

The Ordinance of Communion and Human Speculation

by Evangelist Wilbur Cartwright

The ancient, carnal churches—the Assyrians, the Oriental Orthodox, the Eastern Orthodox, and the pre-Great-Schism (AD 1054) western Catholics all believe in and teach the doctrinal error of the “Real Presence” of Christ in the Eucharist—that is, communion. (“Eucharist” is an unscriptural term for communion used by carnal churches.) This ancient doctrine is traceable through the writings of the Fathers of the carnal church all the way back to the time of the apostles when there were apparently people going about spreading this doctrine. By the second century, the darkness of ignorance and demonic lies was so pervasive and insidious that it crossed linguistic and cultural boundaries, enshrouding nearly the whole of Christianity and uniting all of the ancient, carnal churches in a common, universal, liturgical practice centered around the so-called “Real Presence” of Christ in communion all the way from India to Rome. Of course, anybody who has received the light of correct Bible interpretation brought through the Holy-Ghost-led Protestant Reformation will recognize the error of this doctrine and will be able to maneuver their way out of the various Scriptures twisted by these groups to teach this carnal doctrine.

The light of God’s revelation concerning communion began to break forth in western Europe after Papa God cracked open the Alabaster Vase of the carnal church at the Great Schism of AD 1054. After He cracked the vase to begin leaking out His Truth, God used a bunch of unwitting scholastic philosophers to begin to upset the applecart of the pervasive mysticism and mystical theology which had characterized the carnal churches for a full millenium of superstitious darkness. These philosophers began framing a new concept of “sacraments” in philosophical terms, trying to use human head-knowledge and the natural mind to fight the demonic darkness of superstition hovering around the elements of communion. Instead of the carnal churches’ demon-inspired, traditional belief in the elements of communion as “Divine Mysteries” beyond human

reason, the scholastic theologians of post-Schism, western Europe unwittingly did the Gospel a favor by subordinating these so-called sacramental Mysteries to the categories of human philosophy.

The description of the Eucharist as “Transubstantiation” by Thomas Aquinas was the first comprehensive delineation of the alleged “sacramental mystery” in terms of human philosophizing. As the philosophizers attempted to explain “how” Christ could be “present” in a piece of bread or a glass of grape juice, these new philosophical teachings on the Eucharist actually served to widen the crack in the Alabaster Vase of carnal Christianity, dispelling superstition and allowing the light of God’s holy anointing oil to leak out and begin eradicating dark-age ideas about communion. As the light of the Gospel began to shine more fully, folks began to realize how Christ is *not* present in the Eucharist, thus chipping away at the demonic stronghold of the “Real Presence” doctrine which had unified the carnal churches for a thousand years.

The philosophical doctrine of “Transubstantiation,” adopted by the Vicar of Satan as the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, came under the attack of such men as that blessed “Morning Star of the Protestant Reformation,” Oxford academic John Wycliffe. Thank God for Brother Wycliffe. Although he didn’t go far enough, he was instrumental in widening the crack in the Alabaster Vase and bringing a greater separation between the spiritual church and the carnal church as believers began to “come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord (II Corinthians 6:17).” While Brother Wycliffe was still locked within the cocoon of carnal, Catholic theology, he was trying to break out of that Satanic mysticism which placed communion beyond the pale of human reasoning. But instead of consulting the Word, this great “Morning Star of the Reformation” resorted to his own speculative, human ideas about “how” Christ is, or is not, present in the Eucharist. He began teaching the doctrinal error of “Impanation,” which teaches that Christ is in the Eucharist through His human body substantially united with the substances of bread and wine, and thus is really present as God-made-bread. He taught that all this is possible through the incarnation, basing his view on the faulty, man-made doctrines spelled out at the councils of the carnal church which were held at Ephesus and Chalcedon. Based on these heretical teachings about the incarnation of Christ, Wycliffe was misled into thinking that the Eucharist was actually Christ Himself. He was trying to escape the

Roman Catholic pitfall of transubstantiation, but his doctrine of impanation shows that he was helplessly caught in the pit, unable to claw his way out. If Brother Wycliffe could have seen that God wanted him and the rest of the church to toss the doctrines of the carnal church councils out onto the scrap-heap of dead theology, he might have been able to climb up out of the cesspool of Catholic corruption.

Even the great reformer, Brother Martin Luther was trapped with Brother Wycliffe in the same pit of Catholic error and doctrines of demons concerning communion. Brother Luther's doctrine of "consubstantiation" agrees with Brother Wycliffe's doctrine of "impanation" on two essential points: 1) it denies the Catholic error of Transubstantiation of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and 2) it nevertheless continues to profess the age-old doctrinal error of the "Real Presence" of Christ in the Eucharist. But, thank the Lord, Brother Luther, unlike Wycliffe, was able to climb his way halfway out of that pit of Catholic Breadolatry by denying that the Body of Christ became one being with the bread of communion. But, despite his attempt to be liberated, the demonic talons of the "Real Presence" doctrine remained firmly anchored in Luther's flesh as he continued to affirm that the Body of Christ was somehow present in the bread, even though he denied that the bread underwent any substantial change. The Lutherans who have tried to stay true to the skewed interpretations of their founder explain that they believe that the Body of Christ is "in, with and under the bread" only at the moment of its reception by the faithful, thus emphasizing the importance of faith. So Brother Luther's teaching is a step closer to the point-of-contact doctrine of the Holy-Ghost-Filled Church which began in the time of the Latter Rain. But they just don't go far enough as recognized by the theologians of the Reformed Churches, who accuse the Lutherans of believing in "impanation" just like Wycliffe, the "Morning Star of the Reformation," but, in actuality, the Lutherans are, at least, a step closer to the truth than Wycliffe was.

Amongst the reformers, Andreas Osiander (died 1552), a fervent disciple of Luther, seems to have held the doctrine of impanation, though later Lutheran theologians have tried to acquit him of this error. It is, however, difficult to discern the real meaning of this fiery writer from his confused expressions. For this reason Melanchthon, in a letter of 22 March, 1538, to Pastor Vitus Theodorus in Nuremberg, merely expresses

his suspicion that Osiander held the doctrine of impanation. Both Melanchthon and Luther were thoroughly opposed to the absurdity of Wycliffe's "impanation" doctrine because if it were true folks would be obliged to worship the bread just like the Catholics, and this would have been diametrically opposed to the Lutheran principles and practices of the Lord's Supper which locates the importance of communion in the act of receiving by faith rather than in the communion elements themselves. Thank God the Lutherans didn't succumb to the lying doctrines of transubstantiation or impanation.

After Luther received his Holy-Ghost-inspired interpretation of justification by faith and climbed halfway out of the pit of Catholic abomination, John Calvin came along with a smidgeon of Holy-Ghost revelation and a strong dose of head-knowledge and, ignoring the trajectory of Luther's ascent out of the cesspool of Catholicism, grabbed the shovel of natural reasoning and started tunneling through the mire in the side of the Catholic pit and digging his own pit of human philosophizing. Calvin, basing his whole theology on his doctrine of predestination, failed to escape the subterranean depths of Catholicism and human reasoning, teaching that Christ could possibly be really present in the Eucharist, but only for those who were chosen by "Divine Election." For Calvin, the Lord's Supper was an external sign beneath which the Holy Spirit might be present or absent, not according to the disposition of the faithful, as in Luther's view, but according to Divine Election. Only the chosen could have the faith necessary to access the "Real Presence" of Christ or the Holy Spirit in communion. Dr. Brother Bob Dinkins points out that Calvin wasn't totally wrong. After all, the Holy Ghost can be accessed by faith through any point-of-contact or "sign" as Calvin calls it. But the error of Calvin was his belief that no human being can be completely, one-hundred-percent certain, of being one of those chosen by God.

Calvin lacked that further revelation brought back into the church by Brother John Wesley—the doctrine of full assurance of salvation. But the divine revelation that did shine through Brother Calvin as well as Brother Luther was the fact that the elements of communion were not the reality. The real reality was the Holy Ghost behind the elements and that Holy Ghost was accessed by faith believing. This idea provided the grip-hold by which the Quakers could escape the pits of Catholicism and human reasoning and dispense with the use of sacraments altogether, saying,

“What’s the use of sacraments when we have the Spirit?” Their question is a valid question that we still need to grapple with today. Why resort to the fleshly, carnal emblems of a carnal church when we got the reality of the Spirit? Were the Quakers right in getting rid of the outward signs of water baptism and the elements of communion?

Philip Melanchthon, Luther’s systematizer, went beyond the truth and remained trapped in the labyrinthine pit of the natural mind, saying that the elements of communion were not channels of grace, but rather “memorials of the exercise of faith.” Melanchthon did indeed escape the Catholic pit, by pointing out that it doesn’t matter whether Christ is present in the Eucharist or not. What matters is that he’s present where two or three are gathered together in his name. But Melanchthon ended up digging his own pit of human head-knowledge by turning the elements of communion into memorials of a past event rather than points-of-contact for releasing your faith. So it seems that Brother Luther’s view is closer to the revelation knowledge received by Dr. Brother Bob Dinkins than are Calvin and Melanchthon’s views because, at the very least, Luther seems to have in mind the importance of a present-day contact with God.

To Luther the sacraments serve as tokens of God’s love. Dr. Brother Bob says this isn’t a far cry from the truth. Dr. Dinkins sees the elements of communion, the bread the grape juice, and also the water of baptism as various points of contact for the release of one’s faith. Zwingli, however, came along and told Luther that he was bound in Catholic error and then went to the other extreme of just seeing the elements as symbols of the covenant among the faithful. In doing this, Zwingli denied that the elements could be a point of contact like the hem of Jesus’ garment. Unfortunately, this has become the standard teaching among most believers today. For them, the elements are just symbols. Zwingli fails to talk about the possibility of using the elements to release your faith. Brother Luther helped bring us further back to the Word by acknowledging only two ordinances—baptism and the Lord’s Supper. He continued using the non-scriptural term “sacraments,” but at least he threw out such other unbiblical, Catholic sacraments as confirmation through the laying on of hands, anointing of the sick, ordination through the laying on of hands, and marriage.

Brother Calvin brought us even closer to the Word on this matter by pointing out that Baptism and Communion are just signs or, as Dr. Bob

calls them, “points of contact,” without any special power inherent in them, opposing the belief of the ancient, carnal churches in “sacraments” as acts of God through physical matter producing effects of grace within the human soul (for example, the way in which the Catholic interpret the words of Jesus in John 6, “He that eateth Me shall live by Me.”). Rather, the elements of communion are physical points of contact to be used by man to release his faith according to the inspired interpretations of the Word of God.

On the journey back from carnal Christianity to Biblical Christianity, many stopped along the way, choosing to abide on the far side of Jordan rather than to enter into the Promised Land of true-blue, Biblical Truth. All these people stopping at various places along the wayside, and stopping short of Biblical Truth, resulted in a multitude of different views regarding communion. In essence what these folks were doing was moving in varying degrees away from the complete mysticism of carnal Christianity regarding the Eucharist toward the demystification of communion by elevating the Word to its proper place above communion and by recognizing that bread is always just bread and grape juice is simply grape juice no matter what some Catholic or carnal Christian would try to tell you. Carnal mysticism tries to blur the fact of how removed we are by time and space from the events of Jesus earthly life. True, Biblical Christianity alots the events of Jesus earthly life to the pages of the Word of God, thus making room for the Holy Ghost to move us beyond the pages of Scripture to a new experience of God involving supernatural manifestations and extraordinary, emotional experiences.

Thank God for deliverance from the fallacious doctrine of the “Real Presence” of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. The conflagration of the reformation consumed the false ideas of a worship centered around the Sacrifice of Jesus offered 2,000 years ago to a worship centered around each individual believer’s personal experience of God in his or her daily life. This kind of worship moves beyond dead liturgy, beyond past history, beyond man-made traditionalism, and beyond the inky pages of Scripture and gets us in touch with the power of God which is present to meet our needs at every moment. This Holy-Ghost form of worship resurrects the spiritual church from the graveyard of carnal Christianity, moving us away from theology and mystery, and centering our worship around singing,

prayer, the preaching of the Word, and the supernatural manifestations of the Holy Ghost in our midst.

In the liberation brought by the Protestant Reformation, we are no longer left to wonder the vain wonderings of the dark ages regarding how Christ is present in communion. He is not present in communion any more than he is present in the hearts and lives of true-blue believers. He is only present to faith. Faith is the force which compels God to manifest his glory. The essential elements of communion are faith in God and the power of God. Crackers and grape juice become irrelevant when our faith makes contact with the power of God as the old-time Quakers knew quite well. Contrary to the Quakers' dispensing with the physical elements of water baptism, grapejuice, and crackers, Dr. Dinkins points out that we as human beings need these physical elements as points of contact. As he wrote in his ground-breaking work, *The Hot Seat of God*, "Folks need a physical point of contact. Sometimes we get spiritually bloated and unable to release our faith. A point of contact is often just what we need to expel all that faith pent-up within us." The ordinance of Communion, rather than being a channel of Divine Glory, is simply a point of contact for those who work up enough faith to reach out and tap into the power of God by touching communion or some other point of contact, whether it be an oil lamp, a rabbit's foot, a copy of Dr. Dinkin's book *The Hot Seat of God*, the Blarney Stone, or even a simple bedknob. 🐰