

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
The following has been passed for general release concerning the resignation of Mr Dennis Luker, long-time WCG evangelist:

April 16, 1995

Dear Mr. Tkach and Joe Tkach, Jr.

I write to inform you that with this message, I hereby submit my resignation from the ministry and membership of the Worldwide Church of God.

I am not resigning from the ministry of Jesus Christ, nor from the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Church of God.

You, yourself, wrote this about the Church: "The Church of God, and there is only one, is not a human organization. It is a spiritual body, the body of Christ... There is only one true Church, only one Body of Christ, and it is unified by the Holy Spirit, which dwells in every true Christian. Let's get this point: It is the Holy Spirit that identifies and unifies the true Church of God, not any humanly incorporated Church organization. That is what the Bible teaches, and it is also what Mr. Armstrong taught. It is not correct to say that any particular church organization, including ours, is, of and by itself, the true Church. The true Church includes all the true Christians in the organization, not the organization itself.... The human organizations are not the church itself. The converted people are the Church." (Pastor General's Report, April 26, 1994)

I, therefore, remain a member of the Body of Christ, the true Church of God.

Regarding my calling to the ministry, here is what is written on my original Certificate of Ordination, signed by Herbert W. Armstrong: "Be it known by this official document that Dennis Gene Luker has been chosen according to the will of God to become a Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; that he is qualified in character and by consecration, education and experience; that he meets the Scriptural qualifications; and that he has been duly ordained by the authority of Jesus Christ with fasting and prayer and laying on of hands by the ministers of this Body in congregation assembled upon recommendation by the Board of Trustees, this 25th day of May, 1963 and he is authorized to perform all the duties and exercise all the powers of the



clergy, and is clothed with all the authority conferred by Jesus Christ upon His called and chosen ministers."

Mr. Herbert Armstrong ordained me a Pastor in January, 1967 and an Evangelist in January, 1979. I have faithfully obeyed and served God and His people for nearly thirty-two years in the ministry of Jesus Christ.

I do not and cannot resign from that high calling of God. I am a bond slave of Jesus Christ and as Paul wrote, "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord who has enabled me, because He counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry." (I Tim. 1:12).

I will continue to serve the people of God who, voluntarily, want me to be their pastor.

Sincerely, in Christ's service,  
Dennis Luker

>=====

- He is something else for you. Following is David Hulmes letter of resignation:

Since my January 16, 1995 memo to you outlining why I rejected the preliminary study papers on circumcision, covenants, tithing and unclean, and inviting you to consider the bias evident in the papers, I have continued to be perplexed by the outpouring of similar material.

On February 8 we discussed my February 5, 1995 letter to you regarding your public reaction to a letter you had received from Mr. Neff. in that conversation

you tried to persuade me to your New Covenant position. I mentioned to you that one of the problems for me was the many contradictions and inconsistencies in your writings and public statements over the past year or more. You said that although you knew I did not agree, we could still walk together because I had not spoken against your changes publicly.

I have spent considerable time in the past four months thinking over the objections I have to the administrations new doctrinal positions. Perhaps it would be helpful if I detailed some of the contradictions and inconsistencies.

Several months ago you told me, This church has been far too Old Testament, but I couldnt tell the members that. No, not for five years. I was surprised at

the time, but not knowing what you meant exactly, I let it aside. Since then I have noticed that you have often responded with a categorical denial to the accusation that there is an agenda of doctrinal changes. Yet in discussion with

one minister last December you described the change on tithing from gross to net (announced in the December 6, 1994 PGR) as simply a stepping stone to voluntary tithing. This certainly sounds like an agenda. As you know, many have feared that agenda involves a move into the Protestant mainstream.

Your frequent denials of any such agenda, however, were called into question by Joseph Tkach Jr.s statement in the PGR of April 13, 1994 in reference to the journalistic approach in The Plain Truth:

WE ARE TRYING TO POSITION OURSELVES away from the fringes and MORE INSIDE A CHRISTIAN MAINSTREAM that itself has shifted in the last quarter century. (emphasis mine)

If you did not agree with this agenda I am unaware of any statement to the contrary.

On April 30, 1994 you gave a sermon in Pasadena in an attempt to control the spread of rumors about doctrinal changes. The tape was sent to all congregations to be played on Pentecost. You said the following about those who were spreading the rumors:

They have no compunctions at all about exaggerating. Like I read from this list of rumors that are going around: were going to start keeping Christmas, and were changing the Passover, and were making changes to please the Protestants to get accreditation. We will ask members to start displaying



crucifixes, doing away with unclean meats, doing away with tithing and we dont believe that theres a place of safety, were going to do away with the Sabbath, were going to do away with the Holy Days and were going to do away with the law...

You went on to quote Rev. 21:8, noting that all liars, those who deliberately mislead people, will have their place in the lake of fire.

From this I take it that anyone spreading the rumor that the church was about to do away with the food laws, for example, was misleading people. Yet in your January 5, 1995 PGR column you proved the rumormongers right. You said: ... there is no scriptural requirement for Christians to abstain from unclean meat.

This perhaps did not surprise those who know you well, because you have said that many of the recent changes have been in your mind since the 1970s. In fact you used these words to me in your office on February 8, 1995 and again more fully on April 13. On both occasions you said that Joe Tkach Jr. and Mike Feazell have simply picked up on your own longstanding ideas.

But I am getting ahead of the chronology of contradictions.

Last year, during the Feast of Tabernacles I called from Daytona Beach to inform you of a problem with the content of Earl Williams sermon. After Earl called you, you called me back. Following is the essence of our two conversations:

DH Earl Williams is telling people that the law is done away, that there is no requirement to keep the law—the Ten Commandments. He suggests to people that they read Acts 15 to support this. [1] Further he told me that there is no

evidence that the New Testament Gentiles kept the Sabbath. A member has told me that Earls assistant, Joe McNair, stated to him that the food laws, Sabbath and Holy Days are done away, and that he (Joe) has verified this with Pasadena. Joe has also advised the member that he should not read the book of Revelation.

JWT Earl is too blunt, well-meaning, but too blunt.

DH He is far out on the left wing. This kind of teaching will split the church if not dealt with. People are already divided here over the issue. I would like to say something about this in my final sermon on the Last Great Day.

JWT I dont want you to address this in public. We will listen to Earls tape after the Feast and correct if necessary in the Worldwide News even naming him if the problem warrants it.

JH He is saying the law is done away, abolished, not necessary.

JWT No one in Pasadena is saying that. Mike, Joe and I are not saying that.

DH On the first day of the Feast you said you keep the law because you are saved. Earl does not want me to say publicly that he agrees with you on this.

JWT All were saying from Pasadena is that because we have the Holy Spirit living in us we are motivated to keep the law. Dave YOU CAN LIVE

WITH THAT. (EMPHASIS MINE)

DH Yes I can.

[1] It is interesting to note that Herbert W. Armstrongs teaching on the Holy Days was examined by the Salem Conference of the Church of God Seventh Day in 1937. On May 10, the following resolution was adopted: Inasmuch as some have troubled the Churches, teaching them they should observe the feast of unleavened bread and yearly sabbaths connected with the atonement of the Law of Moses, be it moved, that we reaffirm the teachings of the Church of God on this point, and also the decision of the Apostles and leaders on this



question

(sic) as recorded in Acts 15th chapter, that we observe no such custom. By  
elders W. W. McMicken and William Alexander, Passed.

Later in 1937 Mr. Armstrong was asked to return his ministerial credentials for  
continuing to preach contrary to the Salem Conference and their resolution re:  
Feast Days.

Though on reflection I was not happy with what I perceived to be the intention  
behind the comment, you can live with that I still believed that you were in  
favor  
of KEEPING THE LAW by means of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. That was  
September 26, 1994. But the inconsistencies kept coming.

On November 4 and 5, 1994 you visited Pendleton, Oregon. In conversation  
with a pastor you unveiled what has become the New Covenant approach you  
have now espoused--an approach that speaks of law-keeping in very different  
terms than the church has ever understood. Yet one week later in Pasadena  
you make familiar positive statements about the law in a sermon on Matthew 5,6  
and 7. You asked:

DOES THIS of righteousness MEAN THAT THE LAW IS NO LONGER  
IMPORTANT?

AND ... NO LONGER REQUIRED TO BE OBSERVED... and that the law no  
longer has any more validity or importance in our lives, which is absolutely  
ridiculous? OF COURSE NOT. (EMPHASIS MINE)

and:

Does this mean we are no longer obligated to obey the law..?  
Yes WE SHOULD KEEP THE LAW, we should avoid even the desire to break  
the law. (emphasis mine)

Later you said:

IM NOT TRYING TO MINIMIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LAW. Im not trying  
to minimize the importance of the Sabbath. (emphasis mine)

and:

REAL FAITH SHOULD LEAD US TO KEEP THE LAW IN ITS FULL INTENT...  
(emphasis mine)

On December 3 my wife and I were in Washington D.C. with you. You again  
spoke about the Sermon on the Mount. In that message you again made  
several strong statements about the requirement to keep the law, including:

Salvation is by grace, not by earning it through the law.  
DOES THIS MEAN THAT WE ARE NO LONGER OBLIGATED TO OBEY THE  
LAW? GOD FORBID. (emphasis mine)

and:

Christ is saying THE NEW TESTAMENT GOSPEL IS NOT CONTRARY OR  
CONTRADICTORY IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM TO THE OLD TESTAMENT  
LAW. (emphasis mine)

And you asked: IS THE LAW NO LONGER REQUIRED OR IMPORTANT? the  
answer is absolutely not.(emphasis mine)

I remarked to my wife after services that if you would give the same sermon  
during your visit to Atlanta two weeks later, then Earl Williams would not  
agree.

(Indeed some members in the Washington area stopped attending services after  
your sermon because they felt it emphasized the law too much and grace not  
enough.) I told you in the passenger van on the way back to our hotel that I  
thought it was a good sermon, and you expressed appreciation. As a result I  
still actually believed you might give such a sermon in Atlanta.

When you spoke in Atlanta on December 17, 1994 you gave a very different



Robert M. Teague, 09:36 PM 23/4/95, Re: Mr. Luker's resignation le

message. That sermon became the basis of your presentation to the regional ministerial conference in Santa Barbara on December 20, 1994 and the content of the PGR of December 21, 1994. This was the first time you had spoken and written publicly of the law using language and concepts that are a radical departure from the Church's previous teaching.

Now you asked...is the Sabbath REQUIRED in the New Covenant? (emphasis mine) You never answered this question unequivocally. You also stated:

IF SOME, EVEN MOST CHRISTIANS DONT KEEP THE SABBATH ... IT DOESNT MAKE THEM ANY LESS CHRISTIAN ... (emphasis mine).

During the past year you have repeatedly denied that anything significant is being done away with, yet Mike Feazell clearly told a small group of ministers at the Santa Barbara conference that the Sabbath, Holy days, tithing and unclean meats are done away.

In addition, the PGR and Study Paper of February 14, 1995 contained the following from Joe Tkach Jr. and the author of the study paper respectively:

The question is, Does God tell his new covenant people to rest on the seventh day? The answer is no, he doesnt.

and

Members are free to de-leaven their homes for Unleavened Bread, fast on Atonement and live in temporary shelters during Tabernacles, but these old covenant details are NOT REQUIRED in the church today, since they are not in the new covenant. (emphasis mine)

On the basis of the above three quotes it is impossible to accept that nothing significant is being done away with.

Then there is the issue of Sir Anthony Buzzards publication THE LAW, THE SABBATH AND NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY which has surfaced among us recently. According to Ron Kelly, its conclusions are fully supported by Mike

Feazell and Greg Albrecht. Some of those conclusions include Sunday as the appropriate day of worship, and the observance of the Lords supper as frequently as desired. I understand that at the January 95 Regional Directors Conference the participants were told that soon the Church would observe the New Testament Passover/Lords Supper more than once a year. Then suddenly the announcement of the change was postponed until next year.

It can therefore be said that most of the rumors mentioned in your sermon of April 30, 1994 did have substance and have been confirmed by your own or your administrations statements. Time will tell whether the remaining rumors will find similar substantiation.

As far as I know, today the church is in the worst financial condition in its recent history. Upwards of 170 ministers are alienated, some terminated under questionable circumstances. The church's doctrinal position is publicly in tatters, and a significant number of its members worldwide are deeply disappointed.

It is obvious that many do not accept the so-called new truths, which in most cases are in fact rather old errors, as I indicated to you in my memo of January

16, 1995. [2] These concerned members and ministers are anxious to preserve the truth and way of life they have learned and to which they are committed. They cannot be categorized fairly as legalists or Judaizers. [3] Furthermore they

certainly are not willing to fall under the influence of Azusa Pacific University

theologians, one of whom is reported to be writing a new constitution for the Worldwide Church of God. [4] While others are said to be helping the church into the Christian mainstream by advising on doctrinal matters.



[2] Since writing that memo about the then proposed study papers on circumcision, covenants, tithing and unclean, additional scholarly material has come to hand. It further calls into question your teaching about the sabbath, justification, unclean, etc.

[3] In effect the same accusation levelled at Herbert W. Armstrong by the Church of God Seventh Day in 1937. See note 1.

[4] Reported to me by one of my employees who is acquainted with the theologians son.

My own persuasion is that we have had a more complete, though not perfect, understanding and explanation of these matters under Herbert W. Armstrong than ever we do today. Put simply, it made sense. What is surprising and encouraging is that various contemporary scholars can be marshalled in support of the Church's longstanding beliefs. All of this is said without appealing to God's inspiration of Mr. Armstrong and the long history of the Sabbath-keeping people since the first century. These too are issues which I cannot ignore.

The most disturbing aspect of our recent conversation on the eve of Passover, is that with some pride you stated that you had agreed with Richard Plache and Al Carozzo in the 1970s with regard to the place of the law in the Christian life.

You said you agreed with them (and therefore disagreed with Herbert W. Armstrong) but felt that they were ahead of their time, and that nothing could be

done. I remind you that Richard Plache was one of the prime movers in a 1975 attempt to overturn Sabbath observance in Britain. As a result he was put out of the church, along with Charles Hunting and David Ord, by Mr. Armstrong. If you agreed with these men as you claim, did you inform Mr. Armstrong of your radically different stance any time before his death? In a conversation with him

in September 1985 he told me that he was considering you for the position of Deputy Pastor General. He specifically asked me if you would keep the church intact. I told him I believed you would continue his doctrinal emphases. His concern was to select a potential successor who would MAINTAIN the church, keep it united, and continue its preparation for Christ's return. He thought the work was essentially done. The fact that he chose you on the basis of continuity of doctrine and practice when in fact you believed very differently, in my mind casts serious doubt whether he would have appointed you if he had known your beliefs. That you differed so much from your predecessor explains why almost every doctrinal and administrative change caused me to inform you that something was very wrong. It is only in the light of your comments about Richard Plache and Al Carozzo, however, that I have put it all together. Apparently you and I were not agreed in the first place. I

thought you were upholding Mr. Armstrong, but it now appears you were not. By your own admission you were simply bidding your time.

I wonder that my many protestations about radical change were never answered, and the changes proceeded as if no input had been given. And yet you continued to insist that nothing had really changed very much. Why? Prior to December 1 1994 did you feel it expedient to create the impression publicly that nothing had really changed in the church's view of the law? Was the time still not right? In any event, by mid-December, as you said to me on April 13, Earl Williams was getting out in front of you, and that could not go on. You then had little choice but to agree with him openly in Atlanta on December 17, 1994.

In light of the above it seems unlikely that you will reverse your present doctrinal and administrative course.

Of course a list of contradictions and inconsistencies does not necessarily provide sufficient reason to separate oneself from fellowship, but the implications may. I have tried very hard to support you for nine years despite the almost constant reversals and contradictions. It is with profound sorrow and regret that I have to tell you that I can no longer walk alongside you because we are not agreed on what I believe to be some of the fundamentals of Christian belief and practice. I look forward to the day when we can walk together.



Robert M. Teague, 09:36 PM 23/4/95, Re: Mr. Luker's resignation le

Effective Wednesday, April 19, 1995 I am resigning from my employment with the Worldwide Church of God and its affiliates, as well as from the boards of the

same. As to Ambassador Performing Arts, I will happily volunteer my time and complete my assignment as Director through the end of May, working from home if you would prefer. This would allow for an orderly completion of Ambassador Performing Arts business.

So that there will be no misunderstanding I am sending this document to twelve people known to me for their integrity and honesty. They will serve as witnesses to the content and intent of this memo.

My twenty-three years with the Worldwide Church of God and Ambassador Foundation have been richly rewarding and I am very appreciative of your kindnesses toward me and my family. I am deeply sorry it all has to conclude this way.

Robin Astbury  
Phone: 08 394 2161  
Fax: 08 394 3770  
E-mail: robina@dshroot.dsh.oz.au

The following has been passed for general release concerning the resignation of Mr. Dennis Luker, long-time WCG board member.

April 16, 1995

I write to inform you that with this message I hereby submit my resignation from the ministry and membership of the Worldwide Church of God.

I am not resigning from the ministry of Jesus Christ, nor from the Spirit of God or the Body of Christ, the Church of God.

You, yourself, write in "I about the Church: The Church of God, and there is only one, it is not a human organization. It is a spiritual body, the Body of Christ. There is only one true Church, only one Body of Christ, and it is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, which dwells in every true Christian. Let me say this point: it is the Holy Spirit that identifies and unites the true Church of God, not any humanly constructed Church organization. That is what the Bible teaches, and it is also what Mr. Armstrong taught. It is not correct to say that any particular church organization, including mine, is of and by itself, the true Church. The true Church includes all the true Christians in the organization, not the organization itself. The human organizations are not the church itself. The committed people are the Church." (Pastor General's Report, April 26, 1977)

I, therefore, remain a member of the Body of Christ, the true Church of God.

Regarding my calling to the ministry, here is written on my original Certificate of Ordination, signed by Mr. God V. Armstrong: "Be it known by this official document that Dennis Leroy Luker has been chosen according to the will of God to become a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that he is qualified in character and by congregation, education and experience, that he meets the Scripture qualifications, and having his service ordained by the authority of those who, with fasting and prayer and laying on of hands by the ministers of this Body in conformity with the prescribed requirements by the Board of Trustees, on the 20th day of May, 1963 and he is authorized to perform all the duties and to exercise all the powers of the

Printed by: robina@dshroot.dsh.oz.au (Robin Astbury)