

Hello. My name is Paul Dohse. This is my second session in the conference here, the first Annual Conference on Gospel Discernment and Spiritual Tyranny. And I appreciate your patience as we kinda work through getting these conferences off the ground. You kind of have to crawl before you walk, and we appreciate your patience.

I was challenged last night on one thing that I would like everybody to take away on my first session. And what I would like everyone to take away on my first session is the fact that the past sixty-two years, at least in American Christianity, there's been two time periods that have had the gospel as their major theme and focal point. And you say, "Well, Paul shouldn't that be the case? Isn't that why we're here?" But what I want for everybody to take away that in both in cases there was an overemphasis on the gospel. I believe the Hebrew writer exhorted us that once we're saved, we do in fact move beyond the gospel that got us saved and onto deeper matters of discipleship and applying the Word of God and His wisdom to our life with the aid of the Holy Spirit. I believe the Apostle Paul exhorted the Church that we are ambassadors of the gospel and that the news that they we're taking to the world is "Be reconciled to God." That's the message we take to the world, but as Christians, we are already reconciled.

Sanctification or, if you will, discipleship, isn't a continual reconciliation to God. And this is kind of amazing because none of this is in my notes. I do not believe discipleship is a continual revisiting of our reconciliation to God. I do not believe as many in our day teach that we gain deeper and deeper knowledge of God by revisiting the same faith and repentance that God had saved in the first place. We see this in Jesus Christ's illustration to the disciples in the book of John 13th chapter where he washes Peter's feet. And Peter says, "Don't wash just my feet. Wash my whole body then." What did Jesus Christ say? He said, "No, you are already washed. You only have me of your feet to be washed." This clearly demonstrates that our repentance as believers is a different repentance than what saved us. Our first repentance washed us, if you will, saved us, if you will, justified us.

So I think the Scriptures showed clearly that as Christians, we do in fact move on beyond the gospel. That's not heresy. I think that's the Scriptures. And I don't think teaching such is a false gospel as many in our day contend, and I think the results of not moving on beyond the gospel is so well testified to and exemplified by Susan Dohse, what she is talking about, who happens to be my wife, who's doing a great job with her firsthand

testimony in what she experienced in her Christian life from the time that she was a young girl when people don't move on beyond the gospel.

So what do I want people to take from the first session? That an overemphasis on the same gospel that saved us was predicated on a general mentality that the average parishioner is incompetent. Incompetent in what regard? In regard to what the Apostle Paul said in Romans 15:14. "I myself am satisfied about you, my brothers, that you yourself are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge and able, able to instruct one another." Well, some will quickly say, "Well, that knowledge that the Apostle Paul is talking about is knowledge of the gospel." To that I say baloney. To that I say baloney.

This overemphasis on the gospel, the 123's of salvation, and I have seen this all of my life, that and the emphasis thereof replace this: the ability of the parishioners to instruct one another and as Jay Adams has said, really the best idea for the word "instruct" there in Romans 15:14 is counsel. So what do I want people to take away from this is that underlying the first and second gospel waves, as we call them in this conference, a kind of new terminology for these two movements, and Susan Dohse illustrated the first gospel wave and that first gospel movement so well in her first session. Underlying and predicating these two movements is this whole idea of the incompetence of the average parishioner, and I laid [SOUNDS LIKE] 00:09:05 that in some detail in the first session. But that's what I want to be taken away, this whole idea of incompetence on the part of the parishioner and the ability to instruct one another being replaced with this concept of the gospel.

I haven't talked about a lot of my experiences in the first gospel wave or the second gospel wave, but I mentioned some elements in my first talk. One of them was when I first became a Christian, even as a new Christian, I thought it bizarre that there was such a strong emphasis on bringing people to church to get them saved. And again you see that incompetence, that attitude of incompetence that the average parishioner cannot adequately present the gospel out in the world. Bring them in where the experts, get them under the experts that present the gospel. But I somewhat digress.

Moving on, I wanna build on this first session and illustrate further the point that I want folks to take away from the first session. That brings me to what I call the Jay E. Adams reformation. In my first talk, I spoke of the second gospel wave, pointing to the failures of the first gospel wave and presenting the idea that they were the answer for the failures of the first gospel wave. But during that time in 1970 that the second gospel wave came

into being, there was an alternative. There was an alternative. In the exact year that marked the beginning of the second gospel wave, the publishing of a book by Dr. Jay E. Adams marked the beginning of a movement that had a profound impact on Christianity. The movement, known as the Biblical Counseling Movement, offered a different solution to the failings of the first gospel wave. Again, Susan has done an excellent job of painting a picture of what these failings look like and do look like, continue to look like, in real life.

Let there be no doubt about this. Adams is saying his movement was relentlessly persecuted, and in my opinion persecuted to this day by proponents of the second gospel wave, i.e., New Calvinism. And I believe the reason for that persecution boils down to one word that is in the title of his groundbreaking book. And most people agree that the book that he published in 1970, 1971 was the beginning and the groundbreaking of the biblical counseling movement. And I think that it is not a coincidence that the name of this book hearkens back to what I want people to take from the first session. The name of his groundbreaking book was *Competent to Counsel*. *Competent to Counsel*. And I contend to you that the primary reason that Jay Adams suffered the persecution and the ridicule that he suffers is because of this one word right here in the title: competent.

Romans 15:14, Adams' attitude shared by the Apostle Paul and the Holy Spirit in Romans 15:14 was the major theme of this movement. But not only that, Adams continually encountered the doctrine of incompetence spawned by the first gospel wave. And I do think, again, that for lack of a better term, the Adams movement was the answer to the first gospel wave. Adams told me personally during a visit with him that wherever he spoke throughout the country, parishioners seemed astonished that they could actually, as he put it, do something. He related one incident where after he spoke at a church, the deacons met to discuss this strange new doctrine that Adams was teaching, that it indicated that Christians could "do something."

I'm not sure that any more can be said to make this point. The attitude that Adams encountered as he went about speaking was the whole idea that Christians could participate in an idea like Romans 15:14 that that was deemed a strange new doctrine. And again I'm not sure what else I can say to further make this point. The source of the doctrine of incompetence or the belief that man is utterly incompetent in spiritual matters or worldly matters or both but always in spiritual matters at the very least can definitely be traced back to cradle of western civilization. And this is an idea that I will be dealing with in depth in the book that I'm working on, *The Reformation Myth*. This is an idea that's deep in the psyche of western civilization. And I believe that John Immel in

his talks addresses this as much as he can in the short span that we have in this first conference.

And no, I will not delve into it here. This philosophy made its way into mainstream theology through the writings of Saint Augustine. It is fair to say that Augustine is definitely one of the forefathers of integrationism where this whole idea of man's incompetence was integrated into Christian theology. In essence, the doctrine of incompetence became Augustine's gospel. But though few Christians will contest man's inability to seek a holy God, it is important to note that Augustine integrated a plenary incompetence into his theology for both salvation and discipleship. Hence, it was important to Augustine that salvation and discipleship was a total work of God because man was completely inept in his ability to participate in either. Underlying Augustine's theology was this deep conviction that man is utterly inept. This can best be illustrated in Augustine's motto, "Grant what You command, and command what You desire." This is another illustration to where I'm not too sure where I can add to that. It's sort of it is what it is, right? God's commands are merely a reflection of what He desires. But if those commands get obeyed, it's going to be God doing it all.

Well, I guess borrowing from my first session, the Hillbilly Commandments, one way of putting Augustine's view of things is if God doesn't do it all, it ain't gonna happen. Therefore, what Augustine came up with is what I refer to as a linear gospel. I'm gonna get into this a little bit deeper later on. I'm just gonna go ahead and say it. This in essence is the Reformation gospel. Keeping on track with my initial point, it's a gospel of incompetence. It's a gospel of salvation that fuses discipleship and salvation together and makes it a total work of God because man is completely inept. This is how this underlying philosophy incompetence became the gospel. Do you understand that? It's linear. The cross, salvation, discipleship, glorification, it's one.

Now I would be amiss not to offer a contrast. Here is the alternative gospel. And this is what's critical to our understanding. And basically, in my talk here, we're moving in to the section where I show you how the philosophy of incompetence became the gospel that this conference is contending against. John Immel is getting into the philosophies that led up to that gospel. Susan Dohse is sharing how that's experienced in real life, to reiterate. But back to this, this is the alternative gospel that I believe is the contrast gospel that is actual scriptural truth.

Discipleship is totally separate from salvation. And along with discipleship is the new birth. So in this gospel even though there is an affirmation that salvation is all of God, there is an enablement that comes along with discipleship via the new birth. We're not saying that we do it all in discipleship. Certainly, we believe that we are enabled, but we do teach and we believe it is the truth that discipleship or sanctification, if you will, is a co-laboring between man and God.

And what's critical enough here is that these two are separate. The top line of salvation when we give our life to Jesus Christ, glorification is guaranteed. That is why the top line is separate, and it points it up to glorification, and why the discipleship is separate because nothing we do, nothing we do in sanctification or discipleship can affect the top line. The top line is already done. Again, nothing we can do in discipleship can affect salvation. It's a finished work.

And we're going to take a short pause here, a short break. And then when we come back, I'm going to address this from Romans 8:30.

All right. Unfortunately, all these things, linear gospel as I call it, became a truism from which many interpreters attempted to interpret our role in salvation and discipleship, that is an Augustinian gospel based in the incompetence of man in both salvation and discipleship, sanctification, if you will. Now this over time, and especially in our day, has propagated many inaccurate truisms such as, and this is a good illustration, discipleship, or sanctification, is the growing part of salvation. Sanctification/discipleship is the growing part of salvation. Salvation doesn't grow, all right? Salvation when we're saved, it's finished. It's a finished work. Nothing we do in discipleship can add to salvation or justification or take away from it.

Turn with me, if you would, to Romans 8:30. Here's what it says, "And those whom he predestined, he also called. And those whom he called, he also justified. And those whom he justified, he also glorified." When we're saved, this is all done. It's as good as done. Whatever your view is of election, or whether God looks down in history and because he knows the future sees he was going to show them and bases his election on that, or whether God determines before the foundation of the world, whatever your view is, it's irrelevant to the discussion here. And quite frankly, in my book, it is a red herring.

Salvation is finished work. Nothing we do on discipleship can affect it. It's finished. This brings us to the point of where we discuss serious problems with the Reformation gospel.

In Augustine's attempt to eliminate man from the loop as much as possible and reduce man's role in the salvation/discipleship process and has endeavored to do that, what I will illustrate here is that he unwittingly created a worse salvation. And let me show you how this works.

When you have what I call a linear gospel or a gospel where justification/sanctification is fused together, basically, what you get into is a very unfortunate situation where everything we do in discipleship goes back to the gospel. And this the verbiage a lot of New Calvinists in our day use. What happens is when the two are fused together, this is what you get. Discipleship becomes a minefield because if you're not careful, very careful, of what you do in sanctification, and here's the exact terminology that they use, you unwillingly make sanctification the ground of your justification. And these are the exact words that the likes of John Piper use, the continual warning that things that we do in sanctification can make that the ground of our justification. Note, discipleship is totally separate from salvation. Nothing we do in discipleship can make that the ground of our justification because justification is a finished work.

Now let me ask you something. Is discipleship a finished work? Everybody agrees, right? Discipleship is not finished work but salvation is. Well, how can what we do in discipleship affects something that's already done, that's already finished? But yet, this is the crux of their gospel. And it's the point that everybody is missing.

Galatians is brought up. Let me touch on that where the Apostle Paul says, "O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you? It was before your eyes that Jesus Christ was betrayed and crucified." Let me ask you only this. Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun by the Spirit, are you now being perfected seems to be an ongoing attempts by the flesh." People say, "See? See? We can try to perfect ourselves by what we do in sanctification after already beginning in the Spirit. We can be trying to perfect each other by what we do in sanctification."

Here is the huge problem that I touched on in my first sessions where Christians in our day do not understand doctrine, in fact, it's a badge of honor, and in my wrestling in the arena of ideas on this issue of Christians knowing doctrine and the difference between justification and sanctification, Susan and myself find in wrestling with people and even pastors on this issue that in our day Christians by and large do not understand the difference between justification and sanctification. And therefore, my friends, if you

don't understand the difference between justification and sanctification, you cannot understand the book of Galatians.

And that is where New Calvinists of our day are able to deceive Christians en masse on this first scripture, what is Paul saying. What Paul is saying in this first scripture is Paul is asking a rhetorical question that reveals the folly of trying to finish something that is already finished. That's Paul's point here. When we receive the spirit at salvation, Paul states elsewhere in his letters that we are sealed to the day of redemption. If you're already sealed, you can't do anything in your sanctification as a way to perfect justification as the New Calvinists say Paul is saying in this first scripture and what the Galatians were supposedly guilty of. Paul states elsewhere in his letters that we are sealed at the day of redemption. There's nothing you can do in sanctification to mess that up. It's done.

Paul is asking rhetorically why work to establish something that's already finished. That's Paul's whole point of this passage, not the idea that the Galatians were doing things in sanctification that was making sanctification the, as John Piper put it, ground of their justification. New Calvinists are able to pass this idea on Christians en masse because they're biblically and doctrinally illiterate. Thank you, first gospel wave. Thank you, Billy Graham.

Also, it is interesting to note that perfected as the word that's used in the English standard version, by the way, in verse 3 is a Greek word that means, listen, to come to an end or to finish. That is why Young's Literal Translation states it this way: "So thoughtless are ye! having begun in the Spirit, now in the flesh do ye end?" Here's what Paul is saying. "Oh, you foolish Galatians, you're trying to finish something that's already finished." That's what Paul said.

But what in fact were they buying into? I'll give you an illustration. I wanted to leave the trenches to Susan Dohse, my wife, but let me divert here a little bit. This was what's going on among the Galatians, and I'll put it in context from my own experience and our day. There's a certain denomination, so-called, that teaches - and by the way, most 98 percent of all false gospels are based on this truism. And this is one of those. This particular denomination teaches that when you gave your life to Christ, Jesus died and forgives you and God forgives you of all your past sins up to that point you're declared justified. But then you've got to do something to finish your justification. That truism

right there, again, 98 percent of all false gospels and the Christ plus something gospel is based on this truism right here.

Now I led him out of that denomination. I led him out of it. Later on he was pursued by people from the denomination that he left, and he was tempted for various and sundry reasons to go back to that denomination who held to that gospel. I warned him that if he did that, he was denying the true gospel. This is what was going on with the Galatians. They were going back to a doctrine that taught you being a part of perfecting or finishing a work by God that was already finished. And this is the point of Paul's specific statement to them: "Are you so foolish that when it was all finished and ended with the receiving of the Holy Spirit that you continue to try to finish, that by your works you come to an end?" What end is he talking about? Glorification. So again the foolishness of being a part of a work that's already done. Discipleship is not done.

Now that brings us to this slide here. I didn't make up this slide. This slide comes from a New Calvinist organization. This is their chart. This is their cross chart. The cross illustrates salvation, all right? My friends, salvation does not grow. Salvation is a finished work. Take that big cross and put it all the way back in the beginning. That cross is no bigger at the end than it is in the beginning.

Now notice again, getting back to what I said earlier, that their discipleship unlike with the Jay Adams reformation propagated, their discipleship is a continuation and a continual recycling of the same things that saved us. See how you focus on the gospel and awareness of God's holiness, and then on the bottom, growing awareness of our flesh and sinfulness. Where in the Bible are we taught to continually endeavor and search the depths of how evil we are when in fact we're born again and we're new creatures? The focus should be on getting better and better and better, not an endeavor to discover how totally depraved we are. But again this is what we do to get saved. And you've seen where it says conversion, and then from there we focus on two things and two things only, what is sometimes called gospel contemplationism, growing an awareness of Christ's words, God's holiness. So as in discipleship, and their discipleship and in their gospel, the goal is to continually find the depths of two different things, the gospel and how utterly, totally depraved you are. Now is it fair to say that this goes back to a philosophy or a doctrine of incompetence? The more incompetence you find yourself and the more you successfully see how totally worthless you are, that makes salvation bigger, which brings us to our next slide.

New Calvinists talk about, their words, not mine, and it's based on Romans 8:30, the golden chain of salvation. What's the chain? Is that a chain or is this a chain? This is taken from a sermon by John Piper where he speaks of the golden chain of salvation based on Romans 8:30. They say that sanctification is not mentioned in Romans 8:30 because justification and sanctification are the same thing, i.e., one chain from salvation to glorification. We say, and contend, that Paul doesn't mention sanctification or discipleship in Romans 8:30 because justification is totally separate from sanctification. And sanctification need not be in a description of the finished work of God the Father and Jesus Christ.

I know that you can't read the excerpts and the quotations I have here. But John Piper in this sermon, in this particular sermon, is talking about the dangers of participating in the links of this chain in the wrong way. And in fact, let me just, before I move on, read part of an excerpt. He says, "There is a danger on the way of salvation to heaven." Or he says specifically, "There is danger on the way to salvation in heaven." No, there isn't. If you're saved, there is no danger whatsoever on the way to heaven, unless we did something to mess it up. He said, "We need," notice, "We need something on the way to heaven. We need ongoing protection after our conversion." Oh, really? Wow. "Our security does not mean we are home free." Really?

Now I want to get down to wrap it up. It just amazes that these guys can get away with saying things like this. But then I keep forgetting the average American parishioner is so dumbed down theologically and biblically illiterate that of course he can get away with saying these things. "Our security does not mean that we're home free." He says, "There's a battle to be fought." In what context? In what context? A battle be fought where? Why would we find battle in work that's already done? What's he talking about? "And in this battle, we need protection and help far beyond what we can supply for ourselves." We don't need to supply anything for ourselves in regard to justification because it's a finished work.

He goes on, "The means God uses to protect us," listen, don't miss this. You awake? "The means God uses to protect us is faith. We are now being protected by the power of God through faith. It's salvation by Christ plus our faith." Look, when justification and sanctification is fused together and salvation is a golden chain, anything you do in sanctification goes back to your justification. It's, in their book, properly participating in the links. And if you don't properly participate in the links, the chain gets broken, and you're up the creek without a paddle eternally.

New Calvinism, because it fuses justification and sanctification together has a complicated formula for what works in sanctification and what doesn't work in sanctification, which determines whether or not you make "sanctification" the ground of your justification. But what they've done is created a complicated formula that determines what works in sanctification and what doesn't work in sanctification that might affect your justification. But my brothers and sisters, when the two are fused together, everything that we do in sanctification is a work, whether it's merely meditation, prayer, or doing jumping jacks. Do you understand what I'm saying here?

Now I'm gonna close with another important point on this. Let's talk about this, and I close with this. Paul told Timothy that all of the scriptures are profitable and important, that the man of God can be thoroughly furnished in all good works. That's all of scripture, all scripture. The reformed viewpoint that eschatology or the lack of devaluing of eschatology is no accident. And don't tell me otherwise. I was in a reformed church for twenty years. There was one sermon on eschatology of the book of Daniel, okay? Why the devaluing? Because when you get into eschatology, you get into how many judgments there are at the end of the ages and how many resurrections there are.

With this gospel, the linear one, there can only be one resurrection, one judgment, and at that judgment, you're either going up or you're going down. If you did just the right things in the golden chain of salvation, you find yourself in act of judgment clothed in nothing but the righteousness of Christ via their secret formula. As I said, you're either going up or down depending on what you did in sanctification and discipleship. If you did anything in your discipleship that made that work the ground of your justification, you're going down. If you followed the New Calvinist, and I contend, reformed secret formula just right, you're going up.

Now if you believe, like those evil dispensationalists, that there's two judgments and there's two resurrections, can you see how this messes up their gospel completely? Because if the two are separate, first of all, in the salvation end, if we've already been declared justified and we had already been forgiven, how could there be a judgment? God has promised not to bring in any of these things to remembrance. God has promised to cast our sins as far as the east is from the west. There can't be a judgment or any of that discussed. If there's any judgment at all or some kind of different judgment for discipleship versus salvation, and I contend to you that the Bible teaches as such, so we reject the idea that there's one judgment, and that judgment, that one judgment at the

end of the ages determines the validity of your justification, based on anything you did, by the way.

We contend that there's two resurrections and two different judgments. And depending on what judgment and what resurrection you're a part of determines where you spend eternity. And before I move on in closing, I'll give you a clue. Jesus Christ said, "In the resurrection of the just," there's a resurrection for the just. Why does he call it the resurrection of the just? Because they're already justified before they're even resurrected, that's why. I think the Book of Revelation towards the end, chapter 20, I believe, those areas, chapter 20, 21, if you take the Bible literally at all, you can't deny that there's two resurrections and what the Bible called second death.

Now let me close with this point. This is a direct quote from John Piper. Listen carefully. Listen carefully. This is what he said in this video clip. "He," that is Christ, "is going to take our place and his righteousness is going to count for me on the last day. And that will be my solid ground." I beg your pardon. Jesus Christ's righteousness, and by the way, I think in our day we need to be accurate. All over the place in the Bible, it talks about the righteousness of God being imputed to us. I personally cannot find anywhere in the Bible, and I'd searched, where it says even though it's the big modern word in our day or a big phrase in our day that the righteousness of Christ was imputed to us. All over the place in the Bible, it speaks of the righteous of God imputed to us. I can't find anywhere where it talks about the righteousness of Christ being imputed to us. Now am I splitting here? I think in our day, I'm not. I think that we need to be more cautious and more careful in our day to use specific biblical language.

Look at what he says here, "If this righteousness, his righteous is going," future tense, "to count for me," no, it isn't, it already accounted for me. It's already a done deal. He's not going to take my place at some future judgment. He's already taken my place. His righteousness isn't going to be my solid ground in the future or the last day. It's already the solid ground of my justification. Am I the only one that sees a problem here? This is the work salvation. And I do believe, because it makes me feel good to at least agree with these guys, specifically New Calvinists on something, I do believe they have reformation doctrine correctly. I do think they do have it right. And it's work salvation. Thank you for your attention.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]