

CHAPTER 1

CAN A CHRISTIAN HAVE A DEMON INSIDE THEM?

¹⁶And these signs will accompany those who believe: in my name they will cast out demons...

Mark 16:17(a) (ESV)

⁷And he called the twelve and began to send them out two by two, and gave them authority over the unclean spirits.

Mark 6:7 (ESV)

¹² So they went out and proclaimed that people should repent. ¹³ And they cast out many demons and anointed with oil many who were sick and healed them.

Mark 6:12-13 (ESV)

⁵ Philip went down to the city of Samaria and proclaimed to them the Christ. ⁶ And the crowds with one accord paid attention to what was being said by Philip, when they heard him and saw the signs that he did. ⁷ For unclean spirits, crying out with a loud voice, came out of many who had them, and many who were paralyzed or lame were healed.

Acts 8:5-7 (ESV)

¹¹ And God was doing extraordinary miracles by the hands of Paul, ¹² so that even handkerchiefs or aprons that had touched his skin were carried away to the sick, and their diseases left them and the evil spirits came out of them.

Acts 19:11-12 (ESV)

²¹ Others said, "These are not the sayings of one who has a demon. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?"

John 10:21 (RSV)

Can a genuine born again Christian have a demon inside them, such that it needs to be cast out?

There is a popular saying which is purely manmade and does not appear anywhere in the Bible. It is that a Christian cannot possibly have a demon inside them, "*because the Holy Spirit would never be willing to 'cohabit' alongside a demon which is within you.*" In support of this inaccurate assertion people refer to how our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit and they therefore assert that no demon could possibly remain within us once we have been converted.

By that misguided logic it follows that every Christian must either have never had a demon, even while they were unsaved, or all demons must automatically depart at the moment of conversion. It is a nice theory, and I wish it was true, but there are such major problems with it that I do not believe it, and for several reasons:

Firstly, this complacent assumption is just a popular saying based entirely on human logic and reasoning, not on the Bible, because the Bible never says a Christian cannot have a demon inside them. It never even hints in that direction.

Secondly, it does not accord with our experience in churches and the evidence of our eyes and ears because, as far as I can see, many genuine Christians plainly *do* have a demon inside them. At any rate, their speech and conduct are not only consistent with that, but positively suggest it.

Thirdly, very many Christians, i.e. real ones, have actually had demons cast out of themselves and they, and also the person who cast out the demon, can testify to the fact. I will give some examples of this below. But you should also read Derek Prince's book "*They Shall Expel Demons*" as he gives many other examples from his ministry.

Fourthly, if it was true that the Holy Spirit would never be willing to live within the same person as a demon, why is it that, in the book of Job, we see Satan himself entering into *God's own presence in Heaven* and discussing Job with Him? Moreover, Satan does this more than once. Evidently, God the Father was willing to allow Satan to be in His immediate presence so why would the Holy Spirit adopt a different policy?

Fifthly, if it was true that the Holy Spirit would not be willing to be present within us alongside a demon, why does He consent to be within us while we each continue to have a *sinful flesh nature* or '*old man*'? That sin nature is present within every one of us, and remains until we die, whether we are saved or not. But the continued presence of our sinful flesh nature plainly does not prevent the Holy Spirit from being willing to be inside us.

Sixthly, consider the strange account the Bible gives of the life of King Saul. We see from 1 Samuel chapter 19 that the Bible clearly says two things about him, i.e. that from time to time an evil spirit (a demon) came upon him such that he would throw spears at people and yet, that the Spirit of God also came upon him such that he would prophesy. I will just quote two short passages, but see the whole chapter.

⁹ Then an evil spirit from the Lord came upon Saul, as he sat in his house with his spear in his hand; and David was playing the lyre. ¹⁰ And Saul sought to pin David to the wall with the spear; but he eluded Saul, so that he struck the spear into the wall. And David fled, and escaped. ¹¹ That night Saul sent messengers to David's house to watch him, that he might kill him in the morning. But Michal, David's wife, told him, "If you do not save your life tonight, tomorrow you will be killed."

1 Samuel 19:9-11 (RSV)

²³ And he went from there to Nai'oth in Ramah; and the Spirit of God came upon him also, and as he went he prophesied, until he came to Nai'oth in Ramah. ²⁴ And he too stripped off his clothes, and he too prophesied before Samuel, and lay naked all that day and all that night. Hence it is said, "Is Saul also among the prophets?"

1 Samuel 19:23-24 (RSV)

You might argue that King Saul wasn't saved, but in that case, why did the Spirit of God come upon him and enable him to prophesy? But if you accept that he was saved, then why did God allow the demon to come upon him? By the way, later in this chapter I address the question of King Saul's salvation and prove he was saved by referring to the incident of the witch at Endor and the summoning of the dead prophet Samuel from Sheol. Therefore, see below.

As far as I can see, there is no doubt that King Saul was saved and there is equally no doubt that he had a demon with sufficient power over him to induce him to try to kill David and even his own son, Jonathan. That is heavy duty demonisation by anyone's standards and I feel entitled to conclude the demon must have been inside Saul, not merely influencing him from the outside.

Seventhly, when Jesus and the apostles cast demons out of Jewish people during Jesus' earthly ministry at least some of those demonised people must have been genuine believers, i.e. truly saved Jews. At least there is nothing to indicate they were not. They were the saved people of their day, under that dispensation, just as genuine Christians are the saved people of this dispensation, the Church age. So, if a saved Jew back then could have a demon, why should we assume a saved Christian today can't have one?

Note this verse, for example, which says demons came out of *many* of the Jewish people who came to hear Jesus, not just from a few of them. Why should we assume the only people who ever came to hear Jesus or who needed to be helped were unsaved unbelievers? If anything, it would be safer to assume that most of them were already believing Jews and therefore that many of them were saved:

⁴¹And demons also came out of many, crying, "You are the Son of God!" But he rebuked them, and would not allow them to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ.

Luke 4:41 (RSV)

Eighthly, there is also the vexed practical question of identifying who the real Christians are anyway. We cannot be entirely sure what anybody else is. Remember that Judas followed Jesus around and mixed daily with the apostles for three and a half years and yet it emerged in the end that he had, almost certainly, never been saved at any point. Yet nobody other than Jesus knew that. All of the other 11 apostles were unaware that he was phoney. The Bible only offers us assurance about our own salvation, not other people's.

Thus, if someone attends our church, all we can say with any certainty is that they are a "churchgoer". It would be very foolish to assume automatically that they must also be a genuine saved Christian and that they can't therefore have a demon. That assumption would be absurd because many who claim to be saved are not actually saved at all, either because they are not sincere, or don't truly believe, or have never genuinely repented, or were once saved but have fallen away.

I freely concede the Bible gives far less information about demonization and deliverance than I would wish. There are many unanswered questions to which I would like answers. But that is equally true of many other topics and issues, because the Bible is an economical book. It covers a lot of ground in one volume and does not address everything in the level of detail we might want.

Therefore, I accept there is no verse that explicitly says a saved person *can* have a demon inside them, such that they need deliverance. But, equally, there is no verse that says they *can't* have a demon inside them. What we do have is a number of verses in which:

- a) the apostles and many other disciples did actually cast out demons
- b) Jesus tells us that believers in the future will cast out demons

Some will argue that these demons were only ever cast out of unbelievers, either at the time of their conversion or beforehand. Thus, they contend that they see no evidence in the New Testament of demons being cast out of saved believers who are in the Church. But how can that make any sense? Why would any sensible person make it their policy to cast demons out of unsaved, unrepentant, unbelieving people? There would be no point to it. The demons would just return immediately and nothing would be achieved. I certainly wouldn't do it.

Plus, why would unsaved unbelievers bother to come to the disciples seeking for deliverance if they weren't saved? Most unbelievers would have no motivation to do so and no belief in any of it anyway. Therefore, although nothing is said explicitly as to the status of these people, it only makes sense if we assume they are already saved at the point when the demon is cast out, or at least that some of them were. You might argue that that is just a deduction and does not constitute proof. And you would be right.

But surely you would concede it makes far more sense than to assume the opposite which is, equally, based only on deduction and reasoning, not on any explicit statement in the Bible. Thus, whatever position we adopt on this point we have to rely to some extent on logical deduction and inferences. We have no alternative but to do so. However, I believe those inferences far more effectively support the case for a genuine Christian being able to have a demon inside them than the argument that they cannot.

Also, although we cannot base any of our theology on our experience, we can allow our experiences to help us to illustrate, explain and clarify what the Bible does explicitly say. That is equally true of any other point of doctrine, not just whether a Christian can have a demon. So, for example, when we are counselling a person on how to repent of their sin or how to forgive someone else we are entitled to have some regard to our own experience and also the experiences of others.

That is very useful when explaining what repentance and forgiveness consist of, how they operate, and how to do them. That is the case even though the Bible does not contain explicit definitions, or step by step instructions, or at least not comprehensive ones. Indeed, it is precisely in such situations that we most need to make use of our experience.

The alleged clinching argument against deliverance ministry – “*If God wanted us to cast demons out of Christians then lots of churches would be doing it*”

This point is made by those who don't think we are meant to be doing deliverance and, above all, that we should not be seeking to cast demons out of Christians. It is that “*If God wanted us to do it then lots of churches would be doing it.*” At first sight, before you give it any thought, that seems like a strong point. But then ask yourself how many other things which the Church is undoubtedly meant to do are not actually being done? Let's make a brief list, though we could make it much longer:

- a) We are commanded to evangelise the lost, but most of us don't.
- b) We are commanded to make disciples but most of us don't.
- c) We are commanded to love, bless and pray for Israel and the Jews, but most of us don't. Indeed, most churches oppose Israel.
- d) We are commanded to love one another but most of us don't.
- e) We are commanded to love, study and memorise the Bible but most of us don't.

As I say, I could make a much longer list, but just based on those, would you concede that it is quite normal for churches and Christians not to do what God commands us to do? And would you then use that widespread failure or disobedience as a basis for arguing “*God therefore doesn't want us to evangelise or study the Bible*” and so on? People are very selective in the logic they employ and the arguments they advance.

Accordingly, the fact that, as I freely concede, most Christians, leaders and churches ignore the issue of deliverance is not a basis for arguing that they are right to ignore it. There are plenty of things which the majority are wrong about. Indeed, the majority is usually wrong. That is the norm. Therefore, anything true and valid and biblical is likely only to be believed and done by a minority of Christians. When you view this debate in those terms you may find you suddenly see it very differently.

Some of my own experiences with Christians who have been demonised.

I can testify, from my own experience of deliverance ministry that people whom I believed to be genuine Christians *can* have a demon and *can* be delivered. In part, therefore, I believe that to be true because of what I have seen and heard with my own eyes and ears. Of course, if such evidence was to contradict the Bible, I would have to reject it as a mistake, or even a deception, and believe the clear teaching of Scripture, regardless of what I have experienced. That is beyond question.

But the point is the things I have seen and heard do not contradict the Bible in any way. On the contrary, they are in accordance with what we see happening in the gospels and in the book of Acts. If they were not, I would immediately reject my own experiences and place no reliance upon them whatsoever.

So, the things I have personally witnessed are no basis for formulating doctrine, but they do help to illustrate and explain what the Bible already tells us and they can therefore increase my understanding of those things. They are not the *basis* for my beliefs, either on this point or any other, but they do help to give added insight and understanding of what the Bible does explicitly say and that is both valid and valuable.

In my Book 6 I tell in more detail a story about the leader of a church I used to be a part of. I give him the name ‘Rick’. He had severe character problems and was carnal, deceitful and manipulative. I was the Chairman of the Trustees of that church with responsibility for the employment of all the church’s staff and its finances and so I believe I had every right to speak into the situation, to hold him accountable, and to ask questions. That said, I equally believe that any member of any church is entitled to ask questions and express concerns.

At any rate, I was concerned about Rick for many reasons and had been asking questions for some time but getting no satisfactory answers and, in my opinion, no honest answers. However, one Sunday morning, I believe God gave me an insight into what was behind Rick’s many sins and problems, which I also speak of in Book 6. He was standing at the front speaking to the congregation when, all of a sudden, his face, and especially his eyes, changed in appearance.

I could see another face within his face. In particular the eyes were glowing and red and looked hideous. I knew immediately I was seeing a demon and that it was *inside* Rick, *even though he was the leader of the church*. I believe I was allowed to see this because God wanted me to understand what lay behind Rick’s behavioural issues. But God was even more helpful to me in that He did not reveal that truth to me alone.

The congregation as a whole saw nothing, or at least they gave no indication of doing so, but one of the other trustees came up to me immediately after the service and he had seen exactly the same as I had! I was grateful to God for that corroboration because, if I had been the only one to see it, I may have doubted myself or assumed I must have imagined it. But that confirmation from a fellow trustee bolstered me and I tried even harder to reach Rick and to get him to repent.

Sadly, I did not succeed. He was extremely hard-hearted and went from bad to worse until, in the end, he abandoned his wife, gave up ministry, and left the church. That may have seemed inexplicable to some, but what I saw that day in his eyes helped to explain why he behaved as he did and why he fell away. I believe he was demonised *on the inside* and that at least some of his problems came from that fact.

By the way, you may recall that I have said earlier that I believe demons look just like us, and just like the angels. That is because we and they were all made in God's image, which means we all look like Him. That being so, you might ask why, in this account of Rick, and other experiences I had, the demon is revealed as being hideous, with red eyes etc.

My personal opinion is that when God is trying to reveal to us that a demon is there, inside the person, He needs to make that obvious for us. If He only showed us the demon's eyes as they really are, they would just look like normal eyes and would not stand out to us. I think perhaps God is also trying to show to us the nature of the demon's character and how evil they are, not just their appearance. So, there is no contradiction between what I saw and my saying that demons look just like us.

Also, in Book 6 I tell the story of a lady to whom I will give the name 'Sonia', the wife of an elder in another church I used to be a part of. She, like Rick, had many character problems and was hard faced, devious and manipulative within the church. To cut a long story short, one evening at a house group meeting I believe God revealed to me what was behind it all. Her face suddenly changed and became contorted, grey and hideous, like a stone gargoyle on the side of a medieval church.

Only I saw this. The others saw nothing and Sonia's face was quite normal to them. Even my wife told me later that she saw nothing different about Sonia's face. It lasted for about 10 seconds and I believe God was revealing to me, and only to me, that Sonia had a demon inside her. By now I was older and more mature and discerning and God probably did not think I needed someone else on this occasion to confirm what I was seeing.

I should add, by the way, that before she became a Christian, or claimed to do so, Sonia had been actively involved in spiritualism. That was quite possibly when the demon(s) came in. However, she had been part of that church and also other churches for many years without ever getting deliverance from the demon or demons within her, and without anybody ever addressing the issues of her character and conduct, or her background in spiritualism. That last point in particular is astonishing to me. How could the previous leaders have ignored that?

I expect that, as is generally the case, everyone just assumed she must be alright because she said she was a Christian, was attending church, and must therefore be saved. If so, they would conclude it was impossible for a demon to be inside of her. In fact, I don't suppose the possibility would even occur to them. In the unlikely event that someone had discerned that she had a demon inside her, they would probably have assumed it was not their place to say or do anything about it anyway.

They would probably also have been too scared to tackle her, or her problems, in any event. Most people are. In most churches the members, and even the leaders, prefer to have a quiet life rather than address controversial issues about which people might become angry. Therefore, such problems are not addressed because too many leaders are cowards and are not willing to do anything which makes them feel uncomfortable.

By the way, the question arises here also as to why God chose to use the image of a medieval gargoyle to replace Sonia's face, given that demons don't actually look like gargoyles. Again, I think God just needed to use some stark image or the message would not have been conveyed. So, I am not saying that demons are ugly or look like gargoyles but simply that God might use such a picture to alert you to their presence and also to reflect the nature of the demon's evil character.

There was another woman, whom I will call 'Tania', who was part of the same church that Sonia was in. She too had had an extensive background in the occult and had been a practicing medium for many years. Then she joined that church and claimed to be a Christian, although I don't believe she was ever really saved at any stage. Yet, in terms of *outward appearances*, she seemed to be a Christian because she attended church meetings, had been baptised, and claimed to have repented and believed.

Everyone else accepted her at face value but I could see she had major problems. So, I told her I felt she needed deliverance, even though I doubted whether she was even saved in the first place. What I really meant was that she needed to start again from scratch and receive salvation by repenting and believing the Gospel and then have the demons cast out. She actually agreed that she did need deliverance and we met, together with three others, to cast the demons out of her.

I believe now that I was wrong to agree to that. Looking back, I should have insisted that we first spend time addressing the Gospel, and repentance, and making sure that she got saved before attempting to cast out any demons. But I was younger then and less experienced. Therefore see Chapter 3 below in which I elaborate on the vital need to make sure the person is *truly saved* before you go any further.

In that deliverance session I believe a number of demons came out of Tania and there were various facial, bodily and verbal manifestations by the demons during the time of ministry, and especially as they left her. It was not a pretty sight. One example of this was that, as I was speaking to her, she suddenly changed in her facial expression. She then looked at me with a contorted angry face, albeit it was her own face, and said, in a very deep man's voice, "*I hate you*".

This was said to me, and it came out of her mouth, but it was not *her* saying it. It was the demon speaking through her. I should add, by the way, that although some demons left her, I believe many others remained. Plus, those who had gone out would have returned almost immediately, because *she was not genuine and didn't want to become genuine*. Above all, there was no real repentance. I came to the firm conclusion that she was false and had been false all along. But everyone else took her to be a Christian and a valid member of that church.

As I reflect upon it all now, I think she was sent into that church by the demons to cause harm and to promote deception and confusion. I think even her alleged willingness to undergo deliverance ministry was false and that the demons hoped it might create some opportunity to trip me up or to frighten me or put me off the ministry of deliverance. I doubt whether Tania herself was consciously seeking any of those things but I do believe the demons intended to use her for those purposes.

On other occasions, with other people, some of whom I considered to be *genuine Christians*, I have seen people coughing, and even vomiting, as demons came out of them. In one particular case the person had just eaten dinner less than an hour earlier. Yet, when they vomited, *no food at all came out*. Instead, there was just a horrible slime. I don't like to be gross but I think it is necessary to give such specific details as it helps to explain how these things happen in practice. Derek Prince also used to speak of seeing the very same things during times of deliverance he conducted.

In another case I dealt with, the person became mentally fogged and unable to think or to remember past events when I was urging him to repent of them and to renounce his involvement in the occult and idolatry. The demons were trying to prevent him from being able to repent by hindering his thoughts and blocking off his memory. Nevertheless, I persisted and at least some of the demons were expelled that evening.

In another case, one particular manifestation that occurred was that the woman's leg became extremely stiff and the muscles were firmly clenched up, quite involuntarily, as we sought to cast the demon out. That is she herself was not doing it, or at least she wasn't intending to. The demons were causing her leg muscles to stiffen up, without any involvement on her own part.

Then her hand also became contorted and it twisted into a claw shape with the fingers very rigid. I took hold of her hand as I told the demon to leave and I was surprised by how stiff the hand was and by the fact that she had no control over it and was not intending it to happen.

In another case the manifestation was that as one of the demons came out it scratched the inside of the person's throat so much so that blood came out when they vomited and there was also pain in the throat. That occurred in that particular episode of vomiting but not in all of them. I don't know why that does not occur every time but it is one of the tangible physical things that can happen when we cast demons out of people.

In yet another case I prayed with a very earnest Christian, who was most definitely saved in my opinion, and no demon came out of him *at the time*, so far as I could discern. However, he told me he had *later* repented of various past sins in accordance with my advice and he prayed again for deliverance *on his own*. When he did that on his own, without me, he vomited and he physically felt a demon leaving him.

This process of deliverance was repeated by him on a number of further occasions, with him either vomiting or coughing as each of the demons went out. I emphasise that because I want to make it clear that we can also, if need be, cast demons out of *ourselves*, not just out of other people, and we don't necessarily always need someone else to do this for us.

Obviously, it is best if we can receive help from older Christians but we can, if absolutely necessary, do it for ourselves even when we are alone and it is vital to remember that, especially in these apostate days when the chances of finding anyone who is willing and able to help you are so slender.

A very strange experience I had in Rick's church when I met a person drawing a picture of the congregation with snakes coiled around each of them to represent demons

When I was in Rick's church I was at a Sunday morning meeting (long before the incident when I saw the demon in Rick's eyes) and I noticed a woman in her late twenties sitting in front of me who was drawing a picture using a pencil. My eye was drawn to what she was doing, though I did not know her and had never even seen her before. It was a fairly large church, but not that large, and I feel sure I would have recognised her if she had ever attended before. Therefore, I am sure she never had.

Anyway, after the service had ended, I spoke to her and she then showed the drawing to me *and only to me*. She did so without waiting to be asked, so it was evidently her intention to show the picture to me and to explain it. It was a picture of the people in the rest of the congregation who had been sitting in front of her. She and I had been sitting at the back of the church so the picture included most of the

people. The ones in the foreground were seen in closer detail and those in the distance, towards the front of the church, were smaller and less distinct.

However, she was a really talented artist of a high professional standard and the drawing was very clear, with a lot of fine detail. It showed the people sitting in their chairs with a huge number of snakes all over the room coiled around each of the people's necks, legs, arms and bodies and wrapped around their chairs. It was a very striking and disturbing picture and it really grabbed my attention.

It also involved virtually all of the congregation. I don't recall seeing any person in the picture who did *not* have snakes coiled around them. She then told me the picture showed the spiritual condition of the church as a whole, and of the individuals in it, and that the snakes represented demons and the extent of the power and control they had over the people. As she told me this I was even more startled and I gazed closely at the picture.

However, for some reason, I then turned around to respond briefly to someone else, fully intending to speak further with this strange and intriguing artist. I only turned my back for a moment, perhaps 20 seconds, but when I turned around to speak to her, she was gone. She had disappeared from the building, without even staying for a cup of tea. I searched everywhere for her, but there was no sign of her at all and nobody else had seen her or knew who she might be. She wasn't even outside in the car park. Moreover, she never attended the church ever again.

My initial assumption was the artist was a visitor but I wondered, even at that time, how someone who did not know the church or its members could be so knowledgeable about us. Not only that, but how could a visitor be bold enough to draw such a brutally frank picture, which most people would find insulting, and then turn to me and speak so openly about what it represented?

However much I thought it over, it remained very odd and was hard to explain. In fact, I later came to believe the artist was an angel who had been sent to alert me to the true spiritual condition of that church, which later became a very live issue, and also to the wider significance of demons and their influence over churches generally. I think she was sent to get me to start researching the subject of demons and deliverance in earnest, which is exactly what I did.

I would summarise the peculiarities of the whole episode, and my reasons for concluding she must have been an angel, as follows:

- i. I had never seen this artist before
- ii. I never saw her again
- iii. She was exceptionally talented, not just an amateur. I also think it is strange that she could draw such a highly detailed picture, involving so many people, in such a short time. It ought to have taken ages, and yet she cannot have even started it until the meeting began.
- iv. She just 'happened' to sit right in front of me, on the second row from the back, rather than somewhere else.
- v. I happened to notice her picture but she started the conversation and spoke only to me and to nobody else. Why would anyone attend a church meeting and speak only to one person and then suddenly leave?

- vi. She immediately told me of its meaning, very frankly, without any hesitation. Moreover, it was she who initiated the conversation, not me. She also had no apprehension at all about being so bold in what she was saying about our church, which was effectively a criticism. There was also no ‘small talk’ beforehand or afterwards. She just got straight to the point which, for anyone who knows the people and culture of the UK, and how polite and reserved we are, is very unusual. She didn’t even mention the weather!
- vii. It was an unusually forthright thing for her to say and most would see it as rude, especially as she was only a visitor. But even if she had been a member most would still object to what she said about the people in our church and what it implied.
- viii. It was strange that I then turned away for a brief moment to speak to someone else. I wouldn’t have intended to do that because I was so intrigued. Someone must have distracted me and perhaps they were induced to disturb me.
- ix. It was even stranger that she had gone when I turned around 20 seconds later to speak to her again.
- x. It was odd that when I asked around nobody else had seen her, or the drawing, or had any idea who I was talking about. Indeed, even my wife, who was sitting next to me, had not seen her or at least had no memory of having noticed her. Yet surely she would have noticed her if she had been visible, as she was right in front of us and actively working on a drawing. That alone was unusual and would have made her stand out.
- xi. Moreover, nobody knew of any artist who had ever been to the church, not just on that day, but on any day. My sincere belief is that everyone else just saw an empty chair in front of me with nobody sitting on it.
- xii. What was even odder was that, over the next couple of years, a number of sinister things happened in that church which were clearly demonic and which I might not have recognised as being demonic if I had not met that artist and heard what she said.
- xiii. In particular it emerged later that the leader himself was demonised, as referred to above.
- xiv. The entire leadership team also became very hostile to me when I later tried to tackle the leader over his misconduct, despite the fact that I had every right to do so and did it impeccably politely.
- xv. The leader later left his wife, went off with another woman, and gave up ministry.
- xvi. Another member of the leadership team running “Kidz Church” was also revealed as having been committing adultery long term and his wife then divorced him.
- xvii. The church also fell apart and was greatly reduced in size.
- xviii. It also emerged that many of the other members, including a worship leader, had serious sin issues. That worship leader had also been having an affair and his wife left him. That adds up to three affairs and three divorces and that was only within the leadership team.
- xix. It was odd that this ‘artist’ chose to speak to me, and apparently to nobody else, given that I, and nobody else, later went on to develop a close interest in demonology and deliverance. I even wrote this book about demons, which very few people ever do. Therefore, even on that

point alone, the chances of this happening to me rather than to one of the other members are very remote.

- xx. At the draft stage of this book someone said they felt it was also significant that the ‘artist’ sat *in front of* me, not behind me, such that I was not in the picture myself. They felt that suggested that I myself was not demonised. I believe that to be so, or at least not on the inside.
- xxi. Oddly, the artist never told me who she was, or where she came from, which people almost always do on meeting someone. Not to do so is therefore peculiar, even in itself, especially if one then immediately launches into delivering a stark message which is critical of the church.
- xxii. Yet, in case someone is thinking this person was perhaps eccentric herself, or disturbed, or even mentally deranged, that absolutely did not fit with her general demeanour or her manner of speech. She was calm, well-spoken, sober and impeccably polite and sounded entirely sensible and reasonable.
- xxiii. Also, although she was dressed in a modern, stylish way, her clothes were modest and there was absolutely no suggestiveness, and no tattoos either, as one might expect to see from an artist of her age.
- xxiv. Perhaps the strangest thing of all is that about two years before this incident a church leader gave me what he felt was a prophetic word for me personally. He was rather embarrassed as he was giving it because he himself felt it was such an unusual thing to say. He said he felt that I would one day have an encounter with an angel in which I would speak with them face to face and be given a message. I thought that was odd at the time, and did not know what to make of it, so I simply ‘parked’ it. But later, after this strange incident had occurred, I came to the view that it was probably the fulfilment of that prophecy.

I am not saying for certain that the artist *was* an angel. It just seems to me to be the only possible explanation. If it is the case, it would make sense of a lot of the things that happened to me later and especially in the next couple of years when I tackled the leader and the church imploded.

I would stress, however, that what I write about demons and deliverance is in no way based upon or reliant upon that encounter, whoever she may have been, or on my own experiences in general. Everything I say is based upon the Bible. As with any other issue, our *doctrine* on demonology must come from Scripture, not from our own personal experiences or anyone else’s.

Therefore, the main value of our experiences is to illuminate and help to explain what the Bible says, and to help us to apply it, not as a basis for our theology. Nevertheless, if I did see an angel that day, it is not such a strange thing to happen because the Bible says some of us will do so and without necessarily ever realising they were angels:

***²Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.
Hebrews 13:2 (RSV)***

By the way, I should emphasise that any genuine encounter with an angel will occur *without us asking for it or seeking for it to happen*. If we do seek for it we are laying ourselves wide open to be deceived by a demon who is pretending to be an angel. If a genuine encounter with an angel is to occur let it happen if and when God chooses, *never at your request*. Do not seek for it.

Indeed, as the writer of Hebrews states, it is possible you will not even be aware, at least at the time, that it was an angel. I want to stress this point because some naïve and misguided people do try to contact angels and even to pray to them. You must *never* do that or you will inevitably be deceived and the person who replies will be a demon, not an angel. I cannot emphasise this enough.

Let me make one final point concerning the gender of this person whom I believe was an angel. Why was she female, given that the cases we see in the Bible all involve male angels, at least as far as we can tell? Does that mean she couldn't have been an angel and that I must be mistaken? I don't think so.

The point is that even if the cases we see in the Bible, which aren't that many, all involve male angels, that does not mean that female angels cannot exist or cannot be sent as messengers. That deduction does not follow at all. The only way we could exclude the possibility of female angels would be if the Bible explicitly said there are none, or that they will never have any dealings with us. But it doesn't say either of those things, not even indirectly. There is no such suggestion at all.

On the contrary, all logic suggests there must be female angels. Firstly, we know there are male angels and their maleness would be meaningless and even absurd if femaleness doesn't also exist. That is to say that in their interests, personalities, aptitudes, ways of thinking, manner of speech and action, and even their anatomy, males and females are designed for each other. They are made to fit each other in every sense and to be complementary so as to create a complete whole when they are joined.

Therefore, with angels just as with humans, it would make no sense for God to create maleness without also creating femaleness. Indeed, we know from the incidents recorded in the Bible where demons mated with human women, thereby creating a half breed called *the Nephilim*, that male angels must be capable of sexual intercourse, even though they are not supposed to do it – and even after they have fallen and become demons

Secondly, both we and the angels (and demons) were made in God's image and plainly He chose to express that image, at least within the human race, by dividing us into males and females. Therefore, in the absence of an explicit statement to the contrary in Scripture, we are entitled to assume that there must be female angels.

Thirdly, although we are told that angels in Heaven don't marry, that does not mean they aren't male and female. It simply means they don't marry, just as we won't marry either when we are in Heaven. But that fact doesn't mean we will cease to be male and female.

Indeed, it would be unnecessary for Jesus to say angels don't marry if they were all male. It would be like saying apostles don't marry each other. There would be no need to say that because any such marriage would already be impossible on the basis that apostles are all male. Accordingly, Jesus wouldn't have seen any requirement to say apostles can't marry each other because we already know they are all male and therefore can't marry each other anyway.

Therefore, the fact that He *did say* that the angels *don't* marry must imply that they *could* do so in the absence of that prohibition. That is to say they are capable of marriage in every way, including the physical aspect of marriage, (just like the demons who had relations with human women and produced the Nephilim) in the sense that there are both male and female angels. I take that as a clear indication that female angels do exist. Moreover, given that the Bible never says anything to preclude their involvement in our lives, there is no reason to suppose we cannot see a female angel.

The widespread confusion about demons

Apostle Paul was not ignorant about the Devil and his demons. He thoroughly understood them and was not deceived by them or blind to their tactics:

¹¹to keep Satan from gaining the advantage over us; for we are not ignorant of his designs.

2 Corinthians 2:11 (RSV)

However, the same cannot be said for most of us. The average Christian is almost entirely oblivious to and uninformed about demons. There is a huge amount of ignorance, error and confusion even amongst genuine Christians. Much of this wrong thinking about demons comes from false teaching and from not properly understanding the interaction of the flesh, the world and the Devil. All three of these factors cause us problems at the same time and we need to realise they all interrelate and operate as a vicious circle.

So, there is never a time when we have only one problem or only one enemy to deal with or only one battle to fight. They are all going on at the same time. That causes people to mistake one thing for another, for example to think they are dealing with a demon when it is really just their own flesh.

Or it could be the other way round, such that we keep trying to overcome what we assume to be a flesh problem but we get no success because it is, in fact, a demonic problem. Therefore, if we want to recognise and deal with all three enemies or battles - the world, the flesh and the Devil, we must not confuse them with each other or merge them together. Please see my Book 7 which looks at these three battles in great detail.

But that isn't the only confusion that arises or even the biggest one. Probably the greatest difficulty comes from Christians misunderstanding the very concept of demonisation due to poor teaching but also poor translation of the Bible.

A major source of confusion – misunderstanding the phrase “*demon possession*”

A great deal of confusion exists because of the unfortunate way most Bible translators have chosen to translate the Greek word '*daimonizomai*'. They have mostly translated it as '*demon possessed*' or '*possessed by a demon*' or '*possessed with a demon*' etc. All of these phrases have given rise to the mistaken belief that if a demon is involved in a person's life it must mean the demon *possesses* or *owns* or *completely controls* that person. That is a wrong assumption and is an example of how bad theology can flow from bad translations.

The Greek word '*daimonizomai*' would be far better translated as *demonised* or *under demonic influence* or *demonically oppressed*. Those phrases give a more accurate and realistic picture of what is actually going on when a demon has power or influence in a person's life. It also takes account of the fact that there is a wide range of possible levels of control and influence that the demon(s) may have in a person's life, on a broad spectrum, from minimal to extremely severe

The unfortunate use of this phrase "*possession*" is regrettable because it gives the impression of a person being completely owned and controlled, which is wrong. It is not what the Bible says in the original Greek and it isn't even what the King James Bible really means. The King James Bible, or Authorised Version, which was translated in the year 1611, uses old fashioned phrases like “possessed **with** a Devil”, or “possessed **of** a Devil”.

For a start 'Devil' is the wrong word to use for a demon. Only Satan himself is called *the Devil*. No demon should be referred to as a Devil or as the Devil, as it is confusing. Therefore, the King James version should call them *demons* not *Devils*. However that's just the first regrettable expression. The second one is more damaging, i.e. the inappropriate use of the word '*possessed*.'

Many people today misunderstand those phrases in the King James translation to mean "possessed **by** a demon". That is the phrase that has entered into the English language colloquially, even though *the King James version never says that*. In fact, only one of the other translations I have looked at ever actually says 'by'. Some say possessed *with* or possessed *of*. The sole exception is the NIV, which, for Mark 5:15, says "*when they came to Jesus, they saw the man who had been possessed **by** the legion of demons....*".

That said, some versions, including the NKJV, NASB, ESV and NIV do say "*demon possessed*", which I deeply regret. It is almost as misleading as saying "*possessed by a demon*" and, in the minds of most people that is what it is taken to mean. It equally conveys the impression that the person is entirely owned, controlled and under the power of the demon. So I wish those translations would stop saying "demon possessed" and rephrase those verses more carefully and accurately.

It is also regrettable that the NIV translators chose to use the phrase '*possessed by*'. The inappropriate use of the word "*by*" had already entered the English language in slang usage long before the NIV came along. It even more strongly suggests the demon owns the person or has complete control of them. But that is not what the Bible means even in the King James translation.

At least the translators of the King James are innocent of any error because, when they did their work, using the English language *as it then stood* they were actually conveying the correct meaning of daimonizomai. The error or confusion was not theirs but was the fault of readers in subsequent centuries who did not have a correct understanding of the English of Shakespeare's day.

You have to remember the time at which the King James version of the Bible was translated. In the early seventeenth century it was standard English to say, for example, "*He is possessed of a fine horse*". That simply means the man owns a fine horse, i.e. he possesses the horse, not that the horse possesses him. That was the way people spoke then.

What I mean is that when the King James Bible uses phrases like '*possessed with*' or '*possessed of*' it really means the man possesses, or has, the demon. It does not mean the demon possesses or has the man. That was how it was understood in the year 1611. However, as the King James Bible continued to be used throughout the last four hundred years people began to read those phrases in a different way, forgetting their original 1611 meaning and also forgetting that the word 'by' isn't even there in any of the KJV verses.

People then came to think, quite wrongly, in terms of a demon possessing, or owning, or completely controlling, a person. Instead, the correct way to think is that the person possesses, or has, a demon. What that really means is that, to one extent or another, the person is influenced, distracted, discouraged, harassed, deceived, tempted etc by the demon that *they* possess or have.

So, for example, you would not say "*head lice have that person*", you would say "*that person has headlice*". You would not say "*fleas have the dog*". You would say "*the dog has fleas*". That is a much clearer way to understand how a person can *have* a demon. They *have* a demon who is attacking and

influencing them in some way. The demon does not "have" them and never has "had" them. No demon has ever *possessed* anybody, but billions of people have *possessed demons*.

I am pleased to say the translators of the RSV have chosen to use the phrase "has a demon" in John 10:21. I believe that exactly expresses the condition of the man and I do wish other translators would follow them. Sadly, they don't and the NASB translates the same verse as "demon possessed."

²¹ ***Others said, "These are not the sayings of one who has a demon. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?"***

John 10:21 (RSV)

So, if you really insist on using the word possessed, which it would be far better if we could all avoid, then you would be more accurate, or less inaccurate, if you pointed to a demon and said "*That demon is possessed by a man.*" Better still, just use phrases like "*That man has got a demon*" or "*That man is demonised*" or "*There are demons affecting that man*" and so on.

Ideally, when you say that, try also to specify the precise way in which, and the extent to which, you believe the person is being affected, influenced, undermined, discouraged, deceived etc. Taking that approach and using phrases like those will much more accurately convey what is really meant by the Greek word 'daimonizomai'.

The confusion over the word possessed is now so deeply entrenched that most translations use it or some variation on that theme, usually speaking of people being *demon possessed*. In fact the influence of, or interference by, demons can operate at various levels of intensity. It all depends on how much control the demon has over the person who is being *demonised*.

It can range from a little to a lot, and from intermittent to permanent, depending on the situation and the condition of the individual concerned. More to the point, it depends whether the demon is *inside* the person and therefore needs to be *cast out* or only *outside* the person but whispering into their mind or obstructing them in other ways, such that it only needs to be *resisted*, not cast out.

The chart I have prepared below shows some of the main verses where the word possessed is used in one or more of the translations. I have set out twelve verses and for each I show not the whole verse, but just the operative phrase that each translation uses when speaking of a demonised person. I maintain they should all have been translated *demonised* or some variant of that word, such as "has a demon" or "oppressed by demons" or "harassed by demons".

Verse	KJV	NKJV	NASB	ESV	RSV	NIV
Matthew 4:24	Possessed with devils	Demon possessed	Demoniacs	Oppressed by demons	Demoniacs	Demon possessed
Matthew 8:16	Possessed with devils	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Oppressed by demons	Possessed with demons	Demon possessed
Matthew 8:28	Possessed with devils	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demoniacs	Demon possessed
Matthew 8:33	To the possessed of the devils	Demon possessed	demoniacs	Demon possessed	Demoniacs	Demon possessed
Matthew 3:32	Possessed with a devil	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demon oppressed	Demoniacs	Demon possessed
Matthew 12:22	Possessed with a devil	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demon oppressed	Demoniacs	Demon possessed
Mark 1:32	Possessed with devils	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Oppressed by demons	Possessed with demons	Demon possessed
Mark 5:15	Possessed with the devil	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demoniacs	Possessed by the legion of demons
Mark 5:18	Possessed with the devil	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Possessed with demons	Possessed with demons	Demon possessed
Luke 8:36	Possessed of the devils	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Demon possessed	Possessed with demons	Demon possessed
Acts 8:17	Unclean spirits came out of many that were possessed with them	Unclean spirits came out of many who were possessed	Had unclean spirits	unclean spirits came out of many	Possessed	Evil spirits came out of many
Acts 16:16	A certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination	Possessed with a spirit of divination	Having a spirit of divination	Had a spirit of divination	Had a spirit of divination	Demon possessed

Levels of demonic activity in our lives

It is important to understand this error about the use of the word '*possessed*' and all the confusion and offence that error has caused over the years. Otherwise, you will not have a correct understanding of how demons operate and how to deal with them. Remember, there is a profound difference between:

- a) *a demon possessing or having you*, which never happens to anybody and
- b) *you possessing or having a demon*, which can happen every day to all of us

The reality is that, to varying degrees, all of us can be said to *have* a demon or demons, at least from time to time. There is a wide range of levels of activity by demons in our lives, from the very mild to the very extreme. Any one of these levels of demonic activity could still be described as *you having a demon*, but they could never be described as *a demon having or owning you*.

Even someone as heavily demonised as Adolf Hitler was never 100 percent controlled by demons. He still had some free will left, right up to the end, and even he could have chosen to repent and turn away from his dreadful sins if he had ever wanted to. Indeed, there were a number of leading Nazis who repented even while awaiting trial at Nuremburg prior to being hanged. So we will meet them in Heaven. However, in Hitler's case his problem was that *he did not want to*.

Most people would agree that Adolf Hitler was probably as heavily demonised as it is possible to be. In fact, many people who met him, including non-believers and even thoroughly secular people, said they saw an eerie blue light around him, almost as if electricity was coming from him. I believe that power came from the many powerful demons within him. I have seen something similar myself coming from the eyes of men whom I believe were heavily demonised.

What Hitler had was not merely human energy or power. He was energised and guided to do things no man could do on his own. Hitler had a supernatural foreknowledge. He frequently amazed his generals, i.e. highly professional experts who would give good advice to him which he would over rule because he had a hunch or an intuition and then it would turn out his hunch was right. He regularly operated by intuition, but it was of demonic origin, i.e. the demons were telling him what to do, at least from 1933 to 1941.

For many years, i.e. until April 1941 when he delayed the invasion of Russia in order to deal with a strategically unimportant distraction in Yugoslavia, he made hardly any errors. The only major error before that was in May 1940 when he held back the Panzer divisions from closing in on the British Army as it retreated to Dunkirk. He had the chance to capture the whole British Army and finish Britain as a fighting force on land. But he stupidly held back, in my view due to Divine intervention.

However, from then on his demonic guidance led him into error after error, probably because the prayers of people worldwide caused God to send confusion into Hitler's mind. I believe it was also because God wanted to protect the Jews and to prevent Hitler moving into the Middle East and occupying the land of Israel where many Jews already lived. That is why God granted victory to the British Army at Alamein, which prevented the Nazis from seizing the Holy Land.

The choices Hitler made from a young age and his intense occult activity, meant he was inviting demons to operate in and through him. It was the demons which gave him the phenomenal power he had over people. He began as a mediocre house painter and decorator, but was transformed by the addition of

demonic power into a mesmerising public speaker who could hold crowds in a trance and bend their minds, such that they wanted to worship him, with shouts of "*Heil Hitler*". He did it primarily through demonic power rather than through his own personal gifts and characteristics.

However, my point is that even someone like him could not, technically, be said to be *entirely* in the power of demons. He could still have repented and been saved *if he had wanted to*. This point is illustrated by the life of King Manassah of Judah, who was one of the most evil kings ever to reign in Jerusalem. He even sacrificed his own children to demons by burning them alive. He also committed many other wicked acts. Yet, in his late middle age he repented, changed his ways and became a devout believing Jew. Therefore, we will see Manasseh in Heaven.

If someone as evil and depraved as King Manasseh could do that then anybody can break free of the power and influence of a demon, *provided they want to*. His example proves it can be done. Sadly, it is very rare for people to turn back from such extreme wickedness. The main reason for that however is *they simply don't want to, not that they cannot do it*. That is what makes it all the more tragic. Indeed, in my own experience I have known many demonised people who did not want to be delivered for all sorts of reasons.

If even Adolf Hitler and King Manassah retained their free will and had the ability to turn away from demonic influence if they had wished to, that is surely even more true of each of us. Nevertheless, for most Christians, most of the time, the need is not for deliverance, i.e. the forcible *casting out* of demons *from inside them* by another person.

Instead, the need in most cases is for that Christian to *resist the external* demonic activity in his own life coming from demons *on the outside* of him. That is what the later chapters of my Book 7 focus upon and I would urge you to read that book alongside this one to get the wider picture.

Moreover, demons come and go of their own accord to suit themselves. They do not necessarily afflict a person continuously. They have other things to do and, like Satan, they can only be in one place at a time. So, when you come across people whose behaviour fluctuates and who are sometimes normal but, at other times, become aggressive or gamble, or get drunk be aware that those variations in conduct could be due to the demon coming and going, as happened to King Saul. He had a demon inside him which made him throw spears at people sometimes and yet at other times he would be calm and rational.

But also, even in the case of Jesus, who did not have any demon inside Him, the demonic attacks upon Him from the outside were *intermittent, not continuous*:

¹² *And Jesus answered him, "It is said, 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God.'"* ¹³ *And when the devil had ended every temptation, he departed from him until an opportune time.*

Luke 4:12-13 (RSV)

My conclusions on whether a Christian can "have" a demon

Nobody, on either side of this debate, can point to any verse which states conclusively that a Christian can, or can't, have a demon inside them. Indeed, there is no verse anywhere in the New Testament which addresses the issue, even in a round about way. We are given no direct or even indirect answer to the question. Therefore all of us are required to rely upon our own logical deduction to extrapolate

from various passages and to form our arguments on the basis of our own reasoning. There is no other way.

It is important to get that clear from the outset because I hear people saying *“There is no verse which says a Christian can have a demon inside them.”* They are right, but they never seem to follow it up by conceding *“But then again neither is there is any verse which says they can’t.”* Therefore, we all need to be honest and humble ourselves and admit that any position we take is just our own opinion and nothing more.

Having said that, I believe there is an Old Testament authority for saying a saved believer, albeit a saved Jew, not a Christian, can have a demon. I refer to the case of King Saul who was a saved man, whom we will meet in Heaven. Yet he had a demon inside him which came and went and which caused him, at times, to become insane with paranoia and envy such that he tried to kill David and even his own son, Jonathan.

That said, I recognise you might challenge my premise that King Saul was saved and ask me to prove it. The main point I would make in response is to point to the episode of the witch of Endor who summoned up the prophet Samuel from Sheol, which at that time was for both the saved and the unsaved. Indeed, we see this division of Sheol into two separate parts in Luke chapter 16 with the account of Lazarus and the rich man who were on either side of a great divide.

Samuel rebukes Saul for his folly but concludes by saying *“Tomorrow you and your sons shall be with me...”* The point is Samuel had obviously been summoned from the section of Sheol reserved at that time for saved Jews, also known as “Abraham’s bosom”. Therefore, if Saul was shortly to be with Samuel, he must have been heading to Abraham’s bosom himself which means he must have been a saved Jew.

The point is strengthened even more if we remember that this statement by Samuel includes Jonathan who was undoubtedly a saved man. There can be no question about that. Therefore, we know that Saul was told that the next day he would be in Sheol with two men whom we know were definitely saved, i.e. Samuel and Jonathan.

You must decide for yourself whether my deductive reasoning on this point is valid or invalid. But if it is correct, it means a saved Jew could have a demon. If that is so, then what basis is there for contending that a saved Christian cannot have one? It would make no sense.

But also, I think we have to look at the many occasions within the gospels which record Jesus and many others, casting out demons. Are we to suppose this only occurred in the case of unsaved Jews, not those who were saved? If we believe that, we certainly have no verse to rely upon as an authority because the issue is never addressed.

The gospels just speak of people coming to Jesus, or the disciples, and the demons being cast out and no further clarification is given. Let us therefore ask ourselves what sort of people these demonised Jews were. Are we to suppose they were all unsaved and unbelievers? I see no conceivable basis to say that.

Surely, if anything, it is more likely the people taking the trouble to attend Jesus’ meetings and ask for help were saved believers. If not, what would motivate them to attend? I can fully accept that some of

them, and perhaps many of them, were unsaved. But I see no basis for asserting that all of them were unsaved.

To do so would be to assume the rightness of your opinion as a given and then impose that belief on every verse you read. This is known as '*eisegesis*', i.e. reading your pre-existing beliefs into a verse, as opposed to '*exegesis*' which means simply extracting from the verse what the verse actually says, without adding any of your own pre-conceived ideas.

Perhaps the clinching argument in favour of believing that at least some of the people who were delivered from demons were Christians is that there is little or no point casting out a demon from an unsaved person. Certainly, that has always been my policy because the demon would just return immediately to an unsaved person, there being nothing to prevent it doing so. Most people I have read or heard on this point say the same.

For deliverance to be effective and permanent, the person has to have repented of any sins, and/or forgiven any major wrongs done to them, and/or renounced any vows or occult statements or curses, that had given the demon *the right to enter and remain in the first place*. In the vast majority of cases this will only occur in the life of a person who is *already saved* since an unsaved person is not likely to repent, forgive and renounce in these ways.

In my view, if the demon has the legal right to enter and remain, there is nothing to gain by forcibly casting him out (which you can do if you wish) because he will just go straight back in. It would be like getting a bailiff to evict a squatter but then leaving the windows and doors unlocked so he can walk back in immediately. Indeed, it goes beyond that and the demon might be said to have a valid "tenancy agreement" which he can present to the bailiff and be allowed to re-enter the 'building'.

The point occurs to me that if I and most other practitioners of deliverance know that, why would we suppose the apostles and other disciples didn't know it, such that they were willing to cast demons out of the unsaved? That argument would be inconsistent with what Jesus Himself said about how a demon who is cast out of a person is capable of returning and bringing other demons with him.

That of course would apply in circumstances where there is nothing to prevent the demon returning, because the same circumstances which allowed the demon to enter in the first place are still there as there has not been any repentance or forgiving others, or renouncing of the occult etc, and the person has not changed their sinful lifestyle. See below the statements Jesus Himself made about a demon returning and bringing with him seven others even more wicked than himself:

²⁶ Then he goes and brings seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter and dwell there; and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first."

Luke 11:26 (RSV)

⁴⁴ Then he says, 'I will return to my house from which I came.' And when he comes he finds it empty, swept, and put in order. ⁴⁵ Then he goes and brings with him seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter and dwell there; and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first. So shall it be also with this evil generation."

Matthew 12:44-45 (RSV)

The most sensible position we can adopt is to be open minded to the idea of a Christian having a demon which needs to be cast out and to assume that at least some of the people who obtained deliverance

from Jesus and the disciples were saved believers. I go further than that myself and believe the balance of evidence from Scripture is overwhelmingly in support of the proposition that a saved Christian can have a demon operating from *inside* them – such that it needs to be cast out, not merely resisted, as I dealt with in my Book 7.

Added to that there is my own experience of dealing with people whom I believed (albeit only in my own opinion) to be both saved and demonised. Of course, as I have emphasised many times, our own experiences are no basis for forming our theology. That must come solely from Scripture. But I do find that the many things I have seen and heard are all consistent with and supportive of my belief, derived from Scripture, that a Christian can have a demon inside them.

Another argument some would make in the case of a person who claims to be a Christian and has a demon cast out of them is to say “*Well, if a demon came out of him, he cannot have been a real Christian in the first place.*” Some people do reconcile this debate in that way. But it is unsatisfactory and is hardly a basis for reassurance. So, for example, if we look at the case of the very carnal church leader I dealt with, whom I have called ‘Rick’, the options are:

- a) he was a real Christian and he had a demon OR
- b) he only seemed to be a Christian but wasn’t ever really saved OR
- c) he had been a Christian previously but then fell away and ceased to be saved, at which point he then acquired a demon

Would you agree with me that if you can’t accept option a) and therefore choose options b) or c) it doesn’t provide much satisfaction or reassurance and doesn’t really take us anywhere? It would mean that if you come across people in churches, even in leadership, who are behaving in a corrupt, dishonest, carnal manner then you would have to reconcile those facts with your rigid belief that a Christian cannot have a demon. You would then have to assume either that they were never saved or that they have ceased to be saved and have fallen away.

Either option will put just as many cats among the pigeons as if you had simply concluded, as I believe, that a saved Christian can have a demon inside him from which he needs to be set free. So, by insisting that a Christian can’t have a demon within them you might avoid one theological problem but you create two others in its place.

Therefore, if you take that view, you would need to find a way to rebut my argument that a genuinely saved Christian can have a demon inside them. But the implications of denying that will only lead you into an even larger hornets’ nest whereby you have to assume that any alleged Christian with demonic problems is not and never was a real Christian to begin with or that they have fallen away and ceased to be a Christian. So you might avoid one “hot potato” but you acquire two more equally hot potatoes in its place. And I see no hope of your being able to prove that none of those options apply.

The widespread belief that casting out demons, plus healing and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, were only meant for the days of Jesus and the apostles and ceased in the first century

I would concede that this is the majority view in today’s churches and that most Christians would not even consider casting out a demon or praying for healing, i.e. with any real faith that healing will occur.

Neither would they operate in the gifts of the Holy Spirit or tolerate anybody else doing so in their church. That is certainly most people's position, but it doesn't make it right.

Why therefore do people believe that all these supernatural things have ceased but everything else in the Bible, in particular the Gospel, has continued? I would say the primary reason why most people don't operate in anything supernatural is simply that *they never see it modelled*. That is to say they do not see other people that they know doing any of these things. Therefore, they conclude, automatically, they should not do any of it either. But their policy of refraining from it isn't based on their theology, or on deeply reasoned logical analysis.

It's like saying that unless you see a lot of other people wearing flared trousers (as in 1974) you will not wear flared trousers. But if enough people wore them to make it seem normal to you, then you would join in and start to wear them. Would you agree that this is not a good model for us to follow in deciding what our theology ought to be?

Our beliefs should be based solely on *what the Bible says*, not on what we see other people doing or not doing. Moreover, the majority is almost always wrong and the truth is usually to be found within the minority. So, one would be rather foolish to reject what the Bible says on the basis that most other people disagree with it. You should be expecting most people to disagree with the Bible.

The reality is that, even within churches, when it comes to theology, most people are wrong or at least ignorant and only a small minority of members have studied enough to find the truth. Therefore, we can safely rule out following the crowd as a basis for determining our theology.

We must base all our beliefs on careful and diligent study of the Bible and also on sound logical deductions arising indirectly from Scripture, i.e. in cases where the Bible is not explicit on a certain point. What we certainly should not do is base our beliefs or practices on what we see most other people doing – or not doing. They are, by definition, the people on the “broad road” and that is not the road we are supposed to be on.

Let us also ask ourselves what basis could there be for believing that the many commands given to the first century church were only intended for them, not for the people of the second century, or the twenty first? There is absolutely no verse anywhere in the New Testament which suggests this, even indirectly. Therefore, anyone who holds this view is not basing it on Scripture but on their own reasoning and/or the traditions of their denomination. But neither of those are a valid basis for formulating our theology.

One particular Bible teacher I know who is very much a ‘cessationist’, believes that healing, spiritual gifts and deliverance all ceased in the first century. He maintains that there are only four references to deliverance outside of the gospels and he deduces from that scarcity of verses that deliverance ceased to be a focus of church activity after Jesus' ministry ended. But let's look at the implications of that argument. For a start, there are many things in Scripture which get only one mention, let alone four. But that doesn't mean we can ignore or disobey those verses.

Think of it this way. If you were a soldier in the Army and your Commanding Officer gave you an order, how do you think he would respond if you were to say “*Yes, fair enough, but you have only given me that order once. I would prefer you to tell me five times, or better still ten times. Then I could be sure you really mean it.*”? Any soldier saying that would soon find himself before a Court Martial.

Moreover, concerning the argument that casting out demons is only mentioned four times outside the gospels, I have to point out that there are various things about which the Bible gives very little detail, or which aren't mentioned at all, and yet we know they happened. For example, consider what Jesus said about the village of Chorazin on the shores of Lake Galilee. He spoke of "the miracles that occurred in (Chorazin)" and yet the gospels record none of these mighty miracles.

So, Jesus says they happened, which makes the people's failure to repent more blameworthy if they lived there, but the Holy Spirit did not choose to tell us anything about what those miracles were. Therefore, scarcity of mention, or even no mention at all, does not mean that things did not happen or even that they did not happen frequently. So, that argument is a very weak one in my view.

²¹ ***"Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the miracles that occurred in you had occurred in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."***

Matthew 11:21 (NASB)

For all sorts of reasons there are certain things in the Bible which we are told only once or twice, but other things about which God tells us the same thing over and over again. For example, he tells us 365 times not to be afraid. But if He had chosen to tell us that only once, the command would have been just as binding. So, the number of times an instruction is given is no basis for deciding whether or not to obey it or believe it, or whether it is important.

Moreover, if Jesus says at the end of Mark 16 that His followers would cast out demons and do various other things, He is plainly referring to the future, not the past or present. He is talking about what His followers are *going to do in the future*. But what conceivable basis can there be for concluding that He only meant these things to happen for the remainder of what we now call the first century but not later centuries?

Nobody in the first century thought of themselves as being in the "first century". They just saw themselves as being in the present, exactly the same as we do, and they were hearing Jesus speak of what His followers would do in the future. But the length of that future period or the point at which these activities might cease were not mentioned.

Equally, how can we justify arguing that Jesus only meant the 12 apostles to cast out demons rather than everyone? Bear in mind that even during Jesus' ministry He had already sent out the 70 as well as the 12 and they cast out demons just as the 12 did. And so did many others as well, quite apart from the 12 and the 70. So why should we assume that at the end of His ministry He suddenly changed His policy on deliverance and reserved it exclusively for the 12 apostles or even the 70, but not other disciples?

It would make no sense and, above all, there is nothing in the Bible to suggest it. Accordingly, instead of trying to justify our own inactivity by constructing arguments that the ministry of deliverance, healing and spiritual gifts, have ceased, let us interview ourselves robustly as to *why* we are not doing it.

I have cross examined myself very vigorously as to why I don't see people healed when I pray for them and the conclusion I have reached is that it is primarily because neither I, nor they, have adequate faith for healing. That is partly my fault and partly theirs, but I think it is also because we live in a society that is saturated in unbelief. It is like a thick, damp cloud which surrounds us and takes all the faith out of us.

It brings to mind the situation that even Jesus faced when He found He could not perform miracles of healing in His home town of Nazareth, not because of unbelief on His part, but due to their unbelief which hung like a wet blanket over the town and made healing impossible even for Him.

I believe we are now living in a huge ‘Nazareth’, encompassing most of the western world in which any faith we might have is sucked out of us. That pervasive cloud of unbelief that is all around us, even inside churches, may *explain* our failure to do as we should in the areas of deliverance, healing and spiritual gifts, but it does not *justify* it.

Therefore if we are full of unbelief we need to repent of it and change, even if nobody else does. That may not alter the fact that we are still living in a great big Nazareth, surrounded by people who are saturated in unbelief, but at least we personally would cease to be part of the problem and could start to be part of the solution.

What if a genuine Christian has repented and believed but still has a demon? Does that mean he isn’t saved and never was saved?

The answer to the above question, in my opinion, is very definitely no, even though the demon is inside him and even if it is affecting him and manifesting its presence by obvious signs. My contention is that it is not only possible for a *genuine* Christian to have a demon *inside them* but it is relatively common. There is nothing remarkable or rare about it.

That has certainly been my experience in dealing with Christians who have persistent problems that they can’t seem to overcome. But, as I have tried to demonstrate, it is also perfectly consistent with what we see in Scripture. At any rate, it is far more easy to reconcile that with the Scriptures than the belief that a Christian can’t have a demon inside them.

Having a demon inside you is not something to be ashamed of or to deny because you can’t face the stigma of it. There is no stigma. It is just something we need to address and get rid of. Of course, it is also perfectly possible that the person could be unsaved, given that there are so many false converts in churches who were never properly converted in the first place.

However, the presence of a demon, in itself is *not proof that the person is not saved*. Of course, they might not be truly saved, but so might millions of other people sitting in churches but who have never truly repented or believed. But if we focus solely on the operative point, i.e. the presence of a demon inside the person, that fact alone is not proof or even evidence, that the person is unsaved. They may be and they might not. You will have to determine that as a separate exercise when counselling the person.

Indeed, I would always advise checking carefully to see whether a person is really saved when they present to you with deep problems. It is a wise precaution and it is often the case that they were never properly born again, usually due to an “incompetent midwife” at the time of their conversion who left out one or more ingredients of the Gospel or explained them in a garbled and inadequate way.

Moreover, I believe that the presence within the person of a demon does not mean they can’t repent or believe and be saved. Of course they can. Everybody can. Admittedly that demon will make it all a lot harder by resisting the person’s attempt to repent and believe. Therefore, when witnessing to an

unsaved person whom you think may have a demon, seek to cast it out at the conclusion of the conversion process, not beforehand.

I would not be absolutely dogmatic that it should be done after the person has repented and believed. You will need to use your judgement, but I personally would deal with the Gospel first and seek to get the person saved, or to convince myself as to whether they already are. I would then urge the person, as a separate exercise, post conversion, to repent, to forgive others, to renounce the occult and false religion/idolatry and to seek to break any curses over their lives.

What if a Christian, or indeed anybody, has a demon within them but it was not due to any fault on their part?

Whose fault it was that the demon got into the person is not the primary issue and we certainly aren't there to allocate blame or pass judgement. People need our help, not our criticism. But let me confirm that it is true that a lot of people have a demon inside them even though they have *done nothing wrong*. They might even be a small child or a baby, or they might have been a small child when the demon entered them.

So, we are not there to condemn them. Our task is to get them set free and to show them what to do. Nevertheless it is true that a demon can enter a person, even a child, who had done no wrong and was not to blame. It can arise in various ways as we shall try to examine further. But the most obvious things that cause this are:

- a) occult activity by parents or grandparents
- b) cursing words spoken over the child
- c) traumas suffered by the child due to violent abuse, sexual abuse or severe neglect

For further detail on this, please refer to the chapters which follow and also to the final four chapters of my Book 6 as I cannot repeat it all here. In particular, please see chapter 27 of Book 6 on dealing with witchcraft and curses.

The difference between having a demon on the *outside* of you or the *inside* of you

This confuses a lot of people so we really need to clear up what is meant by having a demon *inside you*, such that it needs to be *cast out* or expelled, as opposed to having a demon on the *outside of you*, which only needs to be *resisted*. Either way the demon will speak into our minds and try to influence us, and either way the demon can do a tremendous amount of harm. But it will do far *more* harm if it is inside us than if it is 'on our shoulder' whispering into our ear.

The analogy I often use is to think of living in a house and the disruption that could be caused by youths who hang around outside, on the street or on the driveway, throwing eggs or stones at us and heckling us as we come and go to our car. Then I compare that to how much extra damage and disruption could be caused if those youths were instead squatters living *inside the house*, having perhaps taken over one of the bedrooms, and causing trouble within the house as they make noise, create untidiness, leave taps running and get in our way.

This metaphor of squatters is very like the position if we have a demon on the inside of us. They can then do a lot more harm and influence us far more and the only remedy is to throw them out. Of course, if we do throw them out it does not mean they will go away completely and stop bothering us. They will immediately join the ‘gang of youths’ who hang around outside on the street and who come on to our ‘driveway’. So, they will still try to disrupt our lives. But the crucial point is they will have a far less effective vantage point from which to operate.

Therefore, we must recognise that we *all* have demons on the *outside* of us, as discussed in my Book 7, just as we all have bacteria on the outside of us, even if we are healthy. Those demons are resisting us, heckling us and obstructing us as we go about our daily business. We can’t force them to stop doing that, just as we can’t make our hands permanently germ free. All we can do is resist them. There is no way of casting demons out of the neighbourhood or even of preventing them from whispering into our ears.

They have the right to be in your town and to whisper into your ear and they will never stop until they are taken away and bound in chains at the start of the Millennium. So, in this sense, we all face demonic opposition and our task is to resist them and also to change ourselves and become less carnal, less worldly and thus less prone to be influenced by them. Then the demons will find us harder to deceive and less likely to do what they want. It is that process of resisting them that I focus on in my Book 7.

Those demons who are on the outside can’t be cast *out* of us and don’t need to be because they are not on the inside of us to begin with. That is why they simply need to be resisted, not cast out. However, if the demon is inside us, then resisting it, though necessary, is not enough. It would also need to be cast out. In other words, we would need ‘deliverance’ from it.

As for *how* demons manage to get inside *some of us, but not all of us*, there are a number of ways it can happen. I would broadly summarise the ways in which they gain entry under the following headings:

- a) Some serious sin which *we ourselves* have committed, for example having an abortion or engaging in adultery or fornication and so on
- b) Some serious sin committed by a *parent or grandparent* which opened up their life to a demon but also gave a demon the legal right to enter us as well
- c) Some sin or crime *committed against us*, whereby we were wronged, violated, traumatised or abused and we have since been *unable or unwilling to forgive* the wrongdoer /abuser who harmed us
- d) Any involvement in idolatry or the occult, or false religion, either by ourselves or by a parent or grandparent which, either way, opens up our life to be influenced by a demon
- e) Curses placed upon us by a servant of Satan or by ourselves or by a parent or church leader who had authority over us but who spoke negative words over us, in faith, which then gave the demon an opening

There is not room in this short chapter to elaborate on all the ways in which demons can acquire the legal right to live inside us. All I can do here is to broadly identify the issues so you can generally be aware of how demons enter but also to be more fully convinced that they really can get in. We shall examine it below in closer detail.

A strange demonic incident when an invisible hand grabbed the crown of my head and pressed its fingers into my scalp – yet there was nobody there

This occurred in 1998, very early on in my process of looking into and studying the subject of demonology and an older leader told me that it was probably done as an attempt to scare me off and to get me to stop researching the subject. My wife and I were sitting in an old village pub in the countryside. The pub was not crowded and we were in a corner so there was nobody behind us or beside us.

All of a sudden I felt a hand grab the crown of my head and dig its fingers into my scalp. I was bewildered by it and looked behind me but, as I said, there was nobody there. I also put my own hand on my head to see if there was something on my head, but there was nothing. This went on for perhaps a minute or so and was very alarming. It really ‘spooked’ me and I was scared by it, as I think the demon intended me to be.

But I was determined not to let it stop me and resolved that I would press on with my studies on demonology all the more rigorously, which indeed I did. I think the demon realised that that ploy hadn’t succeeded, because he never tried that again. I would also add that I think the fact that the ‘hand’ came from outside of me and grabbed the top of my head from outside suggests this particular demon was *outside of me, not within me*. Therefore, I believe it meant I was being attacked from the outside and had not got a demon within me that needed to be cast out.

By the way, it is possible you might be thinking I could be an overly excitable or hysterical person, prone to hallucinations. To rebut that notion I would say, without wishing to exalt myself, that I am actually one of the most sober, calm, analytical people you are ever likely to meet. I never panic or get into a tizz. Instead, I think through every issue or situation in a rigorous, logical, methodical manner. And I refuse to arrive at any conclusion without evidence and without having checked and double checked all of that evidence to gauge its accuracy and validity.

That trait is perhaps partly genetic but may also be due to my having trained as an economist and a lawyer and having spent a 28 year career firstly as a police officer and then as a commercial lawyer and businessman. The point of all this biographical information is to reassure you that I am not a fruit cake and these things really happened and were not imagined.

Another strange experience when I believe a demon slammed a very heavy church door against me

This happened at about the same time as the strange “hand” experience referred to above. Several churches in the town I then lived in were holding a week of meetings concerning prayer and “spiritual warfare” and we chose to visit several churches in the town, by invitation, to pray for them. So a group of us turned up at a large old Anglican church in the town centre and we walked around inside it, praying in little groups as we did so.

I then felt a strange prompting. I felt God was revealing to me that this particular church had been used for satanic rituals and worship, obviously without the vicar’s knowledge or consent. So I told the group leader what I felt had been revealed to me and he took it seriously and suggested we all walk around within the church praying against that in particular.

I then went off by myself to pray and went into one of the corridors at the side of the church which led to offices and store rooms. I stood in a doorway where a large thick heavy wooden door was standing open. It was not wedged open but held itself in place because the door was so solid and heavy and flush to the floor it didn't move. As I was standing in that particular doorway praying against witchcraft and satanism, the door suddenly moved and hit against me quite rapidly, as if someone had slammed it against me.

Yet, there was nobody there or even anywhere nearby. In fact, nobody was in sight at all in any direction. I was completely alone and it was impossible for any person to have pushed the door against me and then run away before I could see them. It simply couldn't be done. Neither could the door have closed by itself as it was too heavy and there was too much traction keeping it open. It couldn't have been a draft of wind either as there was no wind and it was an internal door anyway, far away from any external door from which any draft could have come.

In view of the previous hand incident, I quickly concluded the episode was demonic and that a demon had pushed that door against me, probably just to try to frighten me, as before. But, again, that didn't work and I resolved even more firmly to continue my research into demonology.

I greatly admire the late Derek Prince, and his teaching on demonology and deliverance, but on some details I disagree with him.

I wanted to include this short section because the late Derek Prince, despite being an outstanding scholar and a great man, was criticised for the stance he took on demonology. In particular, many people objected to him engaging in the ministry of deliverance and were especially offended by him saying a Christian can have a demon which needs to be cast out of them. So, my first point is to say, publicly, that I hugely admired Derek Prince, so much so that I travelled to London to attend his memorial service when he died in 2003.

In particular I feel he is to be praised, and I fully expect him to receive a heavenly reward for his courage and integrity and his absolute unwillingness to compromise on any part of God's Word. He not only taught about the need for deliverance, but also engaged in deliverance ministry himself and let it be known that he did so. He was very brave in doing all that because many critics urged him not to do so, especially when he first began, and many stopped listening to his teaching when he refused to give it up.

Some denounced him publicly and even slandered him. Yet he persisted in doing exactly what God's Word said, even if the vast majority of the Church disagreed with it. In making that lonely stand he did us all a great service and he gradually persuaded a lot of people to open their eyes to the importance of demonology and to the ministry of deliverance in particular. In that, and many other ways, I am hugely indebted to him and I want to acknowledge that debt publicly, even if it causes some of his detractors to reject me as well, as indeed some already have.

Sometimes Derek Prince made deliverance sound easier than it really is

However, having said all that, there are a few points of detail about which I disagree with Derek Prince, and I would like to briefly address those here. The first is he sometimes gave the impression, probably unintentionally, that casting demons out of a person is easy and can usually be done quickly. To be fair

to him, Derek Prince did at times speak of difficulties he had had, and of how deliverance was sometimes delayed by his failure to realise something, or by the person's failure to forgive someone or to repent of some sin or occult activity in the past.

Nevertheless, I did pick up the overall impression from him that deliverance is generally easy and will work quickly, and with very positive results in the person's life. Therefore, I would like to challenge that because, otherwise, it is possible for people to become very discouraged when things do not go smoothly for them. They might even give up on deliverance ministry altogether when they encounter unexpected difficulties and delays, or where the demon(s) don't immediately leave when they are told to, or where the person's life isn't immediately transformed.

I have experienced some frustration and failure myself in ministering to people and have never found it easy. Perhaps that reflects badly on me and my abilities but even if it does, I have to be frank with you on everything as I am determined not to give any false impression.

The answer is to be as realistic as possible about the ministry of deliverance and to recognise that it can, at times, and with certain people, be more difficult. It can also take longer with some than with others. Where that is the case then persist in praying for God's help and guidance and also in searching for the problem or the blockage or the missing ingredient that is enabling the demon(s) to remain. Putting it simply the main 'blockages' that prevent or delay deliverance are as follows:

- a) It could be due to a failure by the person to *repent* adequately as a result of complacency, insincerity or glibness. Some gloss over the things they have done, treating them too lightly and without genuine, heartfelt repentance. Or there might not be a strong decision of the will to turn away from that sin. But if the demon came in because of that sin it will not leave until the person *genuinely* repents of it and the demon will know better than anyone whether they have actually done so. If not, the demon will stay until the person deals with it by repenting properly. Therefore, you should never assume that if a person says they have repented then they must have done so. They may not have, and you need to be alert to that possibility. Indeed, in the apostate West, fake repentance is not just a possibility but a likelihood.
- b) Secondly, it could be due to their failure to genuinely *forgive* some other person who has wronged them. It may sound unfair but while ever the person holds on to bitterness and a desire for vengeance the demon probably won't go and you won't be able to cast it out. Therefore, consider this possibility too and probe to see whether there is anything they still need to forgive and/or whether the offence has been *genuinely* forgiven. It is very possible the person is just saying the words, but doesn't really mean it. N.B. For detailed guidance on the definition of forgiveness and advice on how to forgive others, please see my Book 2. But bear in mind that Book 2 looks at forgiving unbelievers rather than Christians. There is a different definition of forgiveness if it is a Christian who has wronged you and I deal with that below.
- c) Thirdly, it could be a failure to properly *renounce* some vow or cursing words spoken over them by some other person, or even by themselves, or some past *occult activity, false religion* or even *idolatry* they have been involved in. Or it could, perhaps, be something their parents or grandparents said or did. In this whole area too the renunciation needs to be heartfelt and genuine, not glib or shallow. Otherwise, whether you consider it fair or not, the demon(s) will probably remain. Demons are arch legalists and will grasp onto the tiniest excuse or technicality, however pedantic it may seem to you, and use it to enable themselves to remain in the person.

Therefore, my advice to you, if you are struggling to cast out a demon, is to persevere, and to look open-mindedly for possible explanations for its non-departure. Above all *pray* that God will identify and expose the blockage. If you are sincere, and if you keep on praying and searching, the answer will eventually be given to you. So don't give up. Also don't make the mistake of assuming the demon must have gone, or that there are no other demons remaining, just because you have commanded them to leave. They could still be there, so assume nothing and wait to make sure.

They may have gone, but it is entirely possible they may not have gone, so no hasty assumptions should be made in either direction. Keep an open mind and ask God to reveal whether that demon has actually gone and, even if it has, whether there are any *others* still there. Both of these questions are really important if you want the person to be truly and fully set free rather than just kid yourself into thinking the person has been delivered when they haven't.

Are there “specialist” types of demon such as a “demon of alcohol” or a “demon of lust”?

Let me now turn to my other area of disagreement with Derek Prince. This has to do with whether or not there are what we might call specialist demons which come into a person to bring about a particular sin or problem, such as lust or drunkenness or gambling etc. Unlike Derek Prince, I *don't* believe that is how it works, and I see nothing in the Bible to even suggest they operate in that way.

The confusion might arise from verses like Mark 9:25 below in which Jesus commands a demon to come out and He addresses it as “*You deaf and mute (dumb) spirit*”. This was a demon which had caused a boy to be unable to hear or speak. But note that it also convulsed him and threw him to the ground, as with epileptic fits. That is very significant in my view and has a bearing on this debate.

In my opinion, when Jesus refers to the demon as a “deaf and dumb spirit” He doesn't mean that causing deafness and dumbness is the only thing that particular demon can do, as if we were talking about a qualified carpenter and distinguishing him from a car mechanic, such that they each have their own jobs and their skills are not transferable. It doesn't mean that. It simply means that, *in this case*, that is what the demon *has done*.

But it would have been perfectly capable of doing other things in the life of someone else if it chose to do so. Indeed, even within this passage, we see the demon also caused the boy to be *epileptic* which hardly fits with the theory that Jesus referring to it as a “deaf and dumb spirit” means that that is all it ever does or all it ever could do. Such an argument makes no sense in my view, and yet it is widely made.

If we were to adopt the policy that the effect a demon has in the person's life defines that “type” of demon and makes it appropriate to give it a name, then Jesus should have called it a “*deaf, dumb and epileptic spirit*”. But He didn't because, in my view, that is not how Jesus saw this issue and it was not what He meant by the phrase He used.

¹⁷ And one person from the crowd answered Him, “Teacher, I brought You my son, because he has a spirit that makes him unable to speak; ¹⁸ and whenever it seizes him, it slams him to the ground, and he foams at the mouth and grinds his teeth and becomes stiff. And I told Your disciples so that they would cast it out, but they could not do it.” ¹⁹ And He answered them and said, “O unbelieving generation, how long shall I be with you? How long shall I put up with you? Bring him to Me!” ²⁰ And they brought the boy to Him. When he saw Him, the spirit immediately threw him into

convulsions, and falling to the ground, he began rolling around and foaming at the mouth. ²¹ And He asked his father, “How long has this been happening to him?” And he said, “From childhood. ²² It has often thrown him both into the fire and into the water to kill him. But if You can do anything, take pity on us and help us!” ²³ But Jesus said to him, “‘If You can?’ All things are possible for the one who believes.” ²⁴ Immediately the boy’s father cried out and said, “I do believe; help my unbelief!” ²⁵ When Jesus saw that a crowd was rapidly gathering, He rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to it, “You mute and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him and do not enter him again!”
Mark 9:17-25 (NASB)

So far as I can see, every demon is a ‘general practitioner’. That is they will seek to cause, prolong or intensify whatever sins or problems that person is *already prone to*, or by which they are *most likely to be tempted*. That could be due to some existing personal weakness or a past trauma or to something in their personality which makes them more vulnerable in that area and/or more likely to be deceived, discouraged or led astray.

Therefore, whereas Derek Prince and others who share his view, might refer to a ‘*demon of lust*’ or a ‘*demon of gambling*’ and so on, I believe that is an inaccurate and unhelpful way to describe them and that it can confuse the issue. It seems to me, from my study of Scripture, and also my own personal experience of ministering to demonised people, that there is no reason to think demons have any such areas of specialism.

I personally think each demon will quickly and easily adapt, depending on what person he is dealing with, so as to identify that person’s individual strengths and weaknesses. Then the demon will simply attack them in whatever way is most likely to succeed in their case. The demon doesn’t mind. He will just take advantage of any specific areas of vulnerability that he finds in them and he will do so with utter ruthlessness, whatever those openings or weaknesses may be.

If you still disagree with the arguments in this chapter, why not try to write out a detailed response explainng why you disagree? Can you do that?

I have had many people disagree with me as to whether a Christian (a real one) can have a demon inside them which therefore needs to be cast out. But what frustrates me is that everyone who has ever disagreed with me on this issue simply states a bare denial. They never give detailed reasons, or indeed any reasons. They just say “*No, that can’t happen*”, or “*My Paster doesn’t believe that*” or “*My denomination doesn’t teach that*”.

What they never do is to go to the Bible and point to verses or apply deductive reasoning to verses which actually support their stance. So, I write a lengthy chapter filled with Bible references, deductive reasoning and logic but all I ever get in response are short denials simply stating that it cannot be true but without anything to base it on.

I think that tells us something because if my argument was false it would be relatively easy to rebut it and disprove it with a series of powerful counter arguments backed up by direct quotes from the Bible or at least deductive reasoning based indirectly on passages from the Bible. But no. All I ever get are short snappy denials with nothing in support.

Therefore, if you still disagree, or even if you are unsure, why not apply yourself to writing out a detailed rebuttal to this chapter, tackling my arguments one by one and disproving them and providing your

reasoning, your references and your factual data in support of your view. Can you do it? So far, I haven't met anyone who can.

And please don't consider it to be a sufficient argument to say "*My pastor doesn't think a Christian can have a demon*". You must also set out *why* he doesn't think so and *what he bases that on*. Then consider whether his arguments make sense. Otherwise, how is his bare denial any more authoritative than your own?