Millar's sermons and writings" and it marked Millar's retirement, after twenty years, as head of Holy Trinity Brompton (HTB) in London, England. Millar has retired from *heading HTB*, but not from *ministry*. Indeed his boss, the Bishop of London, wants to ensure that "Sandy's gifts are deployed on an **even wider** canvas",<sup>1</sup> and Millar's three new roles as: missionary bishop;<sup>2</sup> "priest-in-charge" of another London church; and "professor of church planting" at the theological college lately set up by Holy Trinity<sup>3</sup> are just some of the ways this is likely to be achieved.<sup>4</sup>

In recent years Millar has been somewhat overshadowed in the eyes of many by Nicky Gumbel – his successor and long-time colleague at HTB and the director of the 'Alpha Course'. This is understandable, for it is the *latter's* name which appears on nearly every Alpha resource.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 1. The Bishop has also said "there is enormous excitement ... [about] the new chapter of [Millar's] **even wider** usefulness to the **whole** church" [*Ibid*, p. 3].

<sup>2</sup> 'New "Bishop in Mission" appointed', *ACNS* #4055, Oct. 21st 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Ruth Gledhill, 'Evangelicals plan £6m training centre for tomorrow's ministers', *The Times*, Mar. 19th 2005. (All periodicals cited in my article are UK ones.)

<sup>4</sup> Beyond these three new roles, Millar remains part of the leadership at HTB.

Gumbel has also been the one presenting the Alpha video talks themselves and he has acted as front-man for much of the HTB-related press, radio and television coverage since Alpha took off. But this has all served to obscure the enormous influence that *Millar* exerts on the Christian Church...

After all, it was Millar who spent the Eighties unswervingly promoting John Wimber and converting HTB into the Anglican equivalent of a Vineyard Fellowship (thus it was to him that Bill Jackson went for help when writing his history of the Vineyard<sup>5</sup>); it was also Millar who did most to facilitate Paul Cain and the ‘Kansas City Prophets’ in Britain; it was Millar who visited Toronto Airport Vineyard in 1994 and passed “the Blessing” on to Pensacola’s Steve Hill;<sup>6</sup> and it was Millar who was much the greater force in popularizing both ‘Toronto’ and Rodney Howard-Browne in the UK and Europe.

Let us also remember Millar’s hand in Alpha itself. He was already in a leadership role at HTB before the Course was even born in 1977. He has also been a massive influence on Nicky Gumbel for decades, and assigned him the job of managing Alpha in the first place. Millar was the head of HTB during the entire period Alpha was being reworked for use by the outside world. He has personally written introductions for many Alpha resources and is himself the author of three, viz. *Introducing Worship on Alpha*, *Developing Ministry on Alpha*, and *Integrating Alpha Into the Church*. Beyond all this, he is regularly described as being Alpha’s co-creator. According to a Church of England newspaper for instance, he was responsible for “co-founding the Alpha Course”.<sup>7</sup> Along with Gumbel, he also regularly acts a principal speaker at Alpha Conferences.

To really comprehend Millar’s huge and ongoing legacy it is vital to comprehend the man himself. As a barrister (an advocate in the higher British law courts) for ten years prior to studying for the Anglican priesthood, Sandy Millar is an immensely gifted speaker. Furthermore he is very well read, debonair, witty, intelligent and charming. The problem is that these qualities in a person can easily beguile us and can dull our faculties from being able to discern what lies beneath. The following article seeks to peel away the surface layers and discover the core of this illustrious figure.

By way of background, John Alexander Kirkpatrick (Sandy) Millar was born in 1939 in London, England, but was raised in Scotland. He was educated at Eton, graduating in law from Cambridge.<sup>8</sup> Strangely, out of an HTB-supplied list of more than forty “key” points in Sandy’s life, none actually mention his conversion to Christ. However, in the testimonies I have located Millar says he gave his life “to the Lord” in 1967.<sup>9</sup> Within just a year he had started attending HTB and had joined its ‘Parochial Church Council’. In 1974 he began reading theology at an Anglican college in Durham<sup>10</sup> and he was later ordained by the Church of England – becoming the ‘vicar’ of HTB in 1985.<sup>11</sup> He is married with four children.<sup>12</sup>

## MY APPROACH

---

<sup>5</sup> Bill Jackson, *The Quest for the Radical Middle*, (Vineyard International Publishing, 2000), p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Al Dager, Special Report, *Pensacola: Revival or Reveling?*, (Media Spotlight, 1997), p. 1. See also David Hilborn, *A Chronicle of the Toronto Blessing and Related Events Part II* (Evangelical Alliance (UK), 2001), p. 96 of the PDF version.

<sup>7</sup> *Church Times*, Mar. 10th 2006, p. 20. Likewise Russcoff says, “Millar **along with** curate Nicky Gumbel founded (technically speaking revived) Alpha” [*Russcoff interview with Sandy Millar on July 8th 2004*, published on the web on Jul. 12th].

<sup>8</sup> Trinity College Cambridge to be precise.

<sup>9</sup> Mark Elsdon-Dew, Ed., *The God Who Changes Lives*, Vol. 1, (HTB Publications, 2001), pp. 149-151. See also *Focus*, Jul. 2005, p. UK7. The latter testimony was taken from Millar’s book *All I Want Is You*, (Alpha International, 2005).

<sup>10</sup> For more information about Millar’s background see the ‘Special Sandy Millar Tribute Edition’ of *Focus* as published on Jun. 12th 2005.

<sup>11</sup> Millar was also Chelsea Area “Dean” from 1989-1994 and was “installed as a Prebendary of St. Paul’s Cathedral ... in 1997”.

<sup>12</sup> His wife Annette joined HTB the same year as Millar [*Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 2].

I try hard not to flatter. Flattery misleads and can provoke pride, hence God says He shall “cut off all flattering lips” (Psa. 12:3a). For more evidence that God abhors flattery, see Job 17:5; 32:21-22; Prov. 26:28; 29:5 etc. Our God is a God of truth, so I want my assessment to be truthful. I have therefore sought to give an accurate, “warts and all” depiction of Sandy Millar rather than a flattering, unrepresentative portrayal.

I have been studying Millar since the '90s, but the article you are reading is not a review of his *doctrines* – as this would require a much larger document. (Besides, that job has essentially already been done, as we shall see later.) Rather I am endeavoring to reveal the key characteristics of the man himself. Instead of using limited quotes from different sources to do this, I have initially reproduced the text of a very significant and illuminating letter Millar wrote to the members of his church after his first ten years in charge there.

Millar’s central attributes can be discerned from inspecting any number of his sermons or his regular letters to his congregants, but he mainly rose to fame through his endorsement of the ‘Toronto Experience’ (TE) and I have felt led to focus on a piece he penned in support of that movement.<sup>13</sup> However, the following is not another assessment of ‘Toronto’. It has far more to do with *Millar and his methods*. Indeed it assumes that readers are already unhappy about the TE. For any folks who are still confused on this subject, please see the articles and other resources I have co-authored about it in the ‘Rubies’ portion of the bayith.org website.<sup>14</sup> (Any sentences within the commentary below which are not directly about Millar and his methods have been placed inside bold, square brackets so that they can be easily identified and skipped if necessary.)

Titled ‘*A response to those speaking out against the current outpouring of the Holy Spirit*’, Millar’s letter is not out of date, for it tells us a good deal regarding this pivotal figure and it neatly encapsulates what he is about. His text is duplicated in sections with my comments added in between. To help identify Millar’s material I have put it in a different typeface from my annotations. The punctuation is Millar’s own, as are the emphases. I have merely prefixed each of his statements with an alphabetic character to aid reference to other sections of his letter. I have written a number of footnotes but these mainly just serve to bolster my observations so they can be safely ignored if the reader is persuaded by my comments in the body of the document.

Finally, please note that: (a) I have given US spellings for *my* material but have retained Millar’s UK spellings for his; (b) all emphases in quotes are my own unless otherwise stated; and (c) I have, for clarity, used double quotation marks for actual quotes but single ones where I am merely employing a turn of phrase or a euphemism.

## **MILLAR’S LETTER**

[A] **Dear Friends,**

**What started for us in May of last year as the blessing from Toronto or the “Toronto Blessing” has long since become the “current move of the Holy Spirit” – as fresh as each day’s manna from heaven and no more immediately connected with Toronto than Pentecost is with Jerusalem.**

This sentence is slightly unexpected, for Millar’s reference to “manna from **heaven**” tends to play down the fact that people invariably first received the TE through *proximity to other people* rather than direct from “the heavens”.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Millar’s letter was originally published on page 2 of the Oct. 8th 1995 issue of the *HTB in FOCUS* newspaper.

<sup>14</sup> See the materials listed under ‘Toronto’ on the site.

<sup>15</sup> Millar’s reference to Jerusalem is also interesting, because the outpouring at Pentecost obviously *began* there. Millar thus appears to be suggesting that the “move” about which he is writing began in Toronto – which is not really correct, as he indirectly admits later. (Note also that Pentecost is *fundamentally* linked with Jerusalem. Without clarification, Millar’s comment could be said to downplay the importance of Jerusalem to God – but see Psa. 122:6b; Jer. 3:17; Zech. 14:4; Psa. 48; 87; 137; Matt. 5:34-35 etc!)

**[B] I have never consciously used this column – or anything else – to try to defend ourselves. For a work of God doesn't need defending from anyone – it needs proclaiming!**

This too is slightly odd. If Millar has “**never**” tried to defend himself, is he not claiming that *every* work he has done while in charge at HTB has been of God? This would be quite an assertion, especially given the way he recently indicated that he did make some big mistakes during that period. (Specifically he admitted, regarding his time at the helm of HTB, that “the ... collective **amnesia** of our entire congregation is something we [Millar and his wife] shall **always treasure**”.<sup>16</sup>)

Obviously God Himself is Almighty and therefore needs no defending, but the Bible does call believers to defend God's *sheep* (John 10:11-15) – and to defend God's *ways* from those who would “pervert” them (Gal. 1:7; Acts 13:10). [And since Millar invites us to draw comparisons with Pentecost, it is worth recalling that Peter defended what God did on that occasion.<sup>17</sup>]

**[C] But there are still some today who are using their positions to cast doubt on what God is doing and as I suspect that their motives are no longer simply an innocent desire to “help” I am writing this month to encourage you if you are members here not to draw back as a result but to persevere and go deeper with God – to drink from the wells of salvation (Isaiah 12:3)**

Millar's initial comment here is quite surprising, for a previous letter by him criticized anyone who had “observed, analyzed and dissected” the TE and who had then felt able – after such a detailed investigation – to follow this up with an immediate decision about the TE's source<sup>18</sup> (even though Millar himself made a swift judgment about it<sup>19</sup>), whereas he now questions the motives of those souls who expressed concerns after a period had elapsed for more research and reflection. He appears slightly tricky to please in this regard, particularly in view of the way he elsewhere encouraged us to wait for the *long*-term fruit before drawing conclusions about the TE.<sup>20</sup>

Millar intimates that those elders around the world who were articulating any doubts about ‘Toronto’ at the time of this letter probably had corrupt motives, but he does not appear to justify such an idea. (Additionally, if someone has a “position”, as Millar terms it, are they really not entitled to *use* that position? After all, did not *Millar too* use his position to promote his views on ‘the Blessing’?)

---

<sup>16</sup> *Focus*, Jul. 2005, p. 2.

<sup>17</sup> Could it possibly be the case that Millar avoids trying to mount a real defense of the TE because he knows it to be biblically *in*defensible?

<sup>18</sup> Millar had said the TE phenomena were “**not** intended to be part of some **spectacular** in which they're **observed** ... and become the subject of instant judgment...” [Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 53]. An underlying message here is that the phenomena could only be judged by those who actually *received* them – which is not biblical.

<sup>19</sup> After the arrival of ‘Toronto’ at HTB, Millar and two of his colleagues flew to Canada to “to see ... what conclusions, if **any**, at this stage it was possible to draw” [Wallace Boulton, Ed., *The Impact of Toronto*, (Monarch, 1995), pp. 22-23]. In other words, Millar claims to have reached **no** conclusions about the TE before he went to Canada (even though he had already allowed it to be dispensed to his entire congregation!). Despite later insisting that the TE was *not* suitable for rapid judgment “at a boo/hurrah sort of level” [Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 53], Millar was only in Toronto for three days, and the letter he wrote on his return home proves he had himself made a quick judgment “at a boo/hurrah sort of level” – *viz.* that the TE was so irrefutably “**of God**” that there was apparently no need for any further testing [Boulton, *op. cit.*, p. 22].

<sup>20</sup> For instance, Millar praised an Evangelical Alliance report on the TE which said “**the** test [*singular*] is the **lasting** ... fruit” [Boulton, *op. cit.*, p. 124]. In early 1995 Millar endorsed this newly-published report even though it also declared “it is **too early** for definitive judgments ... [O]pinions differ **markedly** among evangelicals ... Some have **grave** reservations ... We therefore recognise the need for a group within the Evangelical Alliance to continue to provide **re-evaluation** ... We suggest that such a group should plan to review these questions in a **year's** time” [*Ibid.*, pp. 124-5] – this would have been two months *after* Millar's letter was published!

A further possible implication of Millar's statement is that the only way to "go deeper with God" is by receiving the TE. This may have put pressure on his readers to accept the TE *unquestioningly*.<sup>21</sup> Note also Millar's use of quotation marks around the word "help", suggesting he doesn't think it ever *truly* helped for people to ask searching questions about the TE. To my mind, that doesn't send out the healthiest of messages.

**[D] ...and not to allow yourselves to be discouraged by the drip feed effect of what masquerades as sound theology but what is in effect a sort of commercialised chemotherapy offered to people who are suffering from no illness at all – except that they are all-out for God!**

Millar intimates that anyone who checks the theology behind the TE will be "**discouraged**" from walking with the Lord as a result. But *why* will they? Millar doesn't say. I am saddened too by his use of the word "masquerades", because this term applies to *deliberate* deception. Inadvertently or otherwise, Millar appears to be hinting that every long-standing critic of the TE was a *willing* deceiver.<sup>22</sup>

An even more surprising term is "commercialised". Numerous detractors of 'Toronto' offered their research for *free*, whereas a number of ministries *promoting* the TE gained huge sums from their commercialization of it. (Would it not be fair to observe that Millar's own church is somewhat commercialized too?)

"Chemotherapy" is a third unexpected word. Chemotherapy is well known for being poisonous and for causing dreadful side-effects which can be fatal. Millar therefore seems to be labeling any real questioning of 'Toronto' as *toxic*.<sup>23</sup> (Millar refers again to "chemotherapy theology" towards the end of his letter. A theology is either sound or it isn't. If this "chemotherapy" theology isn't sound, it should be a straightforward matter for someone of Millar's talents to demonstrate that fact – yet his letter neglects to identify a solitary flaw in it. What reason could he have had for not simply explaining *why* this "chemotherapy" theology is unsound? Could it be that it is indeed sound?<sup>24</sup>)

[My own experience from years in a 'Toronto' church was that recipients of the "Blessing" were *not* "all-out for **God**" but, frankly, were often all-out for shortcuts to holiness due to a *lack* of godliness.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, can ANY of us honestly claim that he or she is so totally committed as to be "all-out for God" yet? Further, the mark of those people who are genuinely "for God" is not that they accept everything which purports to be from God, but that they obey His scriptural instructions (John 14:21a; Rev. 12:17) – one of which is to test those things which claim to be from Him (1 Thess. 5:21).]

---

<sup>21</sup> Millar's erroneous claim that 'Toronto' represented "the wells of **salvation**" must have exerted further pressure on his readers. The phrase "wells of salvation" only occurs once in the Bible. The context, made unambiguous if one reads the entire passage from Isaiah 11:11 onwards, is the end-time salvation of physical Israelites (as per Zech. 12:7-13:1). (C.f. my last footnote for section A.) For more information about the Biblical prophecies for physical Israel, see chapter 24 of a book I have co-authored called *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Church*. Outlets are supplied in the 'Rubies' section of our website (bayith.org).

<sup>22</sup> The word 'masquerades' has an even worse connotation in HTB's favored Bible version, the NIV (see 2 Cor. 11:13-15).

<sup>23</sup> The irony is that HTB has indirectly employed the term "*toxic*" *in close relation to the TE*. A book published by HTB at the time of 'Toronto' urges us to be "*intoxicated*" [J. John, quoted in Mark Elsdon-Dew, Ed., *The Collection*, (HTB Publications, 1996), p. 200].

<sup>24</sup> Millar does not refer, at the end of section Z, to "chemotherapy **teachings**" but to a "**theology**". He is not claiming that a *set of teachings* masquerades as sound theology, but that a *theology* does. His choice of wording makes little sense. Millar apparently uses the tactic of employing loaded words like "masquerades", "commercialised" and "chemotherapy" because he cannot fault the theology itself.

<sup>25</sup> In fact Millar fuelled this wrong motive when he indicated that he was expecting people to be made holy "through this outpouring" rather than through avoiding sin and separating from worldly temptations [Boulton, *op. cit.*, p. 23].

**[E] But:- 1. Don't we need discernment? Yes! We have always needed discernment, partly because a genuine encounter with God is by definition risky and cannot leave us unchanged.**

I regret the way Millar does not explain *why* an encounter with God is inevitably risky – especially why it should be risky for those folks who are “**all-out**” for God (and who are at a “**party**” thrown by Him, as Randy Clark, John Arnott and Nicky Gumbel all described ‘Toronto’.<sup>26</sup>)

By saying what he does here, Millar hints that we mainly just need discernment in order to determine the ways in which we have been changed after an “encounter with God”. But Christians *principally* need discernment because Satan is extremely subtle and because we fallen men and women are prone to deception. The apostle Paul often warned of these facts. What’s more, the Bible makes plain that many professing Christians will be deceived in the closing years before the Lord’s return. Consider for instance Mark 13:4-6; Jude 17-23; Luke 17:26-28 and 2 Tim. 4:3-4. (I will need to cite other such passages later.)

*Note: I was careful to send Millar a mature version of this analysis of him and to ask him to let me know if any of my concerns were mistaken. Where he has not challenged a comment, I have left it in.*

**[F] I have often reflected that in any meeting there may be people, possibly even sitting next to each other, one of whom will be showing signs of a genuine encounter with the Spirit of God; another of whom is responding in the flesh because he or she thinks that to respond that way will cause the Spirit to do something that He wasn't actually doing; and the third of whom may be showing signs of a demonic response from within to the presence of the Holy Spirit coming upon them from without.**

According to 1 Corinthians 14:33 God is not the author of confusion – so it is a little strange that Millar avoids giving any reasons as to *why* God would be so confusing as to cause manifestations of His Spirit which looked just like those produced by the enemy. Nonetheless this is a helpful statement from Millar, for it goes a long way to confirming his awareness that the TE manifestations did indeed appear identical to demonically-inspired ones.<sup>27</sup>

*Incidentally, some readers may find Millar's text clearer if they look through all the sections of it in one go and then return to my commentary.*

**[G] But there is nothing new in our need of discernment. James tells us that if we ask for wisdom we shall receive it. (James 1:5) We are, many of us, used to asking God for wisdom to discern the works of the enemy.**

Millar’s comment on wisdom is rather selective. It would be much more foundational for him to say “The **fear of the LORD** is the beginning of wisdom” (Psa. 111:10a; Prov. 9:10a) – and thus that, if we do not have a godly fear of the Lord, we won’t even have the *beginnings* of spiritual wisdom.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> **Clark:** Hank Hanegraaff, *Counterfeit Revival*, (Word, 1997), p. 55; **Arnott:** Meeting at Ichthos Christian Fellowship, London, Spring 1995; for more details see his sermon ‘*The Father's Party*’ transcribed at [www.sidroth.org/anoointing\\_main6.htm](http://www.sidroth.org/anoointing_main6.htm); **Gumbel:** Elizabeth McDonald, *Alpha: New Life or New Lifestyle?*, (St Matthew Publishing, 1996), p. 20. Actually, Millar himself used the word “party” in relation to the TE [*The Collection*, p. 214].

<sup>27</sup> Observe also that Millar’s letter includes no *caution* about responding to the TE “in the flesh”, yet he admits that it could happen at his meetings. Similarly Millar has written, without any warning attached to the statement, that, “some of the manifestations may be of the **flesh**” [*The Collection*, p. 212]. The lack of any such warning does not seem to compare very favorably with the amount of space Millar makes available to warn about the TE’s *detractors*. (Note also how Millar italicizes the word “may” in this paragraph, introducing confusion and encouraging his readers to imagine that Satan cannot really be active in HTB’s meetings.)

<sup>28</sup> See also Job 28:28a; Prov. 1:7; 15:33 etc.

Beyond this, it is disconcerting for Millar to omit the fact that God's *written Word* is full of wisdom. Would not a balanced Christian statement about wisdom include *some* reference to the centrality of the Bible in supplying it? Millar suggests that all we need to do in order to discern the "works of the enemy" is simply ask the Lord. This does not fit with Paul's urgent warnings to churches – like those in Ephesus, Galatia and Corinth – to know, and then obey, the *Bible*, and to base their judgments on "the holy **scriptures**, which are able to make thee wise..." (2 Tim. 3:15). God's Word contains a lot of information and advice for us about the "works of the enemy". It is surely *unwise* to obscure this truth.

**[H] What we need now is wisdom to discern the work of the Holy Spirit for it is the Spirit that discerns the Spirit, not the flesh. To attempt to discern the Spirit with the flesh is like an attempt to describe a sunset with algebraic expressions – it simply can't be done. But there is a certain amount of that going on.**<sup>29</sup>

I fear that Millar's "sunset" analogy will have misled many of his readers. Although it may be impossible to fully *describe* a spiritual experience in words, what was actually "going on" among Millar's target readership was doubt about the *source* of the TE, not its precise form. Even *unbelievers* can recognize the fact that "bouncing up and down like a pogo-stick", as one of HTB's 'churchwardens' found himself doing on a visit to Toronto,<sup>30</sup> grabs attention but does very little to honor Christ – yet honoring Christ is a key feature of the ministry of the true Holy Ghost (John 16:14).

Millar appears to confuse matters, for he starts out by observing that believers can discern the Spirit's activity via *wisdom* but he then replaces the word "wisdom" with "Spirit". This seems to be a way of telling Christians that they cannot understand the TE using their (sanctified) *minds*. Millar even seems to equate our regenerate minds with the "**flesh**".<sup>31</sup> In other words, reasoning is fleshly and thus has no genuine place in this debate, even such reasoning as is thoroughly rooted in God's Word.<sup>32</sup> [At Pentecost however, Peter gave a rational explanation of what was happening. He used reasoning there – as well as in his epistles and elsewhere.<sup>33</sup>]

It is interesting to note that, in the early days of 'Toronto', people like Millar tried to use reasoning to explain the TE.<sup>34</sup> When we hearers began to see that the reasoning on offer was deeply flawed, such leaders instead claimed Christians should not use their minds after all (even though we are supposed to have the "mind of **Christ**" – 1 Cor. 2:16).<sup>35</sup>

**[I] 2. What about the origins? And why should I have to go to Toronto to receive this blessing? Perhaps I could answer the second first: we haven't got to go to Toronto at all!**

Regarding people visiting Toronto, Millar is missing the point. The question is not, "Why should I have to **go to Toronto**", but, "Why should I initially have to receive the TE by having it **transferred to me from another human**, rather than receive it from **God**?"

(As you read on, it is worth bearing in mind that Millar had enjoyed more than sixteen *months* to form his ideas on the TE in readiness for penning this letter. However, he obviously thought the letter a solid piece of work, for he allowed it to be re-published several months later,

---

<sup>29</sup> As per sections A, B and C of his letter (not to mention its *title*), Millar once again obliges readers to assume that the TE *must* be a blessing to its recipients.

<sup>30</sup> Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>31</sup> It is ironic that Millar offers no warning about *responding to* the TE in the flesh, but warns about the "flesh" when it merely comes to *thinking about* the TE.

<sup>32</sup> In this context the *dual* capitalization in the phrase "it is the *Spirit* that discerns the *Spirit*" seems to lend further weight to the false idea (first hinted at by Millar in section C) that only those people who have received the TE possess the necessary "Spirit" to determine whether the TE itself is of God or not.

<sup>33</sup> See also Acts 11:4-17 & 15:7-11.

<sup>34</sup> See for instance Millar's 'explanation' in Boulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23, or Gumbel's in *Ibid*, pp. 80-84.

<sup>35</sup> Arnott does precisely this on page 207 of HTB's book *The Collection*.

with only *very* limited modification, in a national magazine.<sup>36</sup> Readers may feel I should have gone to Millar privately about my concerns. I did. But if he chose not to offer any response to a given observation of mine, I have felt it right to make that observation available to the public. After all, Millar made his letter public, and the Apostle Paul made public concerns he had about specific people.)

**[J] Indeed many fewer people from the U.K. are going to Toronto now and hundreds of people all over this country are receiving the Holy Spirit with many of the signs associated originally with Toronto.**

Millar is again sidestepping the issue. John Arnott, among others, admitted that the TE was “highly **contagious** and **transferable**”,<sup>37</sup> and even one of Millar’s own ‘curates’ acknowledged that the TE was spread by contact from person to person “like the Beijing flu”.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, as soon as people had brought the TE back with them, it is little wonder that many others decided not to travel all the way to Canada when they could instead have “the Blessing” *carried* to them from people who had already been there – or from others further down the chain.<sup>39</sup>

[The pivotal matter here is the *transferability* of the TE. The Holy Spirit is a Person, not some substance that can be carried on an aircraft or passed from fallen man to fallen man. (I am obliged to point out that *un*holy spirits can be transferred in such a way, hence passages like 1 Tim. 5:22 and Num. 19:11-16.) And let us compare this central facet of the TE with Pentecost. There is no mention in Holy Scripture of *any* of the thousands of converts on that auspicious day experiencing *any* of the TE manifestations – despite being in close proximity to the disciples.<sup>40</sup> (I will come on to the disciples themselves later.) For more about all of this, see Part Five of a new book I have co-authored.<sup>41</sup>]

**[K] One of the most encouraging aspects of this current move of the Spirit is the difficulty that there is in identifying it with any one person or denomination, country or church. All sorts of fellowships in so many different parts of the world now are seeing exactly the same things and few of them have any direct links with Toronto at all. It is the Holy Spirit doing what He does.**

Once again Millar focuses on the TE’s geography instead of its contagiousness – the latter being a feature which meant that Fellowships didn’t *need* any “direct links with Toronto”. The fact that Millar keeps ducking this point suggests he *knows* that fallen men cannot ‘hand around’ the Third Person of the Trinity.<sup>42</sup>

Despite what Millar says, I have indeed been able – without difficulty, through the Lord’s mercy alone – to trace this “move” to a single ‘church’. Please see the “Powers” chart on [www.bayith.org](http://www.bayith.org) for details.<sup>43</sup> (That diagram, along with a large amount of supporting documentation on the same website, proves that Fellowships did not require *any* links – direct or

<sup>36</sup> *Renewal* magazine, Jan. 1996.

<sup>37</sup> Richard M. Riss, *History of the Revival*, pp. 22-23, as quoted in Dr. Eddy Cheong, *Deceiving the Elect*, (Sanctuary Productions, 1995), p. 11. Admittedly certain other ‘leaders’ made this point in a more ambiguous way – presumably because they knew it was biblically unsupportable.

<sup>38</sup> Andrew Brown, ‘The holy spirit hits South Kensington’, *The Independent*, Jun. 21st 1994.

<sup>39</sup> Similarly, HTB was happy to quote John Wimber saying “**catch the disease** folks, you’ve got a **carrier** among you [i.e. Sandy Millar]” [*Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 12]. I believe this statement was made in July 1995, at the height of Toronto.

<sup>40</sup> Once again Millar encourages us to ignore the roots of the TE by saying that the manifestations were “**originally** associated with **Toronto**” – when that is simply not accurate. They were associated with numerous other groups and places before this.

<sup>41</sup> The book in question is the ‘Church’ volume of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide*. See the ‘Rubies’ section of [bayith.org](http://bayith.org) for outlets etc.

<sup>42</sup> Millar not only ducks this point in sections I, J, and K but also in section A.

<sup>43</sup> The chart can be reached by selecting the ‘Rubies’ portion of the site.



otherwise – with Toronto in order to have picked up the TE from its original source. Indeed, since upcoming sections of his letter effectively say that the TE was carried from its primary source to Canada via people like Randy Clark and Rodney Howard-Browne (RHB), Millar must have *known* that Fellowships didn't need links with Toronto itself. For instance, a link to RHB would have served just as well.)

*As with other statements in Millar's letter, plentiful evidence casting serious doubt on his remarks about 'Toronto' here is offered in the resources available from the 'Rubies' section of the above website.*

**[L] And the origins? I think it is important to make two points if you're discussing origins. a) The Kansas City prophetic people that came over here with the Vineyard in 1990 were not remotely occult as is sometimes suggested and I don't know anyone who is involved in leading a church who thinks they were. Indeed it is a bizarre notion.**

It is interesting to consider why Millar mentions the “Kansas City prophetic people” (or KCP) *at all* here, for they were *not* the origins of ‘Toronto’. (Obviously they influenced the Vineyard movement at the end of the '80s, but that does not make them originators of the TE. Even a peremptory study would reveal that others played an immensely greater role in ‘Toronto’ than did any member of the KCP.<sup>44</sup>) Is it unreasonable to observe that, by talking of the KCP, Millar gives the impression he is facing up to the TE's origins without actually having to delve into its main roots?

[Millar insists that the KCP “were not remotely occult”, but he is very mistaken. The word ‘occult’ means ‘hidden knowledge’. Thus, attempting to establish doctrine from any source other than the Bible is to practice a form of occultism – and the KCP did this a great deal. Indeed, they admitted seeking to “establish doctrine or practice by **revelation alone**, [i.e. not through the Bible]”.<sup>45</sup> For example, none of the following supernatural ‘knowledge’ is taught in God's Word: **(i)** The KCP's Bob Jones promoted the concept “of vicarious sacrifices provided by someone **other than Jesus**”,<sup>46</sup> **(ii)** The KCP also taught that believers should observe a *literal* form of the Day of Atonement – even though our Lord has already fulfilled this;<sup>47</sup> and **(iii)** The KCP informed us that end-time believers will operate in “things of the supernatural that **no one** has **ever** moved in before”.<sup>48</sup>]

[But even if the reader defines ‘occult’ as meaning esoteric *powers* (i.e. spiritual abilities beyond those listed in the Bible as currently available to us), consider these facts: **(i)** the KCP's Paul Cain claimed to have the power to detect other people's unstated sin through *physically* suffering in that person's presence;<sup>49</sup> **(ii)** Cain also stated he could, using spiritual powers alone, communicate *directly* with his mother even if she was in another part of the country – i.e. he used telepathy; and **(iii)** the KCP said they had “the power to **forgive** sins ... **and** to remove the **bondage** of sin”.<sup>50</sup> Even the pro-Toronto journalist Mike Fearon admits that the KCP based their doctrines on a movement which, he notes, was “rooted in **occult** teaching and methodology”.<sup>51</sup>]

---

<sup>44</sup> Hanegraaff, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>45</sup> Bill Randles, *Weighed and Found Wanting*, (St Matthew Publishing, 1995), p. 71. All of which is peculiar because Millar once stated that the KCP possess a “radical **commitment** to the Word of God” [Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 13], whereas Paul Cain announced, “The word [of God] will do you **no** good” [Clifford Hill, Ed., *Blessing the Church?*, (Eagle, 1995), p. 129].

<sup>46</sup> Al Dager, *Vengeance is Ours*, (Sword, 1990), p. 139.

<sup>47</sup> Randles, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65. For other examples see Eric Wright, *Strange Fire?*, (Evangelical Press, 1996), p. 161, or page 37 of the 132-page PDF version of Ernest Gruen's report on the KCP (as at [www.intotruth.org/kcp/kcp-gruen.html](http://www.intotruth.org/kcp/kcp-gruen.html)).

<sup>49</sup> This was declared from the pulpit of Wimber's Anaheim Vineyard in 1989 (i.e. six years *before* Millar's letter) with more than 4,000 people in attendance.

<sup>50</sup> Randles, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

<sup>51</sup> Fearon, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

Millar says he doesn't know "**anyone**" involved in "leading a church" who thinks the KCP were remotely occult. But *surely* Millar knew of people "leading a church" who believed this? After all, in section C we saw him complain about people using their "**positions**" to criticize the TE, and I understand that Pentecostal ministers such as Bill Randles, Peter Fenwick, Augustus Topi, Joseph Chambers and James McConnell (not to mention a blizzard of cessationists of course<sup>52</sup>) believed the KCP to have employed occult knowledge and/or techniques.<sup>53</sup>

Philip Foster is yet another example. He is a Pentecostal elder in Sandy Millar's *own denomination* and he actually wrote to Millar about occult influences on the Vineyard six months *before* Millar produced this assertion. Although Foster did not mention the KCP by *name*, his letter left no doubt that he viewed practices like theirs as occult – *and* he had published a book exposing occultism within the KCP before Millar made his claim.<sup>54</sup> Besides, why must an idea have to be accepted by known church '**leaders**' for it to be worth listening to? This is a classic error that led so many among God's People to reject the Old Testament prophets – and to reject Christ Jesus Himself when He was on the Earth (John 7:47-8).<sup>55</sup>

Millar calls the notion that the KCP were in *any* way occult "**bizarre**". This is a very strong word in view of the scriptural warnings about occultists infiltrating the visible Church – especially the large quantity of them prophesied to be active among Christians during the final years before the Lord's return (Matt. 24:11,24; 1 John 4:1). One reason for Millar to use such a robust term would be if he is 'Dominionist' – and hence denies the Bible's clear teaching that life is going to get ever more *perilous* for the true Church of God as the Second Coming approaches (Rev. 13:4-7; Matt. 24:21-22; 2 Tim. 3:1-5 etc). A Dominionist outlook is certainly consistent with the rest of Millar's letter and with the materials published by his Fellowship.<sup>56</sup> (For a powerful analysis of Dominionism, see Al Dager's book *Vengeance is Ours*.)

**[M] We watched them at very close quarters when they were here and saw them demonstrating a degree of prophetic anointing that in my view we have yet to see in this country even, or should I say especially, amongst some that might criticize them!**

Millar's opening point here is exactly the same type of argument employed in the '60s to defend William Branham (a man who denied the Trinity<sup>57</sup> and who had at least as much influence on 'Toronto' as did the KCP<sup>58</sup>). But the scriptures tell us that *false* prophets can produce 'miracles' too (Rev. 19:20; Mark 13:22), *including prophecies which come true* (Deut. 13:1-4). As such, it is an extremely bad test – although this was not the first time Millar had relied on that sort of evidence.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Cessationists believe that gifts of the Spirit like tongues have ceased. I don't agree, but that's not the point here. I gather that cessationists involved in "leading a church" like Cecil Andrews, John F. MacArthur and Eric E. Wright had already been exposing occult activities by the KCP for *years* by the time of Millar's letter.

<sup>53</sup> My comments in this section should not be seen as an endorsement of the ministries of the people cited.

<sup>54</sup> Bill Randles, *Weighed and Found Wanting*, (St Matthew Publishing, 1995). Indeed, I suspect this valuable book was the very catalyst for Millar's letter since it was one of the earliest items opposing the TE to go on sale in the UK. (It was published in England the month before Millar's letter came out.) As I say, Randles is a *Pentecostal minister*.

<sup>55</sup> Could it be that Millar was only prepared to acknowledge those elders who *accepted the Toronto Experience*? Alternatively Millar must have been using the word "know" in a misleading way.

<sup>56</sup> For more details see Part Four and Appendix B of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Overview* (available from Moriel).

<sup>57</sup> Among other denunciations of the Trinity, Branham said: "Trinitarianism is of the **devil**. I say that – **thus saith the Lord**" ['Throne of Mercy and Judgment', Jan. 8th 1961, *tape #61-0108*].

<sup>58</sup> See the article *The Powers Behind the Alpha Course – The Powerful Men*, plus the associated data table, in the 'Rubies' section of the bayith.org website.

<sup>59</sup> Millar also obliged HTB to conclude that *John Wimber's* ministry must be "New Testament" simply because Wimber produced miracles – even though these would have been easy for Satan to orchestrate [*All I Want Is*

Nor is the right test the relative ‘anointing’ of *detractors*. Millar is in big trouble if he only accepts criticism from those he considers ‘prophetically anointed’, for the true test of spiritual maturity is *obedience to Scripture* (2 Tim. 3:16-17; Jas. 3:2<sup>60</sup>). Millar should be concentrating solely on whether or not the *criticisms are true*, for the ‘anointing’ of the people *bringing* those criticisms is irrelevant in the above situation – because a believer does not need a “prophetic anointing” to identify occult behavior or false prophecies. And anyway, it requires rather less discipline to obtain occult power than *godly* power.

[Here is an infamous example of the ‘anointing’ which so impressed Millar about the KCP. John Wimber himself acknowledged that, “in front of 1,000 church leaders at **Holy Trinity Brompton** – [Paul] Cain stated: ‘**Thus saith the Lord: Revival will be released in England in October 1990...**’”<sup>61</sup> Whatever one’s definition of “revival”, it is a fact – according to HTB’s *own* newspaper – that between 1989 and 1998 church attendance in England *declined*.<sup>62</sup> (Indeed, it dropped by fully one quarter during that period and has continued to fall ever since. Thus, not only can the belated claims that Cain merely prophesied “tokens” of Revival be proved *false*;<sup>63</sup> they can also be proved irrelevant.)]

**[N] In many ways they showed us what St Paul probably meant when he said, “eagerly desire the gifts of the Spirit, especially the gift of prophecy.” (1 Cor 14:1)**

Why does Millar not inform us about *any* of these “many” ways in which the KCP supposedly demonstrated what Paul “probably” meant?<sup>64</sup> The apostle Paul’s statement doesn’t seem at all vague, so why isn’t Millar *sure* what he meant? Is Millar saying the KCP *eagerly desired* the gift of prophecy but didn’t actually possess it? Is he trying to use this verse to help explain away their (self-confessedly frequent) *false* prophecies?<sup>65</sup>

[Why would God ever *give* a false prophecy to a true believer? And, where it required a response from hearers, what would be the value of a prophecy which could not be relied upon? If the KCP were so sensitive in the spirit – such that they even claimed to be able to physically *smell* immorality – why could they not discern a false prophecy before they uttered it? (The KCP’s argument is that, if the ‘anointing’ was too great, churches wouldn’t cope with the accountability that would accompany it and we would thus have people dying like Ananias and Sapphira all over the place. But those two deaths in Acts 5 had nothing to do with the *truthfulness* of prophecies. God may reduce the *number* of prophecies He gives during periods when the Church is backslidden, but He would never reduce the *truthfulness* of His words.)]

[The KCP acknowledged that their gift was “**psychic**”.<sup>66</sup> Put another way, they received prophecies in their *minds*, which is the soulish counterfeit of the way God speaks into the *spirit* of a

---

*You*, p. 44]. It is very dangerous to judge a ministry on its “signs”, for our Lord said “An **evil and adulterous** generation seeketh after a sign” (Matt. 12:39a).

<sup>60</sup> See also 1 Cor. 13:1-3!

<sup>61</sup> Fearon, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

<sup>62</sup> *Alpha News*, Mar – Jun 2001, p. 4.

<sup>63</sup> Suggestions that Cain really just predicted “**tokens**” of revival simply do not match up with Wimber’s decision to bring his *entire family* to England for the prophesied event [Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 225]. Wimber’s other preparations, along with his comments at the time, also make plain that he was anticipating actual Revival rather than just some “tokens” [*Ibid*, pp. 224-225]. Furthermore, Cain’s wording clearly led *other* people who heard him to expect the same as Wimber – and Cain doesn’t appear to have done *anything* to correct any of their wrong expectations. Neither does the ‘tokens’ argument fit with the fact that Cain also gave England’s *Westminster Chapel* multiple prophecies of an imminent “great revival” in Britain. Its leader at the time, R.T. Kendall, made something of an understatement several years later when he said of these prophecies “They have not yet been fulfilled” [Boulton, *op. cit.*, p. 44].

<sup>64</sup> Nor does Millar even tell us where we can go to find such information.

<sup>65</sup> It is public knowledge that the KCP admitted producing many false prophecies. (Is this why Millar only describes the KCP as “prophetic **people**” rather than “prophets”?)

<sup>66</sup> Fearon, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

genuine prophet.<sup>67</sup> The KCP were sensual – i.e. they were directed by their *senses*, not by their spirits – hence God’s sobering comments in Jas. 3:15 and Jude 1:19.<sup>68</sup>]

What a shame Millar omitted the first three words of the verse he quotes here. The missing section reads: “Follow after **charity**”. The KCP were not exactly well-known for having much charity in the biblical sense of the word (see 1 Cor. 13:4-7).<sup>69</sup>

**[O] But I have noticed that the tendency to label as occult things or people that you don’t like, don’t understand or even possibly who are more gifted or anointed than you are has now re-emerged in relation to the “origins” of this current move of the Holy Spirit.**

As far as I am aware, it is not that their detractors didn’t “**like**” the members of the KCP. (They certainly didn’t like some of the *behavior* of the KCP, especially Bob Jones’ “sexual **misconduct**” – as John Wimber delicately phrased it<sup>70</sup> – which contrasts with Millar’s claim on an earlier occasion that the KCP are all “men of sound character”,<sup>71</sup> but that’s another matter.) Nor do I know of anyone who criticized the KCP out of jealousy. The issue was not the *size* of the KCP’s “gifting” but the *source* of it. Neither is it that their critics didn’t understand them. The KCP’s core teachings stretch back at least as far as the theosophist Jakob Boehme – who died in 1624. As such they are quite well understood these days!

Millar appears to be accusing the KCP’s critics of being childish, yet he offers no actual evidence. Is he not being a little immature himself in doing this? And even if he was fooled by the KCP in 1990 – despite these men obviously not being sound<sup>72</sup> – why was he still defending them four whole years after the (extremely tolerant) Wimber had separated from them? (Indeed, several months before Millar wrote this letter, Wimber had publicly *repented* of leading Vineyard into the KCP period.<sup>73</sup>) Three years further on from his letter, Millar was *still* glorifying Paul Cain and the KCP.<sup>74</sup> By all accounts HTB endorses them to this very day, given that Millar and Gumbel shared platforms with the KCP’s John Paul Jackson in 2003 and 2004 respectively<sup>75</sup> – and that HTB’s bookshop was stocking items by both Jackson and Mike Bickle when I last checked in 2005.

The bottom line is that Millar has erected a ‘straw man’. He has grumbled about believers using the specific word “occult” in relation to the KCP, but he is misrepresenting the issue. Even if

---

<sup>67</sup> Hence God gives *visions* in people’s *spirits*, rather than mere “pictures” in people’s *minds*, despite what Millar claims in the *Worship on Alpha* audiotape (HTB Publications, 1997) about a Christian woman he knows receiving a “**picture** in her **mind**”.

<sup>68</sup> A simple test exists regarding people who give predictive prophecies. According to Deut. 18:20-22 they must not have claimed a failed prediction they made as emanating from God. This is because such a prophecy *cannot* have come from our infallible Lord. The Spirit of God testifies with our *spirit* (Rom. 8:16; Acts 18:15), so if a ‘prophet’ cannot distinguish between a prophecy from the *Lord* (which is always given in a person’s *spirit*) and one from another source (which can *never* be given via a person’s spirit) it is because he is receiving all his ‘words’ in the same way (i.e. *not* to his spirit). As such the prophet must be false.

<sup>69</sup> Ernest Gruen’s 233-page exposé of the KCP included several illustrations of their lack of charity. (Their response to this report was profoundly uncharitable too.) A 132-page version of Gruen’s analysis is available on the Internet and, as page 63 of it shows, Gruen is yet another person involved in ‘leading a church’ who believed the KCP to use occult methods.

<sup>70</sup> Hanegraaff, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-150.

<sup>71</sup> Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>72</sup> For more examples of the KCP’s erroneous statements, see for example Dager, *Vengeance*, p. 138; Or Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 291; or Randles, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-141. For a fuller critique of the KCP, readers are directed to Dager, *Vengeance*, pp. 127-152, or to Randles, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-72. For a vivid picture of the dreadful effect the KCP had on churches see Tom Stipe’s Foreword to Hanegraaff, *op. cit.*

<sup>73</sup> Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 391. Wimber also openly criticized the KCP at *HTB’s own summer camp* before Millar wrote this letter!

<sup>74</sup> *UKFocus* (an insert to HTB’s *Focus* newspaper), Nov. 1998, p. UK2.

<sup>75</sup> This was at the ‘CLAN’ meetings organized by New Wine Scotland [new-wine-scotland.org].

he were to argue that a fairer term might be “apostate” *it would still preclude the KCP from being empowered by the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:32).*<sup>76</sup>

**[P] Certainly some of the models are different from ours...**

Millar is referring to the ‘ministry models’ used by those folks who comprised the origins of the TE. (The chart to which I referred in section K includes the key people.) Millar is not talking about their *theologies* but merely the ways in which they *implement* their beliefs. Hence he says things like “We need a theology... **Then** we need a **model**”.<sup>77</sup> Within the Alpha resources, Millar indicates that we can legitimately use whatever “model” we want, *whether or not that “model” appears in the Bible.*<sup>78</sup> What this all means is that his comment above does not represent any criticism of the originators of ‘Toronto’.

Amazingly it gets worse. By only saying his *model* differs from those utilized by the TE’s roots, Millar implies that he *shares their theology.*<sup>79</sup> The views held by most, if not all, of these individuals regarding both the written Word and the Word made flesh are an absolute disgrace, yet Millar not only refuses to censure them but (as we will find in a moment) seemingly chastises anyone who dares to do so. [The contrast with Peter’s unswerving proclamation of a completely sound theology at Pentecost could, as far as I can see, hardly be starker.]

(As an aside, I am grateful to readers for their patience regarding my comments about the TE in what is primarily an article on *Millar*. The fallout from the “Blessing” continues to affect men’s souls, and this article – including Millar’s defense of the TE – could fall into the hands of some people who might be swayed towards accepting its next incarnation.<sup>80</sup> I therefore needed to include some notes about the TE alongside my analysis of Millar in order to counteract the effects of his erroneous teachings on the subject. However, I have spared the reader all sorts of further concerns which could have been raised. Many of these can be found in the ‘Rubies’ portion of the bayith.org website.<sup>81</sup>)

**[Q] ...but I think we ought to be very careful indeed before we suggest that some of the names, Rodney Howard-Browne, Randy Clark (whom I haven’t met but whom a number of people whose views I greatly respect value amongst their close friends) are other than servants of God trying to be obedient to the call of God on their lives.**

Millar has turned this situation upside-down. What the Church *should* be “very careful indeed” about, especially in these last days, is to make sure that a person is truly a mature disciple of the Lord Jesus before allowing them the sort of massive influence over believers which was granted to these men. (Readers must decide for themselves whether an elder of nearly twenty years standing – and one who claims to be so discerning – should have endorsed RHB like this.<sup>82</sup>)

---

<sup>76</sup> Without clarification, and especially in the light of his choice of Bible verse in section U, Millar’s comment here could easily be interpreted as a reference to the occasion when the Pharisees accused the Lord Jesus of achieving His miracles through occult powers (Matt. 12:24). This is tantamount to labeling as a *false* brother anyone who believes the KCP were remotely occult.

<sup>77</sup> Fearon, *op. cit.*, p. 7. Note that a “model” is *not* the same as a practice. It supposedly lies between theology and practice. I consider it a way of trying to circumvent the Bible.

<sup>78</sup> *Worship on Alpha* audiotape.

<sup>79</sup> For dozens of similarities between HTB’s Christology and that of the people on the aforementioned chart, see the articles headed *Chapter and Verse on Alpha’s Jesus* as supplied in the ‘Rubies’ section of the bayith.org website – and as published by Media Spotlight as a Special Report on the Alpha Course.

<sup>80</sup> ‘Toronto’ and its ilk were widely termed the “third **wave**”. Millar seems to advocate its next incarnation when he encourages “a fresh vision of what could happen if God inspired a new **wave** of His Spirit” [*Focus*, Dec. 2003, p. 2].

<sup>81</sup> See the materials listed under ‘Toronto’ on the site.

<sup>82</sup> To me, this statement does not make entirely clear whether Millar has met RHB or not. (I gather that he *has* done so, but even if he has only attended some of RHB’s meetings or has merely watched a few videos of RHB in action, he is still without excuse in legitimizing him like this. Readers will pick up some helpful

Millar uses valuable space mentioning Randy Clark despite the fact that Clark, like so many others, was essentially just a go-between. This again enables Millar to avoid having to refer to more serious roots. And Millar only cautions his church about “**some** of the names”, suggesting he is aware that other roots are even more problematic than RHB. Should he not have said something further on this??

Millar urges his congregants to be “**very careful indeed**” before so much as *suggesting* that people like RHB are anything other than “servants of God trying to be obedient to the call of God on their lives”. This warning apparently harks back to the “touch not Mine anointed” command in Scripture<sup>83</sup> which, while purely referring to *actual physical harm*, was frequently wheeled out by TE fans to frighten the doubters away from mere *verbal criticism*.

Lastly, observe how Millar downplays the misdeeds of his associates but seems happy to condemn anyone who so much as questions his views.

**[R] b) This current move of the Spirit is now totally remote from its origins in any event. We ask the Holy Spirit to come – not the Spirit of x or y.<sup>84</sup> We have been asking the Spirit to come for the past nearly 20 years to my certain knowledge – and He comes.**

Once again, since it is transferable between people, Millar’s statement that the TE is “**remote** from its origins” is, at *best*, irrelevant.

[I sincerely hope Millar’s Fellowship is not superstitious enough to suppose that an activity is automatically made godly, or even safe, just by inserting the words “Holy Spirit” into the proceedings. Devils would indeed laugh at such a notion. Comparing this with Pentecost, there is not even a hint that any of the disciples prayed *to* the Holy Spirit – either before their spirits were filled with Him or afterwards. Indeed it is a practice devoid of true biblical precedent.<sup>85</sup> This point should act as a particularly loud alarm bell to those among us who have been taught that it is a central part of our Christian walk. In fact the practice goes directly *against* Scripture (Luke 11:2; 1 John 1:3; 1 Chr. 15:13), hence any ‘fruit’ from it will never be a blessing.]

[Further, what is to stop Millar’s congregants from combining this practice with his statements in section G – and therefore imagining it would be perfectly okay, regarding any future matters, to ask God the *Holy Spirit* for guidance? This would instantly throw the door wide open to deception even if the people in question were to realize that the spirit behind ‘Toronto’ itself was not the Holy Spirit.<sup>86</sup>]

A final observation is that, if his Fellowship had already been ‘asking the Holy Spirit to come’ for “nearly **twenty** years” prior to Millar’s letter, then HTB’s use of this practice must have preceded John Wimber’s first visit there by at least five years. Millar’s comment indicates that he was already trying to pray to the Holy Spirit by the time he returned to HTB as a ‘curate’ in 1976,

---

pointers to RHB’s true nature from Al Dager’s Special Report on him.) Perhaps Millar had somehow already come to place his trust in RHB and could not bring himself to admit his error. As we will see later, Millar has the fatal practice of defending people who have previously gained his trust even when it becomes obvious that the trust was totally misplaced.

<sup>83</sup> 1 Chr. 16:22; Psa. 105:15. See also 1 Sam. 24:6.

<sup>84</sup> The use of the terms ‘x’ and ‘y’ appears to be yet another way of avoiding having to name (and thus face up to) the serious roots of the TE. Millar employed this method even more brazenly in *The Collection*, p. 213 when he claimed that the blessing “comes **direct** from God and **not** from **X**”.

<sup>85</sup> For more on this matter, including an explanation of 2 Cor. 13:14, see Part Five of the book *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Church* (available via bayith.org). Note also how Peter gave God all the glory at Pentecost whereas Millar seems considerably less interested in praising the Lord for this gift when he states, rather matter-of-factly, that “He comes”.

<sup>86</sup> As it is, Millar already teaches congregants to call out “to the **Spirit** of God” rather than to the *Son* when they are tempted to sin [*UKFocus*, Jan. 2005, p. UK7], and that if they “get **stuck** in the Christian life” they should “ask the **Spirit** of God to show you how much God loves you” [*UKFocus*, Oct. 2003, p. UK7]. See also his comments in *Worship on Alpha*.

so it would clearly be unfair to place the blame for Millar's Spirit-centered rather than Christ-centered outlook solely at Wimber's door – although his influence on Millar was certainly huge.<sup>87</sup>

**[S] He was there before of course but He comes with different manifestations and in a different sense – to those who are hungry for Him.**

What Millar calls a hunger for *God* was often merely a hunger for exciting experiences. And anyway, the Toronto manifestations also occurred to individuals who had *no* appetite for God, including unsaved journalists whose only 'hunger' was for a good story.<sup>88</sup>

[Millar indicates here that he thinks anyone who questions 'Toronto' cannot be hungry for God. But those who are really 'hungry' for *God* also hunger after "**righteousness**" (Matt. 5:6) and hence they grieve over the increasingly immoral state of the world – and of the Church for that matter – and know that when God *truly* moves it results in lasting repentance leading to genuine holiness. They also know that the 'power' they should chiefly be seeking is the power to become more Christlike in their behavior rather than the power to laugh uncontrollably for hours at a time. The fact that 'Toronto' did not produce biblical repentance was the very reason some folks questioned it.<sup>89</sup>]

[(A deceiving, false spirit in a church would undoubtedly imitate some aspects of Christianity, as per passages like 2 Cor 11:13-15, but the *lasting* types of repentance I noticed the TE producing were very *unbiblical* – e.g. repentance from self-control and repentance from obstructing the originators of the TE from propagating their false doctrines and practices. For an assessment of some of these key originators, see the 'Church' volume of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide*. The 'Rubies' section of the bayith.org website lists outlet details.)]

**[T] 3. What about the fruit? The fruit is the true test of the work of the Spirit and is in any event infinitely more important than the manifestations.**

The word "**infinitely**" in this statement communicates that the distressing manifestations caused by Toronto are not to be considered significant. Millar seems to be using this phraseology as a way of sidestepping the uncomfortable fact that the manifestations are biblically indefensible. He *originally* claimed they were of importance<sup>90</sup> but it seems that, once he recognized the problems

---

<sup>87</sup> According to HTB, Wimber's was "**the** special friendship at the **centre** of Sandy's life" [*Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 12]. HTB goes on, "For nearly **twenty years** [i.e. from around 1978 up until his death in 1997], the friendship and Christian influence of **one** man was to inspire Sandy's life over **all** others: that of **John Wimber**" [*Ibid.*]. Millar described Wimber as "a wonderful man" [*Ibid.*]. For more, see for instance *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 8, or the *Worship on Alpha* audiotape. "John Wimber and the Vineyard movement were a **huge** influence [on Millar]" [*Church Times*, Mar. 10th 2006]. Influences on Millar *prior* to 1978 include David du Plessis, Jackie Pullinger, Colin Urquhart, Jean Darnell, John Collins & David Watson.

<sup>88</sup> At the start of this section, Millar wrote "I think it is important to make **two** points if you're discussing origins". Not only are the two points he has made *invalid* but there are a lot more than two points he could profitably have made.

<sup>89</sup> In a separate document, Millar tried to argue that the TE's uncontrollable laughter could reflect heaven's joy at the salvations 'Toronto' was supposedly causing [*The Collection*, p. 13], but biblical "joy" does *not* imply laughter, let alone uncontrollable laughter.

<sup>90</sup> Millar considered the TE manifestations to be of real importance. He wrote, "These **manifestations** are restoring us to ... intimacy with God" [Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 54]. Millar also described the Toronto laughter as "**immensely** refreshing" and "a **wonderful** antidote to ... 'po-faced' so-called spirituality" [*The Collection*, p. 214]. (Note Millar's use of the word "antidote". Just like the word chemotherapy, this again implies that any doubts about the TE are *poisonous*.) Indeed, Millar's suggestion that "the fruit is ... infinitely more important than the manifestations" is seriously undermined by the way he previously taught that the manifestations were **part** of the fruit! Millar saw in the physical shaking a prophetic "picture of the church being shaken into life" [*Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 9]. Of course, Millar also strongly promoted John Arnott who taught that making a noise like an animal was a "prophetic" statement of some kind [Oakland, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47; Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 137. See also Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 36; Dager, *Holy Laughter*, p. 4; and Randles, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-119].

this caused him, he instead decided to insinuate that they don't matter after all. (I discuss Millar's claim that "the fruit is the true test" in the very next section.)

**[U] Indeed it is the fruit by which a tree is recognized and which is the test by which to judge both the tree and its roots – not the other way round (Matthew 12:33).**

A tree is indeed known by its fruit, which is precisely why the trees – i.e. the men and women – who originated 'Toronto' should have been tested according to the fruit of God's Spirit in their characters and doctrines before letting them loose on churches in this way (Gal. 5:22-23).

[The problem arises when one tries to make the fruit the test of a "move" or *movement*. If Noah's ministry had been judged on the amount of fruit it had produced during his 120 years of preaching (zero!), none of his family would ever have gone onto the Ark. God's Word does *not* say fruit is "the test" of a movement. One obvious reason is that, if the fruit is poisonous, some people would have to be poisoned in order for us to discern the nature of the movement.] Millar likens the Toronto movement to a tree but, in the verse he cites to justify this concept, the tree doesn't represent a movement at all but represents the *Person* of the Lord Jesus, which is why there is no mention of "roots" anywhere in the passage – despite what Millar implies.<sup>91</sup>

[As Romans 11:16 demonstrates, we need instead to consider the *roots* of the TE, for the correct test of a movement is the people, doctrines and practices on which that movement is based. When I researched the roots behind 'Toronto' I got quite a shock. Investigate some of the names on the chart cited in section K and you will discover: plagiarizers and pedophiles, fraudsters and freemasons, drunkards and drug-takers, idolaters and adulterers, shamans and shameless sodomites, and more. But according to Millar's measure the Church can only know whether or not these people are of God by the fruit of things like the TE. And, since Millar insists that the TE *is* of God, is he not saying that the roots – i.e. the people on the chart – are probably all of God too?]

Finally, Millar's choice of scripture in this section is particularly inappropriate because its context is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The plainest inference is that anyone who criticizes the TE is, in fact, committing the unforgivable sin.<sup>92</sup> This will have served to place yet more pressure on Millar's readers to ignore the TE's dissenters and to follow him blindly, whereas true blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is where you declare Satanic something you *know for certain* to be the work of God's Spirit. This would be stupendously hard for any sincere person to do!

**[V] The fruit from this current move of the Spirit here at Holy Trinity Brompton and at [HTB's sister church] St Paul's Onslow Square (and other churches I am sure but I am not so closely connected day by day with them) is overwhelmingly positive and good:**

Notice Millar does not claim that the fruit of the TE was **100%** good, nor even that it was overwhelmingly good for **every** other church which had it. He is admitting it was possible for at least some of the "fruit from this current move of the Spirit" to be *unquestionably bad*, yet he neglects to explain *how* the Spirit of God can produce bad fruit.<sup>93</sup> [(Obviously the Holy Spirit will

---

<sup>91</sup> The fruit of a movement can help to *confirm the findings of the correct tests*, but it must never take precedence over those tests nor be used as a reason to delay judgment.

<sup>92</sup> Part of the subtext of Millar's letter is that any material critical of 'Toronto' is *demonic*. Assuming the Spirit of God inspired some of that critical material, is it not *Millar* who is in danger of blaspheming the Holy Spirit?

<sup>93</sup> For just some of the many cases of unquestionably bad fruit from Toronto, see Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 158, or the letter titled 'Toronto Curse?' in *Prophecy Today*, Mar – Apr 1996, or the article "Will Dan Strader Get Out of Jail in 2004?" as published at [www.deceptioninthechurch.com/strader.html](http://www.deceptioninthechurch.com/strader.html). Incidentally, why does Millar use the phrase "positive and good" in his letter? Given HTB's distaste for "negative" things (even though the Bible is often "negative!"), this statement would seem to be tautological – i.e. a less-than-honest attempt to show 'Toronto' in the best possible light. In truth it is apparent that Millar himself produced some bad fruit via the TE. A shocking instance is documented in the Cecil Andrews audio tape *Alpha: Attend or Avoid?* (Take Heed Ministries, 2000).



*never* do so, whereas it is a kindergarten-level task for *un*holy spirits to produce fruit which appears *good*.<sup>94</sup> See e.g. Matt. 7:21-23.)]

[One common fruit from this movement was confusion. Just as occurs on the Alpha weekend, some recipients of the TE reported substantial bewilderment afterwards. This is the complete antithesis of what the true Spirit engenders. In fact according to verses like Psalm 35:4 & 26 it is a mark of *judgment*, and it was hardly an obvious feature of Peter's mind at Pentecost as he gave a crystal clear gospel message.]

**[W] ...a new love for Jesus, the Bible, fellow-Christians; new hope and boldness, fresh faith and a new desire and freedom in prayer.**

Fruit is, as we saw in section U, the test of a *person* but it is not the correct test of a *move or movement*. After all, people are sometimes saved while being attached to horribly unsound cults but it would clearly be foolish to claim, on the basis of these genuine conversions, that the cult itself must be of God. As Al Dager puts it, "Let's not confuse God's grace with man's foolishness. Nor should we justify man's foolishness because of God's grace. And let's not confuse results with the truth".<sup>95</sup> Put another way, a person being blessed by God – as a result of His tremendous mercy – in a particular church meeting, does *not* legitimize the meeting itself.

[Astonishingly, the various fruits Millar lists here do not even prove that an *individual* has met with the Spirit of God. The Bible unambiguously states: "the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, [and] temperance [i.e. self-control]". The word "**is**" in this passage demonstrates that *all nine* facets of this single fruit would be produced if the authentic Spirit of God were involved.<sup>96</sup> Merely manifesting a handful of them is not sufficient, because the flesh (and the Devil) can easily mimic a subset of them, and things like gentleness, meekness, and self-control were not exactly to the fore in recipients of the TE. Nevertheless let us assume that Millar's list does constitute the correct test for determining if a person has met with God. Even here we run into serious problems:]

**["Love for Jesus"]:** New Agers claim to love Jesus. So do Muslims. But this is a counterfeit of true love. *Biblical* love for Jesus would entail obeying His commands in Scripture (1 John 5:2-3; 2 John 1:6 etc), but this was hardly evident in TE recipients. If there was an increased love for Jesus it was for "**another** Jesus" (2 Cor. 11:4) rather than for the Lord Jesus Christ. As I noted in section P, many TE promoters taught a different Jesus from the one described in holy writ.]

**["Love for the Bible"]:** [The TE certainly promoted a powerful *interest* in the Bible, but we must not be naïve about the subtlety of the enemy. After all, the Pharisees too were extremely interested in the Bible.] For Millar to claim that the TE caused genuine *love* for the Bible is an appalling misrepresentation of the facts. I have a vastly tougher time convincing TE recipients to love God's Word than I do those souls who have not imbibed this spirit.

**["Love for fellow-Christians"]:** [People on drug highs claim to love *everyone* yet we would not infer that their love was godly. (The TE produced several drug-like effects, and the term 'pharmaceutical' is from the Greek word for dabbling with false spirits, yet some folks cannot seem to see the connection.)] Any "love" generated by the TE was very short-term, for Toronto fans are notorious for being distinctly *un*loving toward sincere souls who queried the TE.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> An analogy here would be the damson fruit and the sloe fruit. On the surface they look almost identical, but the sloe is very bitter. These different fruits can, however, be readily distinguished from each other by the respective *trees on which they grow*. (Hence, just as with those occasions when we are investigating a movement within Christianity, we would patently be much better advised to look at the *tree offering the fruit* rather than tasting the fruit itself.) [This analogy was drawn from an article by Andrew Robinson.]

<sup>95</sup> Al Dager, Special Report, *Holy Laughter: Rodney Howard-Browne and the Toronto Blessing*, (Media Spotlight, 1995), p. 4.

<sup>96</sup> See my article *Godless Godliness?* in the 'Rubies' section of bayith.org for more on this – and for proof that Millar and company were aware that the TE actually produced the *opposite* of the true fruit of the Spirit.

<sup>97</sup> Rodney Howard-Browne's deeply unloving behavior toward such people is well known. (Millar's letter ends "With **love**, Sandy Millar", but biblical love means teaching people the truth rather than deceiving and flattering them. For examples of the unpleasant nature of the TE spirit see my article *Godless Godliness?* or see HTB's

["**Hope and boldness**": Muslims too are hopeful and very bold. So are New Agers. If hope is the measure then the TE cannot have been of God for it led to as much disillusionment as hope. More than a decade on, many folks have given up hope of seeing the worldwide Revival that Millar and others indicated 'Toronto' was ushering in.<sup>98</sup> (Of course, this is a Revival about which the New Testament is silent. In fact the Bible explicitly pours cold water on the idea in whole chapters like Mark 13; Rev. 13; and 2 Thess. 2.)]

["**Fresh faith**": Again, other religions produce strong "faith". The question is, where was the TE-generated faith *directed*? Not at obeying the Bible apparently. (This is hardly surprising when TE leaders admitted that Toronto could not be justified by the scriptures, and when the manifestations are all listed there as marks of God's *un*happiness.) Neither was the "fresh faith" directed towards Christ.<sup>99</sup> There was "fresh faith" for some, but it was a faith in the human leaders of the movement rather than God's holy, eternal Word.]

["**New desire and freedom in prayer**": Yet again, many pagans have a desire to pray. A vital requirement is that we pray in a God-fearing way (Heb. 5:7b; Jer. 5:22; Psa. 89:7). It is precisely because the TE *reduced* reverence for God that people shook off restraint and found "new freedom" to approach the Almighty in any way they saw fit – but we need to remember Nadab and Abihu who, when they did similarly in Lev. 10:1-2, *fully* 'caught the fire'!]

[As Nader Mikhael sagely observes, if Christians were informed that God was moving mightily in the next town to theirs, it would naturally prompt the very types of fruit Millar lists here, *even if the report was a hoax*.<sup>100</sup>]

**[X] We are hearing testimony after testimony<sup>101</sup> of this and of many new Christians coming to faith through the Alpha courses and elsewhere too.**

We have already seen, in section M, that this claim is undermined by the church attendance figures for England. Regarding Alpha too, Millar's own newspaper paints a seriously different picture from the one he presents here. A report appeared on page 4 of the March – June 2001 edition of *Alpha News* analyzing British Fellowships which had run Alpha. Of those that had used the Course for three years or more, over *half* the total (54%) actually *shrank*. The report's authors endeavored to make the statistics look better by pointing out that, of those churches which had run the Alpha Course for *six* years – the maximum period for which data was available – "**only 49%** shrank". (The word "shrank" in this context means these churches each lost more than 10% of their original numbers.)

[Millar's comment is interesting for another reason. Nowadays HTB is extremely keen to play down Alpha's links with the TE,<sup>102</sup> yet Millar directly connects the two in this letter and

---

reply to the Open Letter on Toronto which I co-authored. All three items are available from the 'Rubies' section of the bayith.org website.)

<sup>98</sup> Millar wrote: "**Naturally** we expect it [i.e. Toronto] to flow out and over into a movement that will affect the rest of the **world**" [Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 31]. It didn't. (Millar also wrote the Foreword to a book promoting the TE entitled *Prepare for Revival*.)

<sup>99</sup> A modest illustration of this is that Millar has so far only mentioned the Lord *once* in his letter. The faith and focus instead both center on the *spirit* behind 'Toronto', a spirit which has already been cited fifteen times by Millar. (See also my commentary on sections X and Z of his letter.)

<sup>100</sup> Nader Mikhael, *The Toronto Blessing, Slaying in the Spirit, The Telling Wonder*, (self-published, 2nd edition, 1995), p. 224.

<sup>101</sup> It is intriguing to consider Millar's reliance on *testimonies*, for this suggests that the changes in his congregants were so muted that he had to be explicitly told of them (rather than these changes being obvious enough for him to discern for himself, as they were during the Great Awakening under Edwards et al). Apparently the changes at HTB weren't terribly evident to Millar's *readers* either, else he would have had no need to include such a statement.

<sup>102</sup> See for example HTB's reply to an Open Letter I co-authored on Toronto (both items are available from the 'Rubies' section of bayith.org), or consider the interview Millar gave in 2004 where, despite claiming that the TE was "**very good and very 'Biblical'**" he still felt the need to dissociate Alpha from it by saying, "Alpha preceded it and is **independent**" [Russcoff, *op. cit.*!]

elsewhere.<sup>103</sup> Evidently Alpha's 'Holy Spirit weekend' is compatible with 'Toronto'. Indeed, it is believed that the TE was first transferred to Zimbabwe *via* people on an Alpha Course,<sup>104</sup> and Gumbel once confessed: "We are now nearly a year on from when the [TE] Spirit fell with power on our staff meeting ... At **all** the **Alpha** conferences we have had the **same** experience".<sup>105</sup> It can be demonstrated that Alpha's weekend retreat is still giving participants a version of the Toronto spirit.<sup>106</sup> For reasons I have already touched on, and for others described in a book I have co-authored,<sup>107</sup> this is a very unhealthy state of affairs regardless of the rest of the Course.]

[A fundamental flaw with Millar's claim in this section is that Alpha testimonies usually emanate from the 'Holy Spirit weekend' rather than from the talks focussed on the *gospel*. In other words, unsaved Alpha guests are receiving the TE spirit and are *concluding that this experience means they are saved*. Since unbelievers likewise received the *original* 'Toronto Blessing' without being saved after the event, this has very worrying ramifications for Alpha. It also explains why so many official Course testimonies fail to make *any* mention of conviction of sin or even of the Lord Jesus.<sup>108</sup> But churches expecting great revival will assume salvation has taken place even if they merely hear an Alpha guest say: "I felt something supernatural enter me and it was very nice, and I would like these exciting manifestations – which I believe are from God (largely because you told me so) – to continue".]

Finally, note Millar's use of the weak phrase "coming to faith" instead of something meaningful like "repenting and becoming followers of Jesus" or "being saved from Hell through Christ". Millar's letter was written to his *own church members*, so why is he so coy about the truth of the gospel? And what possible excuse could he have for not exalting our Lord properly? This can't be an accident, for the selfsame feature is found among his staff too.<sup>109</sup> (I am obliged to mention here that I have yet to find a published testimony of Millar's own conversion that contains *any* mention of the cross, or indeed any reference at all to Christ's death, or any talk of repentance, or of conviction of sin, or even of sin itself.<sup>110</sup>)

**[Y] So as we start this new year here<sup>111</sup> I hope you will be encouraged to go on drinking deeply of the water of life while this season continues.**

Millar conspicuously fails to give any of the three Scripture references for the phrase "water of life". Could this be because each of them is antagonistic to his desired interpretation?<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Millar twice links Alpha and the TE in *The Collection*, pp. 212-214.

<sup>104</sup> Fearon, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

<sup>105</sup> Boulton, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

<sup>106</sup> See the three *Powers Behind the Alpha Course* articles, plus the Open Letter about Toronto, all on the bayith.org website.

<sup>107</sup> See the book *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Overview* for a study of the program's content as well as an exposé of the dangers of the weekend.

<sup>108</sup> See Part Three of the main 'World' volume of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide* for numerous examples from HTB's own resources. (The 'Rubies' section of www.bayith.org lists outlets for this item and for other books on which I have worked.)

<sup>109</sup> For instance, in its internal publications HTB's Ken Costa sometimes just refers to new Christians as those who "find faith", and Nicky Gumbel often merely says these people have "come to faith" [E.g. *Focus*, Jun. 2005, pp. 9,21 resp.]. (When Millar requires stronger wording, he seems to prefer just saying "I hadn't been **converted**" [*The God Who Changes Lives*, p. 155] or "My wife was **converted**" [*All I Want Is You*, p. 29]. See also *Ibid*, p. 70.)

<sup>110</sup> Additionally, none of the testimonies I have so far tracked down mention hell or heaven or the judgment to come. One can probably understand the lack of any references to the blood of Christ which cleanses us from sin, but Millar doesn't even touch on any *remorse* for his sins either.

<sup>111</sup> Millar is referring to the new *student* year. (HTB is very youth-oriented. I believe this is in order to divert attention from the older members who get so disillusioned with all the failed promises etc that they leave.)

<sup>112</sup> These passages (Rev. 21:6; 22:1; and 22:17) make clear that we should go to the Lord Jesus, not to the Spirit, for the true "water of life" – and that this term refers to the result of faith in *Christ* rather than faith in the promoters of the TE.

[Millar encourages readers to “**drink... deeply**” here. See also his reference to ‘drinking’ in section C. These comments will have done nothing to reduce the ‘drunken’ behavior which often characterized the TE. Elsewhere, Millar was even more direct in his promotion of this ‘drunkenness’. In his very first article on the subject he argued that the TE constituted a ‘re-evocation of the Day of Pentecost’ and that, since the disciples were accused of being drunk in Acts 2, the Church should not be surprised if ‘Toronto’ manifestations “carry with them **many** of the symptoms of drunkenness”...<sup>113</sup>]

[The article you are reading has already proved, for four separate reasons, that the TE was *not* a ‘re-evocation of the Day of Pentecost’. My comments in sections J, P, R and V show that the two episodes differed in crucial respects. Note also that, unlike what occurred during the years of the TE, a single *day* of Pentecost resulted in the glorious salvation of “about three **thousand** souls” (v41)...]

[These facts aside, it has frequently been pointed out that the scriptures only refer to the accusation of drunkenness at Pentecost being made by *mockers* (v13). All mockery involves *exaggeration*. Onlookers at Pentecost saw a gathering of men who were inexplicably bold and joyful. Since these are common by-products of alcohol too, any exaggeration means the accusation of drunkenness was almost inevitable. It does *not* mean the disciples had to be staggering around or lying comatose on the floor. Neither is there any evidence, unlike what took place during Toronto, that folks were slurring their words or struck dumb. Indeed the opposite is true (vv6,11). Even John Wimber was obliged to admit “There’s nothing in Scripture that supports these kind of [TE] phenomena”.<sup>114</sup> In fact the Bible tells us that enforced drunken behavior is a mark of *judgment* (Job 12:25; Isa. 63:6; Jer. 48:26 etc) – yet HTB saw a great deal of this uncontrollable drunkenness.<sup>115</sup>]

**[Z] Keep close to your Bible, your home group, your times of worship on Sunday and your growing ability to hear the voice of Jesus – “my sheep follow me because they know my voice. They will never follow a stranger: in fact they will run away from him because they do not recognize a stranger’s voice.” (John 10:4,5) I should give up buying chemotherapy theology too!**

Before we look at the rest of Millar’s statement, note the word “**buying**” in his final sentence. This reinforces the suggestion he introduced in section D that many critics were “commercialised” – i.e. were at least partly opposing Toronto for the *money* and were therefore ungodly and to be ignored.

Although Millar mentions the Bible here, he does not actually instruct his readers to see it as their final authority – nor even to test the TE by it. Some folks will insist that Millar’s phrase “Keep close to your Bible” *must* mean submitting to it, but he includes this statement alongside an instruction to: “Keep close to ... your **home group**” – intimating that he thinks these two things enjoy a similar status. Likewise, “keep close to ... your **times of worship on Sunday**” implies that church services – at least those at HTB – have the same sort of authority as the Word of God.

Millar sets himself up as a role model,<sup>116</sup> yet his letter has cited very little scripture indeed, and its conclusions are repeatedly unbiblical. If his readers imagine this letter to be an illustration of ‘keeping close to your Bible’ then it can only serve to undermine the authority of scripture again. (Besides, why will they bother to keep *truly* close to their Bibles when, as Millar admits in

---

<sup>113</sup> Published on Jun. 12th 1994, as quoted in Hilborn, *op. cit.*, p. 30. As I pointed out earlier, an HTB book also advocates being “**intoxicated**” with the Spirit [*The Collection*, p. 200].

<sup>114</sup> Roger Oakland, *New Wine or Old Deception?*, (The Word For Today, 1995), p. 3.

<sup>115</sup> E.g. see Fearon, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27. Ironically, it seems that Millar’s Spirit was incapable of handling the *actual* drunks who sometimes came to HTB’s meetings (presumably for a free fix), thus Millar was forced to hire security staff to patrol the church despite no mention of this need at Pentecost *or at any other point in the NT*, and despite it running directly counter to Jer. 17:5 [Will Bennett, ‘Church hires “holy bouncers” to keep peace’, *The Independent*, Feb. 27th 1995, p. 3].

<sup>116</sup> See for instance sections G, Q and R.

section K, “**All** sorts of fellowships”, including ones which have little respect for the Bible, got “the Blessing”?)

Incredibly, Millar manages to undermine holy writ even further here. The main context of Millar’s letter has been doctrine and practice, and it is the *Bible* which is to be our rule in both these areas, whereas Millar invites us to assume that *feelings* should be a major guide to them. (If we are to hear the “voice” of the *true* Lord then we need to *obey scripture*, so Millar’s repeated sidelining of the Word is not going to help folks *know* the voice of the true Jesus. Note also Millar’s lack of any caution that the true “voice of Jesus” is only heard from inside one’s *spirit* – or occasionally from outside one’s *ears*. To listen for a voice in the *head* is an occult practice. Interestingly Millar elsewhere hints that the voice he obeys is in “my **head**”.<sup>117</sup> This experience has been seen in both the TE and Alpha.<sup>118</sup>)

Without explanation, Millar’s “sheep” reference above communicates that his readers cannot be deceived, yet he simultaneously warns about the deception of toxic theology “masquerading” as the truth. It is a shame he did not avoid this contradiction – ideally by giving scriptures like: “**Be not** deceived...” (1 Cor. 6:9; 15:33; Gal. 6:7), and “**let** no man deceive you...” (1 John 3:7a; Eph. 5:6a; 2 Thess. 2:3). If Adam and Eve were deceived then all of us can be.

One last, small observation. Toronto was supposed to be bringing honor to Christ Jesus and generally glorifying Him (as was seen at Pentecost), yet He gets just two mentions in Millar’s letter – and on *neither* occasion is our Lord and Saviour given *any* title, whereas God’s *Spirit* enjoys the suffix “Holy” on seven occasions. Even Paul is honored with the adjective “saint”.<sup>119</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS FROM LETTER

Despite having kept tabs on Millar for most of the intervening time, I am not aware of him ever having retracted this letter. Indeed, let us recall that he allowed it to be re-published *nationally* some months after it was first circulated. Far from repenting, Millar actually chose to mark the tenth anniversary of Toronto by *inviting Arnott to speak at HTB*.<sup>120</sup>

What then are we to make of Millar? In this solitary letter we have seen major errors in terms of his doctrine and practice. (For further aberrant doctrines and practices taught by his eldership, see the book I co-authored called *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Overview*<sup>121</sup>) Have we not also seen a tendency in Millar toward hypocrisy<sup>122</sup> and manipulation?<sup>123</sup> (See both the last two footnotes for more details.) It is indisputable that Millar undermines Holy Scripture.

From this letter it also appears that Millar *takes God for granted*.<sup>124</sup> (In 26 newspaper pages of tributes to Millar, published by HTB on his retirement as their ‘vicar’, one will find many

---

<sup>117</sup> *All I Want Is You*, pp. 37,68. (See section N’s footnotes for extra material on how God speaks to us.)

<sup>118</sup> See Part 5 of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Overview* for proof.

<sup>119</sup> It is a lesser point, but note too how the Spirit is honored with capitalization (“**He**”, “**Him**”) in Millar’s letter (see sections F, K, R and S), whereas Christ our Redeemer (“**me**”, “**my**”) is not. (It is a relatively minor issue, but I would suggest that any professing believer is suspect if they *often* merely use the word “Jesus” in their teachings to other Christians (i.e. if they omit every one of His titles). Without even looking for this pattern, I recently came across ten such uses in a row by Millar [*The Collection*, pp. 34-38]. Compare this with the biblical epistles! Note however that the *synoptic Gospels* are a special case for they focus more on chronicling events than on teaching doctrine directly, and they don’t ask us to prejudge Jesus’ Lordship or Christhood.)

<sup>120</sup> *Focus*, Mar. 2004, p. 4. That article calls the TE “an extraordinary movement of the **Holy** Spirit”. (The edition of *Focus* which followed Arnott’s visit quoted him at length, and the text comprised one long defense of ‘Toronto’.) HTB leaders were still assuring people that the TE was a major move of “the [Holy] Spirit” in the summer of 2005 [*Focus*, Jun. 2005, pp. 4,8].

<sup>121</sup> The latest edition (i.e. ‘revision 5’) of the book is incomparably better than the rudimentary early versions. For a list of outlets worldwide please see the ‘Rubies’ section of the bayith.org website.

<sup>122</sup> See sections C, D, O and Z.

<sup>123</sup> I would suggest that Millar manipulates his readers in at least sections A, B, G, H, L, M, R and Y.

<sup>124</sup> See sections K, R, X and Z.

allusions to his *joke/story-telling*,<sup>125</sup> not to mention several references to his taste for whiskey,<sup>126</sup> but there is only a single claim that he is *God-fearing* – and even this instance largely seems to be present in order to make a Limerick about him work properly. Similarly I am struggling to recall any occasion during all the years I have been looking at him when Millar has *ever* instructed his congregants to fear the Lord – although I do know of times when he has taught them *not* to fear God.<sup>127</sup> By contrast, as we noted in section G, the Bible is absolutely adamant that the fear of the Lord is the most basic requirement for true wisdom. More verses about this crucial matter of fearing God include Isaiah 8; Proverbs 14:26-27; 19:23; and Psalm 25:12-14.)

Of further interest to me has been the apparent, and frequent, lack of *honesty* in Millar's letter. As far as I can see, he is unhelpfully misleading in at least sections A, B, K, L, O, P, R, S, U, W and Y. Additionally, is he not being dishonest each time he avoids the real issue?<sup>128</sup> Consider too the following pattern:

- When “the Blessing” first arrived, Millar claimed that its manifestations were biblical. Once people had proved him wrong, he instead claimed that the manifestations are not to be considered significant after all.
- Millar initially claimed that the human roots of the TE were biblical. When people proved him wrong here too, he instead claimed that the human roots were irrelevant.<sup>129</sup>
- In the early days, Millar claimed that the reasoning behind the TE was biblical. Once people proved him wrong yet again, he instead claimed we shouldn't try to use reasoning. No wonder Millar “**treasures**” the collective amnesia of his congregation, as we saw in section B.

Another pattern in Millar's letter is obfuscation. He introduces confusion again and again. If the reader requires proof, just return to sections B, D, E, F, H, N, S, T, V, Y or Z alongside my commentary and footnotes. *This is a central point:* Millar is very charming, intelligent and well-informed, thus if he also purports to be a wise and discerning elder then many people will trust him implicitly. If what he actually teaches is *confusing*, then lots of these people will give up trying to understand the issues for themselves and will instead simply follow this seemingly very spiritual man who is apparently so advanced in the faith that his deep wisdom cannot adequately be expressed in mere words, nor grasped by lesser mortals. (Millar's letter was not a ‘one-off’ in terms of confusion. Other materials by him regularly contradict each other – and even themselves.)

Added to this, witness the *coercion* Millar employs. Instead of reasoning with his congregants, he browbeats them into submission by repeatedly suggesting that those who cast doubt on his views cannot be of God. He uses such coercion in sections B, C, D, K, O, Q, S, U and Z. The Apostles may have urged or pleaded with God's people, but they never used Millar's manipulative techniques. (One of his own colleagues at HTB has confessed that Millar “engineers” situations.<sup>130</sup>)

---

<sup>125</sup> There are simply too many instances to list them all here, but a couple follow: “Whenever I bump into Sandy ... his warmth is followed by a **giggly** story of some kind that we can **chuckle** about” [Charlie Mackesy, *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 26]. His “communications director” says of Millar, “Spending time with Sandy is, quite simply, **fun**. ... [H]e sets off with almost **childish** delight on a story ... **Sometimes** it is to illustrate what he is saying, but **often [not]**” [*All I Want Is You*, p. 16]. Millar is in his *sixties*. C.f. 1 Tim. 3:8a or Titus 2:1-2.

<sup>126</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 24 (two refs), p. 25. See also page 26!

<sup>127</sup> E.g. see *Focus*, Apr. 2004, p.2. Also “we **needn't** be frightened of [God]” [*UKFocus*, May 2005, p. UK7]. Even more shockingly, Millar redefines biblical fear of the Lord simply as: “If we **reject** the love of God we are right to be **anxious** about our relationship with God” [*ibid*].

<sup>128</sup> See sections E, I, J, L and T. In fact Millar's entire letter seems less than honest in that it suggests there are only four remotely legitimate questions about 'Toronto'. We have already raised a number of others in this very limited study of the subject.

<sup>129</sup> See Millar's later comments in *The Collection*, p. 213.

<sup>130</sup> James Norman, *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 26.

# CONCLUSIONS FROM OTHER MATERIAL

Combine the above elements (e.g. the manipulation, the opposition to fearing God, the confusion, the coercion, the undermining of Scripture) and Millar can lead the bulk of his listeners wherever he wants. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that Millar consistently talks about a level of discipleship and “vision” far beyond what his corrupt teachings make possible.<sup>131</sup> The result seems to be that many in his church become so embarrassed by their (unavoidable) failure to live up to his apparent expectations, that they make him their literal ‘vicar’ – i.e. they cling to him in the place of Christ in the hope that they will somehow be vicariously saved through their dedication to such a man of God. This behavior is reinforced by the way in which Millar often appears to ‘turn a blind eye’ to breathtaking sins among his congregation.<sup>132</sup> His followers understandably assume that, if Millar is so close to God and yet accepts them, they too must be acceptable to God, in spite of their unholy lifestyles...

## Some Instances

For example, when a young congregant revealed that he had become a freemason, Millar gave “**no** warning” and indeed “said **nothing**”.<sup>133</sup> Millar also didn’t seem to be too concerned that a celebrity who took Alpha at HTB and whom HTB then used to promote the Course, has since: posed fully naked for magazines, been seen both swearing and drunk on TV, and admitted she is a practicing lesbian. (HTB was still legitimizing her in its newspapers as recently as November 2004.<sup>134</sup>) Likewise Millar appears to have taken no steps to challenge the jaw-dropping behavior of Lord Hutton – the HTB congregant who, among other travesties, whitewashed a public inquiry in the government’s favor to such an extent that it even caused members of the government itself to blush.

I have come across so many examples of grievous sin being tolerated (or even instigated) by HTB’s eldership that I will need to devote an entire article to the subject, but one additional case ought to be rehearsed here. According to a national newspaper: a female member of HTB’s “ministry team” remained in place while she was having an “affair” with a married man. (This resulted in the man’s wife divorcing him.) The illicit relationship fell apart and Millar’s “ministry team” member went to court to place a restraining order on her “obsessive” suitor (this despite the man himself being a member of HTB and having responsibilities at the Fellowship).<sup>135</sup> Interestingly this situation may well have derived from Millar’s own teachings, for one of his cardinal ‘ministry values’ is worded in such a way as to give the distinct impression that he wants his congregants to relate to each other at a totally inappropriate level:

Millar says, “[John Wimber’s] number **one** value – which we [at HTB] inherited and we still have – is **intimacy** with God. It **has** to be. If you ask why we do the worship we do, it’s because we seek **intimacy** with God ... [A] dear woman said to me, ‘**Please** don’t use the word “intimacy”, because we don’t use it to mean that sort of thing.’ So I ... started talking about the ‘**closest possible** communion relationship with God’, ... But then I **gave up on that** because what I meant was **intimacy**. The Bible, as you know, relates it to **SEXUAL** union. And ‘intimacy with God’ is our number **one** value. ... Our **second** value, I suppose, would be ‘intimacy with **ONE**

---

<sup>131</sup> Millar flatters HTB when he says “we have between us the resources **100** times over, to **complete** the re-evangelisation of London” [*Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 5].

<sup>132</sup> Naturally this is also reinforced by Millar’s belief that a *special* type of priesthood exists (of which he claims to be a manifestation). E.g. see *Focus*, Mar. 2004, p. 2, or *Worship on Alpha*.

<sup>133</sup> Andrew Farley, *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 24.

<sup>134</sup> *Alpha News* #35, p. 13. The Alpha graduate in question is Samantha Fox and she is described in this 2004 HTB newspaper as “the **former** topless model...”, yet such is simply not true! She was posing ‘topless’ again soon after completing Alpha, and had even posed *fully* nude on multiple occasions between doing Alpha and the date of this newspaper.

<sup>135</sup> Richard Kay, ‘Unholy row splits star’s church’, *Daily Mail*, Jan. 26th 2005, p. 43.

**ANOTHER**’<sup>136</sup> Millar elsewhere confirms that both values are “**fundamental**” and are “priorities”<sup>137</sup>.

(Millar’s primary error is that the Church is not yet married to Christ. We are betrothed to Him, but the marriage itself is still to come. As such, we are not yet in any position to be ‘intimate’ with God in this sense. A much more accurate description of our current relationship is to be found in Luke 17:7-10. HTB’s wrong understanding of our position means that the likes of Wimber and Millar experimented with spiritual activities until they found an arrangement which produced a feeling of intimacy with a supernatural entity. They then claimed that this feeling must be from God, even though the method they had devised was unbiblical and was therefore going to lead to intimacy with demons if with anything.<sup>138</sup>)

### **Nightmare**

In 2003 Millar told his congregation “I have, as ... **some** of you who know me **well** [are aware], this ... **recurring nightmare** that you and I are queuing up to get into heaven ... and you say to me ‘I have just heard ... that you have to be **holy** to get into heaven. **Why didn’t you tell me?!**’”<sup>139</sup> Assuming Millar is not being dishonest again, this statement raises several serious questions:

For a start, what had Millar been *doing* for the preceding 27 years of ministry at HTB if he hadn’t been ensuring that his congregants got the message about holiness? And why had he seemingly only told *some* of his *close* friends about this recurring nightmare before this stage? Why did he wait until only eight months before he announced his *retirement* from heading HTB to tell his congregants this thing? Why were none of the *other* ‘leaders’ at HTB apparently succeeding in telling the congregants to be holy either? Why was HTB’s membership not living in a holy way *already* if its ministers properly exalt the Bible (since Scripture makes it plain that we need to be holy if we are to see God)? Besides, why was there any problem about holiness if HTB’s members are indeed, as Millar asserts, “all-out for God”?

Could it be that Millar has failed to supply his church with the true, biblical definition of holiness? At a meeting I attended, he implied that Christians have little part to play in holiness when he declared, “You’re holy because He [Christ] **makes** you holy ... [and] He **keeps** you holy”.<sup>140</sup> Millar did much the same when he taught us that holiness (rather than righteousness) is “**imputed**” to us.<sup>141</sup> Holy means *separate* and is something *we* have to do.<sup>142</sup> For instance, we need to separate ourselves from things that tempt us into sin. Because Millar lowers the bar so much with regard to the lifestyles of those with whom he is prepared to fellowship, his congregants know he’ll still accept them – almost no matter how sinful their walk becomes. This does little to encourage holiness.

### **The Bible**

A major reason why HTB’s members have such a hard time obeying the Bible is their sheer ignorance of it. While claiming to believe Scripture, presumably in order to avoid

---

<sup>136</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 18. This erroneous idea that congregants should be “**intimate**” with Christ is often promoted by Millar (e.g. see *The Collection*, pp. 47-48, or the *Worship on Alpha* audiotape.). This idea is also evident within the Alpha resources – e.g. in Talks 4 and 9 of the ‘Edition 2’ video set released by HTB in transcript form in the summer of 2000. (The foolish teaching that Christians should be “**intimate**” with *each other* reappears in Alpha Talk 14. Thus even some of HTB’s *leaders* worry whether their “**vision**” of abstaining from sex outside marriage is “**right**” [*UKFocus*, Oct. 2003, p. UK7].)

<sup>137</sup> *Focus*, Jul. 2005, p. 2.

<sup>138</sup> See section S and its footnotes for more. Where does the Bible allow us to *experiment* with the spirit realm?

<sup>139</sup> ‘For All The Saints’, sermon given by Millar at HTB on Nov. 2nd 2003.

<sup>140</sup> Sermon given at St. Mark’s Tollington Park, Oct. 16th. 2005.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.* Millar does much the same in *UKFocus*, Jan. 2005, when he teaches “You cannot get from here to there (‘there’ being **holiness** and righteousness) unless you let him [**God**] do it” [p. UK6] and that it is in “the arms of Jesus where we find the source of **all** holiness” [p. UK7].

<sup>142</sup> 1 Pet. 1:15-16; Titus 1:7-8; Rom. 12:1; Lev. 20:7 etc.



frightening away Christians from his influence, Millar promotes biblical illiteracy by repeatedly undermining it.<sup>143</sup> The evidence suggests that Millar does not believe the Bible to be God's revealed Word. This would explain why he seems much happier using ambiguous prefixes like "traditional", "orthodox" or "historic" instead of "**biblical**" when referring to his preferred type of "Christianity".

At the very least it appears certain that Millar doesn't view the canon of Scripture as being *complete* – even though the book of Revelation seems pretty final to me. An ex-member of HTB expressed this precise worry to me after a private meeting with Millar, but I make the observation *myself* for a number of other reasons. To start with, Millar loudly supports and defends people like the KCP who believe in extra-biblical revelation. Also, Millar has said he is "convinced that **ALL** the gifts, ministries and fruit of the Holy Spirit that we see in the New Testament remain ... today"<sup>144</sup> – which must include the gift/ministry of *writing holy scripture*.

There is further evidence. Millar roundly defends John Wimber's unbiblical vision, and shows no respect at all for those folks who have realized it "isn't Biblical enough".<sup>145</sup> Millar even admits: "I don't like the word ... 'evangelical'".<sup>146</sup> (The statement from which this quote was drawn suggests that Millar wants evangelicals to have their faith in God's Word diluted and leavened by uniting with 'believers' who hold to *any position they like* regarding the Bible and its authority.)

Incidentally, the Holy Spirit only indwells our *spirit*, but Millar indicates that the entity with which *he* communes indwells his *physical* body.<sup>147</sup> It is therefore not surprising to find that he is commonly directed by a 'feeling in his **bones**'. In fact he uses the phrase "I know in my **bones** that..." so frequently that his friends have nicknamed this source of 'truth' as Millar's "**osteo-epistemology**".<sup>148</sup> Such a spirit is not going to promote obedience to the *Bible*, and this would account for Millar's apparent admission that he is prone to seeing "something that is totally clear [in the Bible] and **all** the ingenuity of human nature sets about trying to **find a way around it**".<sup>149</sup> One way he achieves this is by appealing to Church history – i.e. to traditions of men. Millar criticizes those who "sit light ... to **tradition**"<sup>150</sup> even though he himself sits very light to tradition when it suits him, e.g. regarding his highly untraditional choice of Bible version and his acceptance of people barking like dogs at his meetings.<sup>151</sup>

**WARNING!** Readers of a sentimental disposition are invited to stop reading at this point, or to "gird up their loins" before continuing. I have even more alarming facts to bring to our attention, and although I have worked hard to present the information in a calm and reasonable fashion, I have also put concern for God's flock before man-made conventions that sometimes obscure important truths. God commands us to "**love** the truth" (Zech. 8:19) and to be "**valiant** for the truth" (Jer. 9:3). I am not seeking to offend but rather to

---

<sup>143</sup> Millar often quietly weakens the significance of God's Word [e.g. in *All I Want Is You*, pp. 62,75,97]. Just like Alpha, Millar teaches that the Bible loses its importance once we become members of God's family (e.g. in *Ibid*, p. 84) – even though the Bible was written *to* God's People. During Millar's watch, Alpha has been recommending its participants to read the Bible for just seven minutes a day [Talk 5]. How can the Word ever dwell in someone "**richly**" (Col. 3:16) on only a few minutes per day?

<sup>144</sup> *The Collection*, p. 213.

<sup>145</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 18.

<sup>146</sup> *All I Want Is You*, p. 108.

<sup>147</sup> E.g. see his Foreword to Rob Warner, *Prepare for Revival*, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1994), p. xiv.

<sup>148</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 9. See also *Ibid*, p. 27.

<sup>149</sup> *All I Want Is You*, p. 32. An example of him doing this very thing can be found in *Ibid*, pp. 87-89. Another is in *Focus*, Mar. 2004, p. 2.

<sup>150</sup> *Focus*, Feb. 2004, p. UK5.

<sup>151</sup> Millar's route to becoming an Anglican bishop was extremely untraditional too [*HTBnews*, Mar. 2006, p. 4], as is his choice of clothing for most church services. Millar is revealed as a double-minded man when he criticizes those who "sit light to tradition", because he is simultaneously a strong advocate of the Vineyard Movement which is well-known for being radical and *avoiding* tradition (as well as for outrightly rejecting many of the traditions of Millar's C of E!).

“earnestly contend for the faith” (Jude 1:3) and to alert the Church to real dangers. I beg readers who intend to continue with my analysis, (a) to put our wonderful Saviour’s good Name before their own feelings, (b) to fear God rather than man, and (c) to spare a thought for the many souls under Millar’s spell. Finally, I recommend readers to honestly ask themselves how *other* well-known Christian ministers measure up to the points raised below.

## CULTISM AND CORRECTION

I have identified five different prongs used by HTB to oblige its members to blindly follow the elders of that fellowship.

### Don’t Think

In his letter, we saw Millar disparage the use of reason. From my studies, corroborated by past members of HTB, Millar *regularly* discourages congregants from thinking for themselves.<sup>152</sup> Along with his inordinate use of jokes and charm, this makes for a worryingly cultic situation. An acquaintance of mine who has known Millar since the ’70s agrees that he promotes a cultic outlook at HTB whereby people are taught (as hinted at in his letter) to see their primary commitment as being to *HTB* rather than to God’s Word. This is just one of the numerous ways they are dissuaded from questioning the eldership.

### Don’t Criticize

A related worry is the way in which HTB teaches congregants to handle any reservations they may develop about what their elders are doing. Apart from being encouraged to place excessive trust in the ministers, despite their obvious fallibility, the congregants are assured that only those individuals with a special calling as watchmen are in any position to look out for problems.<sup>153</sup> Should a person feel they *have* this calling, they are told that the only outlet for any concerns is *prayer*.<sup>154</sup> In case they might not be satisfied with this, they are explicitly hindered from expressing their views.<sup>155</sup> If they still have the temerity to do so, in spite of the way we have already seen Millar intimidating them in his letter, their concerns are merely “charmed away” instead of being followed up in a mature, biblical manner.<sup>156</sup> (For any readers who think HTB is operating in a reasonable fashion in all this, we need to remember that Paul *told* the Corinthians to “judge ... what I say” (1 Cor. 10:15; see also Rom. 14:13b). In Acts 17:10-11 the Bereans were commended for doing exactly this.)

### Be Loyal

While no longer its *head*, Millar continues to be involved in the leadership team at HTB, and a further way he has achieved a cult-like environment there is by showing extravagant loyalty to people – which engenders the same in return. (I’ll give an example in a moment.) The result is

---

<sup>152</sup> For some instances see *All I Want Is You*, pp. 33,74,96,109. Millar teaches that it is a sign that a church member’s love has grown *cold* if they so much as “offer an opinion about books in the Bible, or verses or preachers” [*HTBnews*, Aug. 2007, p. 3].

<sup>153</sup> Nicky Gumbel, *The Heart of Revival*, (Kingsway, 1998), p. 178.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.* See also *All I Want Is You*, pp. 75-76. HTB informs us that criticism is incompatible with love. The Bible says the very opposite. For proof of both statements, see chapter 22 of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Overview*.

<sup>155</sup> *All I Want Is You*, p. 83. Millar also teaches, “We take our religion too **seriously**. It is **not** adapted for argument ... Christianity needs presenting, **not protecting**” [*Focus*, Apr. 2005, p. 2].

<sup>156</sup> A long-time member of HTB has observed that “**Any** reservations you might have about a particular course of action are **charmed** away [by Millar]...” [*Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 26]. HTB’s eldership has *occasionally* been known to seek the congregation’s views, but this seems always to have been rare and appears to be getting even rarer – and these views are invariably solicited on the leadership’s terms (e.g. only on subjects the leaders choose).

that loyalty to *each other* has become more important in Millar's circles than loyalty to *the truth*. This enables the enemy to do incredible damage. Let me explain...

Millar's own 'Finance and Pastoral Director' has openly declared, "one of the **hallmarks** of Sandy's leadership is the **extraordinary** loyalty he gives to his colleagues. Once you've earned his trust, no matter how **misplaced** that trust may be, it **never wavers**. He will back you through thick and thin. And loyalty **begets** loyalty. When you work with Sandy and know the loyalty ... he gives his colleagues, you want to **reciprocate** that as best you **possibly can**"...<sup>157</sup>

It follows from this that his staff members can fall into gross sin or gross error and Millar will *continue to trust and back them while they spread their leaven*. Similarly, Millar can teach whatever he likes and those around him feel obliged to follow him loyally *even if they realize he's on the wrong road*.

### **Follow the Crowd**

Yet another way in which Millar cows his congregants is by surrounding himself with a large team of totally loyal lieutenants. Millar eulogizes this team ("Sandy is **always** talking about how the staff at Holy Trinity are the best staff in the **world**"<sup>158</sup>) and the effect, as noted above, is that this group becomes completely allied to him. The result is that congregants are made even less likely to question Millar's direction because doing so would imply that his *staff* are all in error too. Given that the group which Millar placed around him before his retirement from heading HTB was so large that its PR department had seemingly lost track of numbers and could only say there were: "**around** 160 ... **not** including the staff working full time in Alpha offices around the world",<sup>159</sup> it is a formidable wall to contemplate challenging. All told, it is no surprise that more than one ex-member of Millar's world has told my ministry they felt "brainwashed" by HTB.

### **Don't Listen To Critics**

The final nail in the coffin is that, as we have witnessed, Millar warns his Fellowship not to listen to anyone from outside HTB who criticizes him or his methods. As a result of this, we hear remarks like: "I really owe **everything** I am to **HTB and Sandy Millar** [*not to Christ?*] ... [I] became ... an ordained minister in the Anglican church, imbued [sic] with HTB values which I **since** discover are not universally held".<sup>160</sup>

**PLEASE NOTE:** If the reader is upset by the tone of my remarks about Millar, it should be borne in mind that subjugation of one's congregants is termed "the deeds of the Nicolaitanes" in the Bible – "which thing I **hate**" says God (Rev. 2:6,15). God also detests *hypocrisy* (Matt. 23:13-29) and *untruths* (Prov. 6:16-19), both of which are evident in Millar's letter and ministry. And I doubt if the Lord is overjoyed by Millar's promotion of 'Toronto' either. As such I urge readers not to tolerate Millar but to share God's outlook on the man. For myself, I am seriously grieved to think of the many sheep being directly led astray by him – and the countless others *indirectly* so – and my writing needs to reflect the gravity of the situation. Some readers may denounce me for 'tearing down', but why is it 'tearing down' to warn of danger? And is it not *Millar* who is doing the real tearing down in leading the huge number of souls he influences into receiving false teachers and false spirits?<sup>161</sup>

## **FULL EFFECT**

<sup>157</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 13. Also, "Over the years both Sandy and [his wife] Annette have shown **such** loyalty..." [*Ibid*, p. 27]. In response, Millar has admitted, "The team ... are astonishingly **loyal**" [*Focus*, May 2005, p. 4].

Indeed, what is the *one* thing that Millar says "has been what makes [my] job such a fulfilling, enjoyable and exciting one"? Is it the supposed salvations? Is it the spiritual growth among his congregants? No, it is "The **loyalty** that Annette and I have enjoyed from the staff" [*Focus*, Aug, 2004, p. 5]!

<sup>158</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 15. For an example see *Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 5.

<sup>159</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 12.

<sup>160</sup> Ulric Gerry, *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 22. See also Lee Duckett's tribute [*Ibid*, p. 24].

<sup>161</sup> Millar has impacted "**millions**" according to both David Pytches and Nick Crawley [*Ibid*, pp. 5,22].

The issue of Millar's extreme loyalty is even more serious than we have already noted, because if even just one false brother can manage to convince Millar that they are sound, he will show them unswerving loyalty in perpetuity.

This means that any false teachers, or false prophets, once they have gained Millar's trust, can bring all manner of falsehoods and false spirits into Millar's meetings (and into his church's other activities) and he will back these people to the hilt. As we have already discussed, HTB utilizes all sorts of methods to dissuade congregants from questioning both Millar *and* other 'leaders' he supports.

Unfortunately Millar seems prepared to work with *anybody*, virtually irrespective of how heretical they are. For those who don't believe this statement, Gumbel has plainly said of HTB, "we will work with **anyone**",<sup>162</sup> and one of Millar's most senior aides has confirmed, without any apparent concern, that "Sandy is ... prepared to work with **anybody** ... so long as it's all under the **heading** of the advancement of the kingdom".<sup>163</sup> In other words Millar's Dominionism strikes again. As long as he imagines that working with a given person might make the world look more like it will in the Millennium, the *beliefs* of that other person are almost irrelevant (but see passages like 2 John 1:9-11; 1 Tim. 1:3 and Titus 3:10-11).

One certainly gets the impression that doctrine is almost irrelevant to Millar when he writes, "belief in the **bodily resurrection** of Jesus is not an appendage to the Christian faith – it **is** the Christian faith",<sup>164</sup> and "belief in the Resurrection ... is not **part** of the Christian faith, It **is** the Christian faith".<sup>165</sup> Provided someone accepts this solitary element of the gospel (as many cultists do), it seems no other beliefs really matter (although even *here* Millar has collaborated with George Carey who has said "we **cannot** know that He [Jesus] was raised by God from the dead"<sup>166</sup>). Millar seemingly expects his congregants not to question *his* teachings while simultaneously expecting his congregants not to question the (often dramatically *different*) teachings of the people he works with either!

Of course, in order to soothe any concerned brows, Millar presents this deeply unbiblical stance as simply an "**intense** desire to preserve **unity**".<sup>167</sup> Sacrificing truth for the sake of unity would be bad enough – for none of the heroes of the faith did so in Scripture, and it obviously runs counter to the "God of **truth**" (Deu. 32:4; Psa. 31:5; Isa. 65:16 etc) – but Millar's *actual* motivation appears to be an intense desire for *influence*.<sup>168</sup> After all, he doesn't stop at working with heretics. He will even give his platform over to astonishingly anti-Christian people like the comedy writer Richard Curtis whose films have regularly mocked Christianity.<sup>169</sup> (HTB has even published a photograph, taken inside Holy Trinity Brompton itself, of Millar smiling away while standing next to Curtis and his "girlfriend" – as the HTB article euphemistically described her.

---

<sup>162</sup> *UKFocus*, Dec. 1998, p. UK3.

<sup>163</sup> Jeremy Jennings, *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 13.

<sup>164</sup> *Focus*, Apr. 2005, p. 2.

<sup>165</sup> *Focus*, May 2003, p. 2; italics in original.

<sup>166</sup> Cathy Burns, *Billy Graham and his Friends*, (Sharing, 2001), p. 530.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid*, p. 8. Even though the word 'truth' appears over 75 times more often than the word 'unity' in Scripture, and despite what the Bible says in 3 John 1:3-4, one of Millar's closest confidantes says "His life verse [*singular!*] is ... 'How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in **unity!**'" [*Focus*, Jul. 2005, p. 2].

<sup>168</sup> Frankly, Millar appears to want to maximize his influence so that he can *undermine faith in the Bible among as many evangelical Christians as possible*. (Gumbel too admits that a big priority at HTB is the maintenance of its *influence* [*Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 4].) I fear that it was a desire for greater position and influence that led Millar to step down as HTB's 'vicar' just in time to be made a bishop. If the reader imagines Millar can't be too interested in status in view of the fact that he took a long time to move on from HTB, Gumbel confesses that Millar had already been "**threatening** to do this for **years**" [*Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 4]. Gumbel reports that, each time this happened he had to "**plead**" with Millar to stay [*ibid*]. They can't *both* have been right! So much for Millar's claimed ability to hear God – or his claimed *obedience* to God – and hence the wisdom of encouraging his congregants to follow him unthinkingly.

<sup>169</sup> "Richard Curtis ... was interviewed by Mr Gumbel at a Sunday **service** at Holy Trinity Brompton" [*Alpha News*, Mar – Jun 2005, p. 4].

Assuming Curtis lives by the deeply unbiblical principles espoused by his films, was Millar not thereby lending credence to *fornication*?<sup>170</sup>)

## **FURTHER THOUGHTS**

I realize it is seldom taught today, but we must be biblical and accept that the true test of a man of God is not that he is a gifted speaker, nor that he is so charming he “could sell snow to the Eskimos”,<sup>171</sup> nor even that he is an impeccable family man. It is that he shows the Spirit of Christ and obeys the Scriptures (1 John 2:3-6; 3:24 etc). Given this, Millar is patently not walking with God, so how has he managed to convince his congregants that he *is* in the Lord’s will? It’s quite simple. Here are the top ten tricks.

- 1) When HTB is criticized, Millar invariably seems to allege that the criticism is an attack from the *world* or the *enemy*, thereby bolstering his assertions that HTB is at the center of God’s plans and that the Devil is attempting to trick the Fellowship into taking another direction.<sup>172</sup>
- 2) Millar is “meticulous”.<sup>173</sup> In other words, by being incredibly well organized and by requiring his staff to run the Fellowship and its activities like a commercial business would, he makes it *appear* that God is looking after HTB.<sup>174</sup> As with Alpha, everything is pre-planned and ordered as tightly as possible, to the point where Millar ensures that *all* clocks “**MUST** be at the right time”.<sup>175</sup>
- 3) Millar claims that HTB is on the “cutting edge”.<sup>176</sup> Not only does this please his congregants but it also provides an instant explanation if things go wrong. (*Note: It also serves to neuter HTB’s critics, because congregants feel that such people are not qualified to comment unless they too are on the same “cutting edge” – i.e. are already allies.*)
- 4) HTB claims that Alpha is a product of the Holy Spirit and that *this* is why it is so popular. In fact, its popularity is the result of “literally thousands of **questionnaires**”<sup>177</sup> received back from Course attendees (including *still-unsaved* ones, despite 1 Cor. 2:10-14) who have unwittingly acted as guinea pigs to iron out the problems the Spirit missed!
- 5) HTB’s leadership appears *deliberately* to attract ‘middle-class’ people to the Fellowship.<sup>178</sup> By being very resource-focussed, the church’s official activities receive a great deal *materially* from its members. (Millar seems to preach on the subject of “giving” at almost every opportunity, and HTB often hints that men are partly saved by *works*.<sup>179</sup>) Thus HTB is

---

<sup>170</sup> With the possible exception of *Mr. Bean*, every single one of the seven films or TV series cited in *Alpha News* as being written by Curtis promote sex outside marriage. (I am unaware of *any* signs that Curtis was convicted of his sins as a result of being in the presence of such supposedly godly men as Gumbel and Millar!)

<sup>171</sup> This is said of Millar in *Ibid*, p. 22.

<sup>172</sup> Millar’s congregants are repeatedly assured that HTB is in God’s will. Millar also says, “The **world** will always seek to undermine and destroy **YOUR** faith” [*Focus*, Dec. 2004, p. 2]. Note that he avoids phrases like “**Christian** faith” or “**Biblical** faith” here. The result is that anyone who approaches a member of HTB and (rightly) seeks to undermine their faith in Millar and/or HTB is likely to be deemed ‘of the world’ and thus ignored.

<sup>173</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 14. See also *Focus*, Jul. 2005, p. 2.

<sup>174</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, pp. 14,18,24.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid*, p. 14.

<sup>176</sup> Confirmed by Gumbel [*Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 4].

<sup>177</sup> Intro. to Alpha video Talk 1.

<sup>178</sup> The social activities (along with the anecdotes in HTB’s sermons) are invariably middle-class. So much for “God hath chosen the ... **base** things of the world, and things which are **despised**, ... yea, and things which are **not**, to bring to nought things that are” (1 Cor. 1:27-28).

<sup>179</sup> For examples see Parts 1 and 2 of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: World*.

able to throw a lot of money and manpower at solving problems; thereby leading to the impression that God is with the Fellowship.<sup>180</sup>

- 6) Millar excessively exalts those who are prepared to work with him.<sup>181</sup> This includes unsound ‘leaders’ from *outside* HTB who become highly respected by HTB’s congregants as a result of Millar’s vocal endorsements. When these external ‘leaders’ publicly reciprocate Millar’s support by praising him back, his congregants imagine they have had their faith in Millar vindicated.
- 7) Millar’s unbiblical doctrines, practices, and friends, permit a *counterfeit* spirit to be active within his church – along with its attendant lying signs and wonders to impress the gullible (as per 2 Cor. 11:4; 2 Thess. 2:8-10 etc).
- 8) Millar promotes the (unbiblical) idea that churches which are large or growing in numbers must inevitably be on the right track (in which case the Mormon church too is of God!).<sup>182</sup> HTB’s fame, made all the greater by many of the above points alongside its shameless self-promotion, ensures such numerical growth even though the Fellowship is horribly stunted *spiritually* – and even though the growth is largely just transfer growth from other churches less prominent or exciting. (HTB’s very size acts as yet another intimidating bulwark against criticism by congregants, as do the dishonest claims made about its successes.<sup>183</sup>)
- 9) HTB keeps members happy (and puffed-up) by planting new fellowships and thus appearing to be successful compared to other churches. But this is not all it seems. By continually talking about Alpha for years on end, HTB’s leaders cause the congregants to get heartily sick of all mention of the Course such that they become very willing to take part in an HTB planting of a new fellowship simply so they’ll get a break from the subject for a while.<sup>184</sup> (This is why HTB always seems full of *young* people. The older ones get fed up with HTB’s endless unfulfilled promises of huge revival, and endless talk of Alpha, so they join “plants” in the hope that the new fellowship will be small enough for them to be able to bring their concerns to its leaders, or in the hope that the leaders of the new plant will “play a different record” – i.e. won’t parrot the same tired things they are hearing at HTB.<sup>185</sup> The very fact

---

<sup>180</sup> Both Millar and Gumbel also suggest from time to time that a *wealthy* church must be a godly church, but see Rev. 3:16-18.

<sup>181</sup> “He **always** made me feel **special** and **fifty** times more gifted than I actually am” (Rob Parsons); “I so appreciate Sandy for that **extraordinary** belief he has in you” [*Focus*, Jun. 2005, pp. 4,14].

<sup>182</sup> See for example his letters in the May and July 2004 editions of *Focus*. Or consider these statements by him: “[M]ission ... is what matters” [*Church Times*, Mar. 10th 2006, p. 20], and “[W]e were **losing** people ... and something had to be done” [*Ibid*, p. 21].

<sup>183</sup> Consider the following, from page 4 of *Alpha News* #22: “An official survey by the diocese of Lichfield has discovered that nearly 1,100 people have become Christians **through** the **Alpha** Course in the diocese in the last seven years”. This is NOT what the survey found at all!! The Alpha Course had not just been deployed evangelistically, but had also been used as a church membership/commitment course and as a confirmation class as well. In other words, and as the survey report made clear, it was *impossible* to estimate how many people had “become **Christians** through the Alpha Course”. Indeed, it is quite possible that *none* had [Mark Ireland, MA Thesis, *A Study of the Effectiveness of Process Evangelism Courses in the Diocese of Lichfield, With Special Reference to Alpha*, Oct. 2000].

<sup>184</sup> Note the clever, self-perpetuating situation HTB’s elders have engendered here. Christians join HTB due to its image as a successful church – an image created largely because HTB plants other churches. But it is this very influx of new people who aren’t yet bored of the “Alpha” mantra which is what makes it *possible* for HTB to plant other churches without diminishing in size – the very thing that makes HTB look successful and which attracts believers.

<sup>185</sup> These folks hope they can convince the new leaders not to go on about Alpha all the time. They hope the leaders will take a different evangelistic tack – and these leaders sometimes *do* reject Alpha, presumably partly for this very reason. Church planting thus becomes unusually valuable for HTB because it gives disillusioned members an escape route while keeping them from criticizing HTB publicly.

that, outside the leadership, HTB comprises so few people over 40, despite Millar having been there for so many decades, is telling.<sup>186)</sup>

- 10) Millar is able to pull the wool over people's eyes with his scintillating verbal dexterity. We must remember that he was a barrister for ten years and was "on the way to a **brilliant** career at the Criminal Bar".<sup>187</sup> In particular, he was a "**devastating ... mitigator**",<sup>188</sup> and he therefore has the ability to present anything that happens at HTB in a positive spiritual light (just as we have seen him do with the TE). Even when God brings a measure of judgment on HTB, Millar can side-step it.<sup>189</sup> Millar is a man for whom image takes precedence over substance. This is antichrist, for it is the very opposite of Christ. The song "Give 'Em The Old Razzle Dazzle" from the musical *Chicago* could have been written for Millar. He dazzles people in order to keep them from seeing that his case has no spiritual merit. He seeks to entertain, amuse and thrill so as to keep his congregants from investigating the substance of things. One of the many regrettable results of this is that HTB's members are led to want showbusiness more than God.

Incidentally, let us not be fooled into thinking that HTB is safe now that Millar is running a new fellowship. Millar is still in a leadership position at HTB and admits "I'm still **very** closely connected with HTB and with Alpha".<sup>190</sup>

### Flattery and Favor

Yet another way in which Millar keeps people happy is his regular use of flattery. We have already seen that he is "always" flattering his staff and that he describes his congregants as "**all-out** for God". He also flatters Gumbel by name, for instance when he says "Nicky G could do **anything in the world**".<sup>191</sup> Many further examples of Millar's flattery could be given. Returning to his congregants for a moment, he claims they have "the resources **100** times over, to complete the re-evangelisation of London".<sup>192</sup> Millar is forgetting that "a flattering mouth worketh **ruin**" (Prov. 26:28b). For some of the other passages showing how incredibly dangerous and ungodly flattery is, see Prov. 26:28; 29:5; Psa. 5:8-9; or Job 17:5; 32:21-22. Compare Millar's behavior here with that of Paul in 1 Thess. 2:5.

Millar is such a capable man that people are in awe of him. Among other talents, he plays the trumpet and piano; he is an able skier, golfer and tennis player; he has an amazing memory and excellent administrative skills. Observers have remarked with sincerity that Millar could have reached the "**top** of **ANY** career he had chosen".<sup>193</sup> Tragically, people look up to him for *these* reasons instead of viewing him spiritually.

It's true that, when people meet Millar, or even just attend his services, they are bowled over by his charm. I was. But we mustn't be fooled. The very word "charm" is a big clue to the problem. Millar exudes favor towards people, but Proverbs 31:30 says "Favour is **deceitful**". We

---

<sup>186</sup> Of course, some of the loss of numbers from HTB is simply the result of members producing children and not wanting to raise them in London, but (a) HTB's corner of London is very pleasant indeed and a much nicer environment to raise kids than are other parts of London (which is presumably why a lot of children do attend HTB), (b) One could easily still remain a member and get to meetings at HTB even if one lived outside London, and (c) even if neither of the above observations were correct, the issue of raising children can't possibly explain away more than a proportion of the huge turnover seen at HTB.

<sup>187</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 22.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>189</sup> I would argue that Millar side-stepped God's judgment in just this way when the Lord took HTB's Churchwarden, Mick Hawkins, at the tender age of 42. Mick had been the father of six children. Millar's speech following the death appears to have been designed to keep congregants from questioning Millar's ministry [*Focus*, Aug. 1996, p. 3].

<sup>190</sup> Interview on the 'Sunday Radio show, BBC Radio 4, Feb. 12th 2006.

<sup>191</sup> *Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 5.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.* For another grievous example of Millar flattering HTB's members, see *HTBnews*, Aug. 2007, pp. 2-3.

<sup>193</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 24.

must not allow ourselves to be taken in by it. Publicly, Millar almost always seems to be smiling, but as a well-known playwright famously observed, “one may smile, and smile, and be a **villain**”.

### **Behind the Smile**

Millar’s sweet exterior evaporates when someone has the audacity to challenge him. In the letter we have analyzed above we have seen his pleasantness reduce significantly in the face of questions leveled at his interpretation of ‘Toronto’,<sup>194</sup> and Philip Foster never received a reply to his letter of concern cited in section L. Millar has shown a degree of “*hauteur*” (a haughty spirit) even when presented with very gentle challenges,<sup>195</sup> and, during a meeting with a bishop and an evangelist who were both highly *pro*-Alpha and were simply offering constructive suggestions about how to improve the Course, Millar accepted no actions, did not take a single note, and was “defensive”.<sup>196</sup> (Bear in mind that both the visitors were from Millar’s *own denomination*.)

Consider too this report from *The Times*: “Pete Ward, an academic at King’s College, London [University], wrote an article describing Alpha as ‘the “McDonaldisation” of Christianity’. The Alpha people didn’t take it well. ‘His article is a **JOKE**...,’ **snaps Sandy Millar**”.<sup>197</sup> Anyone who knows anything about the article in question will be aware that it was far from being a joke. To those readers who have met Millar, I urge you not to be dazzled by the fact that he is the epitome of charm. Many *non*-Christians are extremely charming too, so this is not a good test. Indeed, 1 Corinthians says we can have all the charm in the world but that this means nothing if we don’t also have charity. Part of the biblical definition of charity is that it “rejoiceth in the **truth**” (v6) which, as we have witnessed, disqualifies Millar instantly.

### **Upright Image**

Another way in which Millar beguiles God-fearing Christians is by appearing to have a firm biblical stance on the moral questions of the day. On rare occasions (i.e. when something major and public takes place in his own denomination to challenge one of the few issues on which Millar purports to have set himself up as a standard-bearer) he is prepared to criticize (even though he demonstrably cannot take criticism himself),<sup>198</sup> but again this seems to be a front – as evidenced by what he says and does on *other* occasions and by the *deeply unholy individuals whom he endorses and with whom he collaborates*.

In this regard, consider his supposed firmness on the topic of homosexuality. When the U.S. branch of the CofE gave a bishopric to a man who openly practices homosexuality, opponents of the move naturally looked to Millar for leadership – so he was obliged to make some sort of statement. But it was a terribly weak one.<sup>199</sup> Consider these observations:

- Millar explicitly stated he was *not* speaking on behalf of his Fellowship,
- He muddied the waters by combining the matter at hand with the bishop’s divorce,
- He nowhere denounced *any* homosexual act, gave no Bible references, and indeed said “I am not telling any of you what to do”,

---

<sup>194</sup> I suggest that Millar shows haughtiness rather than humility in sections B, F (“**often**”), G, V (“**so**”, “**day by day**”) and Z. And his unkindness towards those who challenge his view of Toronto has been revealed elsewhere in this document. When a long-standing HTB congregant in his thirties sent Millar details of his sincere concerns about the TE, Millar stood up at the following Sunday’s morning meeting to warn the Fellowship that “Foolish young men have been writing letters” [Mark Mullins (the man in question), *personal email on file*, Oct. 6th 2005].

<sup>195</sup> Madeleine Bunting, ‘Happy, clappy . . . and zappy’, *The Guardian*, Mar. 4th 1998, p. T.002.

<sup>196</sup> Mark Ireland, *op. cit.*

<sup>197</sup> Bryan Appleyard, ‘Answering the call of God and Gucci’, *The Sunday Times*, Jul. 29th 2001, p. 8.

<sup>198</sup> Millar swiftly, and *directly*, criticized the ‘Dean of Worcester’ over a concern the latter had expressed about the TE [Owen Bowcott, “Toronto Blessing” has believers fainting in the aisles’, *The Guardian*, Jan. 30th 1995, p. 3]. Millar called the Dean’s behavior “mischievous” – a word which, according to the Bible, refers to *deliberate* evil (Prov. 24:8; Psa. 21:11; 38:12).

<sup>199</sup> Millar discussed this in his talk ‘For All The Saints’, given at HTB on Nov. 2nd 2003.



- Instead of appealing to God’s Word, he merely appealed to the physical quantity of people on each side of the debate – as if truth is determined by the opinion of the majority at any given time!<sup>200</sup>

(Note that, when interviewed the following year about the issue of giving bishoprics to active homosexuals, Millar simply said “you can’t come to a squash club and then change the rules to make it into a rugby club”.<sup>201</sup> This hardly communicates the gravity of the matter, and it seems rather hypocritical when one considers Millar’s support for *other* rule changes in the Church of England such as the ordination of women.<sup>202</sup>)

So, when he can’t avoid the subject he just makes a very ambiguous and weak statement. But when he feels he can get away with keeping his head down, or even feels able to play down the matter, he assuredly appears to do so.<sup>203</sup> And all the time he seems very happy to legitimize people who are deeply compromised on the issue of practicing homosexuality.<sup>204</sup> No wonder the head of the “Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement” is reported to have welcomed Millar’s promotion. The Bishop of London admitted Millar’s hidden agenda when he declared, “to suggest ... that he [Millar] might become a standard-bearer for Church of England dissidents is to **misunderstand** the man”.<sup>205</sup> And when Millar was asked if he saw himself as a “flying bishop for evangelicals” he firmly rebuffed the suggestion, saying “Certainly not. **Certainly** not” (emphasis his).<sup>206</sup>

Further evidence of Millar’s true agenda can be found by observing his total and absolute support for Nicky Gumbel<sup>207</sup> even though the latter’s Alpha materials promote a significantly lower

<sup>200</sup> When Millar spoke of a “demonic ideology”, he was not referring to the ideology that says active homosexuals can rightly be made bishops, but to the ideology that says it is acceptable for a minority of folks to introduce practices into the CoFE that are not part of its tradition. Yet Millar did this very thing when he, and a few others, introduced the “Toronto Blessing” to the CoFE!

<sup>201</sup> Russcoff, *op. cit.*

<sup>202</sup> As we have already noted, Millar’s own appointment as a Bishop required the Church’s rules to be bent. He called this process “a development of the church structures” and said in its defense “We **have** to evolve. Otherwise we **are** going to **die**” [*HTBnews*, Mar. 2006, p. 4].

<sup>203</sup> When asked about the issue of practicing homosexuality within the Church of England, Millar recently said “**mission** [i.e. evangelism] ... is what matters [*homosexuality doesn’t matter?!*], and it is **desperate** the way we seem to be willing to talk about **anything** else. The people out there aren’t really interested in our internal **little** discussions” [*Church Times*, Mar. 10th 2006, pp. 20-21]. Millar is ignoring the fact that the end doesn’t justify the means (and that God will not bless the Church of England if it takes this attitude towards practicing homosexuality). Millar’s frequent intimation that the end justifies the means is particularly dangerous when combined with Dominionist theology. This is because the “end” or expectation of this theology is that the Body of Christ will grow in power *and numbers* to the point where it *has the whole world under its dominion before the return of the Lord Jesus*. This means that Millar can justify almost any action on his part on the basis that it will, or at least is intended to, increase attendance at church meetings and thus make it seem like dominion over the world’s populace is a step closer. Dominion would require a lot of people, hence Millar has talked about “attract[ing] people to the Christian faith ... in the sort of **numbers** that we **need**” [*Introduction to Alpha Video Number 1*, (HTB, 1994)]. Millar seems prepared to make whatever changes to Christian practice are necessary to fulfill the Dominionist agenda, hence comments of his like: “I feel **very** strongly that in church life today you **have** to change ... [else] you won’t get **new people**” [*Church Times*, Mar. 10th 2006, p. 21]. (Note: I don’t personally think Millar believes in Dominionism. I reckon he simply exploits this doctrine as a way of justifying ever more compromise with the world.)

<sup>204</sup> Examples would include Philip Yancey, Rowan Williams, David Hope, Tony Campolo, John Stott, Steve Chalke and Roger Forster. HTB has promoted Desmond Tutu on several occasions, yet Tutu has publicly called for the “**ordination of practicing homosexuals**” [Burns, *op. cit.*, p. 486].

<sup>205</sup> *Church Times*, Mar. 10th 2006, p. 21.

<sup>206</sup> Interview on the ‘*Sunday*’ Radio show, BBC Radio 4, Feb. 12th 2006.

<sup>207</sup> Millar says of Gumbel, “Nicky is ... anointed... He is a **giant** amongst men” [*Focus*, Aug. 2004, p. 5]. See also Millar’s unbounded praise in the Forewords for Gumbel’s books. Gumbel states that Millar “has **always** allowed me to do **anything** I wanted” [*Ibid.*, p. 4], and has “**always** wanted me to take over [at HTB]” [*Ibid.*].

standard on these moral issues than Millar claims to. (Gumbel feels able to teach his hearers never to criticize, on the basis that *he* never criticizes any churches or believers. He can safely leave Millar to do any unavoidable criticizing. As a result, HTB's congregants are further dissuaded from criticizing their 'leaders', and so the unquestioning atmosphere Millar engendered there is strengthened once again.)

### **Motives Unknowable?**

Certain readers will be uncomfortable in drawing any conclusions about Millar's heart or motives. While it is true that the Lord alone can ever know a person's heart *in detail*, He is more than capable of giving Christians insight into other people's hearts and motives (good and bad). Let me prove this from Scripture. Peter was able to tell Simon the Sorcerer "thy heart is not right" Acts 8:21-23. Paul was able to know the motive behind one of his co-workers leaving him: "Demas hath forsaken me, **having loved this present world**" (2 Tim. 4:10a). Paul was also able to discern that "Diotrephes ... loveth to have the preeminence" (3 John 1:9). When the Lord shows us directly, or the evidence becomes copious enough and the person in question refuses to take any opportunity to challenge that evidence, we must start to draw conclusions.

### **A Gateway**

Millar needs to be seen first and foremost as a *gateway*. He is a gateway to: a counterfeit spirit; an array of serious errors and unbiblical practices; and a whole *host* of heretics and false teachers. If you ever find yourself tempted to fall for Millar's very considerable charms, I recommend you take a moment to remember the people he endorses, such as the KCP, and all the misery and havoc they have been able to cause in people's lives thanks to the patronage of Millar. If you remain at all confused about him, bear in mind that the enemy is subtle and that a man who acts as a gateway to heretics must make himself appear as reasonable as possible (i.e. the "acceptable face" of the movement) else no-one in their right mind would go anywhere near the rest of the group.

What solitary agenda would explain all of Millar's behavior? His actions are consistent with those who are trying to get Christians to accept the final AntiChrist. The Church of England today is so spiritually impoverished that it acts as a very effective bridge between evangelical Christians and spiritual Babylon (i.e. the false church).

Millar's boundless energy, his determination, his persistence and so on, would all be valuable if he was serving the right kingdom. The fact that these qualities are being used to further the *wrong* kingdom makes him remarkably dangerous. All told, I believe Millar's characteristics make *him* a "recurring nightmare".

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** IF THE READER HAS FOUND THE ABOVE MATERIAL SERIOUSLY HARD TO COPE WITH, PLEASE IGNORE THE REMAINING SECTION FOR THE TIME BEING, AS I HAVE NO DESIRE TO PUSH PEOPLE BEYOND WHAT THEY CAN HANDLE.

## **A PATTERN**

Among other things, we have now seen Millar's: dishonesty; manipulation (e.g. via use of such things as intimidation, confusion, entertainment and hyper-spirituality); tolerance of very serious sin; excessive focus on the numerical and material growth of his church; hypocrisy; arrogance; and lack of openness to correction. (For readers who have not yet availed themselves of the footnotes, please be aware that further evidence is offered there.) As I end, I must return momentarily to the subject with which we started this analysis, *viz.* the 'Toronto Experience'. Elsewhere I have drawn up a chart supplying over a dozen reasons why the TE was demonic.<sup>208</sup> In

---

<sup>208</sup> See the chart *Twelve Telling Tests of the T.E.* in the 'Rubies' section of the bayith.org website.

order to get to the absolute core of Millar, it is very helpful to consider the unbiblical ways in which a *false* brother would attempt to lead Christians into a demonic practice like the TE:

- ▶ Would he not praise and/or obscure the true, ungodly roots and origins of that practice?
- ▶ Would he not downplay the *importance* of the roots?
- ▶ Would he not intimidate those souls who were unhappy about the roots?
- ▶ Would he not exploit the Bible when it could be twisted to support his view, but then disregard it when it opposed him?
- ▶ Would he not direct us to underestimate Satan and to be relaxed about the possibility of being deceived?<sup>209</sup>
- ▶ Would he not encourage us to put reason to one side?
- ▶ Would he not misrepresent detractors of the practice he was promoting?
- ▶ Would he not undermine the authority of Scripture?
- ▶ Would he not advise us to place an undue amount of trust in *himself*?
- ▶ Would he not call us to postpone any conclusions until we had personally undergone the (demonic) practice?
- ▶ Would he not claim that we will be denied our rewards in heaven if we do not partake of this practice?
- ▶ Would he not hint to us that the practice is even a necessity for our ultimate *salvation*?
- ▶ Would he not produce threats to the effect that anyone who casts doubt on the practice shall suffer Hellfire?
- ▶ Would he not flatter those in his church who accept the practice?
- ▶ Would he not defend other propagators of this practice, even if those folks were known heretics?
- ▶ Would he not call us to delay judgment until the practice had had a chance to spread throughout the church?

The shocking truth is that, regarding Toronto, Millar has done *all fifteen* of the above.<sup>210</sup> I urge you to pause for a moment and consider this fact.<sup>211</sup> Surely no *true* brother would ever do more than a handful of these things, even if that brother believed in the ‘Toronto’ spirit. In view of this list, plus the rest of my material on him, are we not obliged to infer that Millar must be a *false* brother?<sup>212</sup> After all, the nature of some of his deceptions mean they can hardly be accidental.

Don’t be duped, by his waffle, into thinking that Millar is just a well-meaning but woolly-minded Christian. Not only is he a brilliant communicator,<sup>213</sup> and able to talk very intelligibly on spiritual issues when he wants to, but he also has one of the finest minds I have ever encountered.

---

<sup>209</sup> Millar has stated, in the context of the *TE*, “We believe with all our hearts that he [God] **loves** us – which is our **safety** with him” [End of J. John talk on leadership at HTB week away, Jul. 24th 1995]. But our only *true* safety is that we obey God’s commands. Even though He loves us, God does not promise to protect us if we go against His Word.

<sup>210</sup> Fourteen of them were found in the above letter alone. (In the Foreword of a book dedicated to endorsing Toronto, Millar indicates that those who reject the TE will lose their rewards in heaven when he writes, regarding spiritual gifts, “we need everything we can get if we are to achieve **anything** of lasting spiritual value” [Warner, *op. cit.*, p. xiii].)

<sup>211</sup> Some readers may be thinking, “Would a false brother not also exploit the ‘Gamaliel principle’ despite it clearly not being applicable to situations where **devils** might be the cause?”. Millar promoted people such as Michael Green who did just that, but I am told by folks who were at HTB during this time that Millar didn’t use the ‘Gamaliel principle’ *himself* because he didn’t want to give his congregants the slightest reason to doubt that the TE was of God.

<sup>212</sup> Millar seems to exhibit a large number of the behavioral characteristics I expect to see in the “Man of Sin” (2 Thess. 2:3) such as flattery (Dan. 11:32). Of course Millar isn’t that person, but the similarities do make him unusually worthy of study.

<sup>213</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 13.

Thus his opaque and hazy style of speaking and writing is almost unquestionably *deliberate*<sup>214</sup> and I proffered one reason for his use of it in the ‘Conclusions From Letter’ section of this study. Note however that this waffle has several *extra* benefits if Millar is a false brother:

- (i) It enables him to seem consistent in his claim that rational thought about spiritual issues is not godly,
- (ii) It allows him to make people *imagine* he has faced up to a tricky issue (e.g. a criticism of HTB) without him actually having to,
- (iii) It helps him slip wrong teachings into his material even if those teachings are unrelated to the issue at hand,
- (iv) Finally, it also makes life easier for the false teachers who are allowed to preach at HTB. Why so? Millar’s waffle justifies the use of confusion by other teachers. Additionally, bewildered congregants are mightily relieved when someone else preaches, partly because Millar frequently re-hashes the same talks and anecdotes and partly because congregants can *make more sense* of other preachers. So happy are they to be listening to fresh material they can vaguely follow that they don’t worry nearly so much about its accuracy as they otherwise might.

## THE HEART

Certain readers will be adamant that we can *never* identify a false brother – since the Lord said “judge not, that ye be not judged”. However, for the following reasons such people perhaps need to ask themselves how well they know their Bible:

- (a) this passage in Matthew 7 is warning against condemning someone for doing the *same things we do*, hence the direct reference to hypocrisy in verse 5. It is not denouncing *all* judgment!
- (b) Holy Scripture reveals how to identify a *true* brother (see all of 1 John), so we can surely follow the same principles to identify a false one; and
- (c) we are actually *commanded* to find out the spiritual condition of those around us (Matt. 7:15-21; 1 John 4:1).

Peter, Paul, John the Baptist (and others) judged people. Paul even rebuked churches for *not* judging (1 Cor. 5:11-13). Would God really want us to be incapable of recognizing false brothers operating in our midst? We can indeed discern non-Christians if we apply the instructions God has given us in His Word (e.g. in Isa. 8:20; Rom. 8:9; and 1 John 3:10). For a lot more proof of all this, please see Part Four of the ‘Church’ volume of *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide*.<sup>215</sup>

## ODD BEDFELLOWS

In closing, my research has also uncovered many links between Millar’s Fellowship and *Freemasons* (well beyond the fact that both the legal profession, from which Millar hails, and the

---

<sup>214</sup> Further evidence that the confusing waffle is deliberate comes from Millar’s own mouth: “What **frightens** me in moving on [from HTB] is that ... I am without ... the congregation that ... explains to [other] people **what I really meant**” [*Focus*, Aug. 2005, p. 2]. Why is he *frightened*, unless he doesn’t *want* to explain what he really meant? Could it be that he purposely uses ambiguity and waffle so as to confuse and subjugate – and that he wants to be able to hide behind other people when outsiders start asking difficult questions?

<sup>215</sup> See the ‘Rubies’ section of bayith.org for outlets.

Anglican hierarchy in Britain are infested with masons<sup>216</sup>). Numerous examples are cited on our website, and I have plans to formally publish an even larger batch in the near future. (It is in this sense that I see Millar as false. I suspect he is quite sincere in his – blasphemous – belief in the Masonic, dualistic view of the universe. It is irrefutably the case that HTB propagates Masonic teachings in the guise of Christianity.<sup>217</sup> But whatever his true agenda, it plainly isn't the defense of Biblical truth. Millar forever seems to subordinate this to tradition or loyalty or unity or political power or evangelism or tackling poverty or ecstatic supernatural experiences or numerical growth or even protecting the environment. It seems he will exploit anything he can think of in order to come between Christians and their allegiance to the Word of God.

Millar works hard to give the appearance of being reasonable, or at least sincere, but I think the combination of the material in this article has shown that neither characteristic is genuinely true of him. If despite all of the above, the reader is still not prepared to recognize Millar as a false brother, it cannot be denied that he is an extremely serious hazard to the true Church and needs to be avoided. Do not all these findings also oblige us to be *profoundly* suspicious of everything Millar's eldership does – **and of every individual and group with whom it works?**<sup>218</sup> Would truly sound ministries seek to endorse, and even collaborate with, someone as desperately unsound as Millar? And would someone as desperately unsound as Millar regularly endorse sound ministries operating today?

Any reader still tempted to support Millar should bear in mind one or two extra facts. If you consider *any* of the following to be seriously apostate then the accompanying comment(s) below must logically lead to severe doubts about the true nature of Millar's ministry.

**Rowan Williams (the Archbishop of Canterbury)**

Millar's appointment as a bishop was made "at the **request** of the Archbishop of Canterbury".<sup>219</sup>

**Roger Forster**

Alongside other praise, Forster has said that he and his wife have "the **highest** respect" for Millar.<sup>220</sup>

**The General Synod of the Church of England**

Of the "General Synod", Millar has announced, "You can't get much more respectable than that",<sup>221</sup> whereas the truth is that, when David Jenkins "defended his doubts about the virgin birth and bodily resurrection of Christ" the General Synod gave him a *standing ovation*.<sup>222</sup>

**David Pytches**

Among other commendations about him, Pytches has said of Millar "We thank the Lord for such an example".<sup>223</sup>

**Richard Chartres (the Bishop of London)**

Chartres has declared regarding Millar, "we rejoice in [him]".<sup>224</sup>

**John Wimber**

Before he died in 1997, Wimber said of Millar "he is a man ... I **highly** respect".<sup>225</sup> Wimber also said, "What I am looking for in every country I go to is a discipler –

---

<sup>216</sup> This is made obvious by ex-masons, and even by such compromised exposés of Masonry as Stephen Knight's book *The Brotherhood*. Rowan Williams himself requested Millar be made a bishop [*HTBnews*, Dec. 2005, p. 2]. Why would the head of such a Mason-dominated organization request the promotion of Sandy Millar to bishop if the latter does not share his outlook?

<sup>217</sup> See *Alpha – the Unofficial Guide: Overview* for details.

<sup>218</sup> For a list of many of these people, see HTB's online audio catalogue or see the chart (and supporting documentation) mentioned in section K above.

<sup>219</sup> *HTBnews*, Mar. 2006, p. 4, quoting Millar speaking on the *Sunday* radio show, BBC Radio 4, Feb. 12th 2006.

<sup>220</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 5.

<sup>221</sup> *HTBnews*, Mar. 2006, p. 4.

<sup>222</sup> *Associated Press*, Jul. 7th 1986, as cited by David Cloud, *Friday Church News Notes*, Mar. 30th 2007.

<sup>223</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 21.

<sup>224</sup> *HTBnews*, Feb. 2006, p. 2.

someone who can take people from [a] raw state, [disciple them,] ... produce finished product and **teach others to do the same thing**".<sup>226</sup> Wimber went on to say that Millar was one of only about *thirty* disciples he knew of "in the **whole earth**".<sup>227</sup> (I am tempted to ask why these supposedly self-replicating "disciplers" were apparently so poor at creating other disciplers. They must surely have been very bad at their jobs if Wimber only knew of thirty on the entire planet.)

## EPILOG

We now come to Millar's response to my concerns. I have received *none*. Time and again I extended the deadline for a reply but, apart from a note from his secretary, sent a little over a week after I first emailed my material, to assure me it had arrived safely and would be brought to Millar's attention, I have heard nothing whatsoever. (After waiting several weeks, I wrote to his office via a number of different routes to remind him of the document. I even hand-delivered a copy of my analysis to Millar's house to *ensure* he had seen it. In the end he was given nearly seven *months* to reply but I never heard anything from him.) Bear in mind that almost all of the evidence documented in my study has come from HTB's *own publications*.

We have already observed that Millar is very closed to correction – or "fiercely **independent**" and "**bordering** on obstinacy" as even one of his closest colleagues euphemistically puts it.<sup>228</sup> That would be bad enough (see Proverbs 9:7-10 and 15:10,12,31-33). But surely if Millar were a sincere, rather than false, brother he would at least furnish *some* sort of reply to my calm, honest, detailed, source-referenced assessment of him – if only to show me where I had gone wrong? I believe a person's reaction to correction is a useful guide to their real nature. When challenged, do they – as all Christians should – respond with: **grace** (e.g. Col. 4:6; 2 Pet. 3:18), **humility** (e.g. 1 Pet. 5:5; Acts 20:19), **patience** (e.g. Jas. 5:7-11; 2 Pet. 1:5-8), **gentleness** (e.g. Gal. 5:22-23; Titus 3:1-2), and **a healthy fear of God** (e.g. Prov. 22:4; Eph 5:20-21), or do they not? I don't believe Millar has shown his detractors *any* of these attributes, let alone all of them. Every single church in history that has become apostate has surely done so because its elders refused to heed correction, yet Millar is doing the same thing in the 21st century.

It will be argued that I am wrong about Millar and that he is merely a misguided believer who has been imbibing a false spirit for a very long time. I will leave the reader to decide if this view would explain the evidence I have presented. But either way, Millar has been submitting himself to false spirits for thirty years now and is patently no longer reachable. Combine this with his energy, intelligence and charm and you have a truly lethal cocktail.

Millar will presumably continue to directly inject his beliefs and practices into the Christian Church for a while to come. But even when he finally disappears, this analysis will still have relevance, for: **(a)** the tricks exposed here are not unique to him; **(b)** his articles, talks and so on will still be in circulation; and **(c)** many of the souls he has influenced will continue his destructive work unless they can be woken up to the truth that their foundation is, if you will pardon the pun, suicidally sandy.

---oOo---

---

<sup>225</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 12

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>228</sup> *Focus*, Jun. 2005, p. 9, and *Focus*, Jul. 2005, p. 2, respectively.