

Hello. My name is Paul Dohse. This is my third session in this conference, the 2012 First Annual Conference on Gospel Discernment and Spiritual Tyranny. This third session is good news because it's of sorts a summation of my other two talks, and I'm sure that is really good news.

In what I said in my second session, it begs the question, do these New Calvinists, who again I contend that have Reformation theology correct, it would seem as if, Paul, if they really hold to this doctrine, there would be an idea inherent in it that we can lose our salvation. Do I think they would ever come right out and say that? Heavens, no. In essence, do they do say that? I think they do.

Let me kick off this third session with a quote, and this is by Michael Horton. He says, and I believe what is an excerpt from page 62 of the book, *Christless Christianity*, he says the following: "Where we land on these issues," that is of the gospel, "is perhaps the most significant factor in how we approach our own faith and practiced and communicated to the world. If not only the unregenerate but the regenerate are always dependent at every moment on the free grace of God disclosed in the gospel, then nothing can raise those who are spiritually dead or continually give life to Christ's flock but the spirit working through the gospel." When this happens, i.e., let me insert, when this happens, what's this? "When somebody gets saved or continues to have spiritual life as believers, not just once but every time we encounter the gospel afresh, the spirit progressively transforms us into Christ's image. Start with Christ, that is, the gospel, (That's his statement.) and you get sanctification in the bargain. Begin with Christ," but I'll make a reference back to his own parenthesis, "Begin with Christ, that is the gospel, and move on to something else and you lose both." Both what? Justification and sanctification.

Again, I ask, how can these guys get away with saying these things in broad daylight? Does that quote not summarize the points that I have made? He uses the word "lose," not me. Okay? He's saying that the way a Christian grows spiritually is no different than what an unbeliever needs to start with. He says whether a person is saved or is growing, it's all in gospel. He's saying these things, not me.

Do you remember, and this is in my notes, I'm going to read this again quickly. And this is in my notes. I'm just going to insert this in, and maybe you can make the connection.

But he said, "Where we land on these things is perhaps the most significant factor in how we approach our own faith and practice and communicate to the world if not only the unregenerate but the regenerate are always dependent at every moment on the free grace of God disclosed in the gospel, then nothing can raise those who are spiritually dead or continually give life to Christ's flock but the spirit working through the gospel. When this happens, not just once, that every time we encounter the gospel afresh, the spirit progressively transforms us into Christ's image. Start with Christ, that is the gospel, and you get sanctification in the bargain. Begin with Christ, then move on to something else, and you lose both."

Okay, this is the John Calvin Institutes of the Christian Religion translated by Henry Beveridge, I believe, and I refer you to page 509. And towards the bottom, here is what Calvin says. He says, "Therefore, we must have this blessedness not once only." What's he talking about in context to salvation? "Therefore, we must have this blessedness not once only, but must hold fast during the whole of our lives." Okay. Ooh, [SOUNDS LIKE] 00:07:23 a bit of an issue there holding our salvation fast but not much. He continues, "Moreover, the message of reconciliation with God is not promulgated for one or two days, but it's declared to be perpetual in the church." He's saying reconciliation is perpetual. What's reconciliation? Reconciliation is justification. Right? He's saying right here, John Calvin, that justification is perpetual. Really? Progressive justification?

Now this concept in Reformed theology is referred to as progressive sanctification when really what they mean is progressive justification. Well, Paul, then why do they call it progressive sanctification? Are you saying they're deceptive? Well, yes, I am saying they were deceptive, but let me be nice too about it. They're saying it's progressive sanctification because they see the two as being the same thing, right? Okay? So they're really not lying. It's a lie that they're not lying. Maybe the only place in human activity where lying but not lying is possible. But they can call it, again, they can call it progressive sanctification because they believe the two are the same. Do I believe that when they use the term progressive sanctification, do I think they know that a lot of the evangelical speak they're talking about, the more traditional gospel chart where the chain is broken and discipleship is severed from justification? Yes, I think they know that.

So anyway, we have Calvin here saying that justification is progressive or perpetual. So it's progressive justification, which if you've gone to Bible College of Saint Mary, the term progressive justification would certainly raise some eyebrows and some red flags real quick which they call progressive sanctification because they see the two as being the

same. I continue, "Hence," Calvin continues, "believers have not even to the end of life any other righteousness that which is they're described, that is the righteousness of Christ. So," note, "in order for us to continue to have that righteousness, justification must be perpetual." Are you beginning to see the problem here?

He continues, "Christ ever remains a mediator to reconcile the Father to us. And there is a perpetual efficiency in his death." That's progressive amputation. That's progressive amputation of Christ's righteousness to remain just before God. Okay? "Ablution, satisfaction, expiation, in short, perfect obedience by which all our iniquities are covered. That is what, the perfect obedience of Christ." So what he's saying here is that reconciliation in perfect obedience is perpetually imputed to us, imputed to us, throughout sanctification. That's why these guys can speak of the total depravity. They don't say total depravity in the sense but that's what it is. That's how we can be totally depraved and still saved, you know, if we allow Christ or live a certain formula where Christ obeys for us. If we obey on our own, we're messing up the links of the chain.

He continues, "In the Epistle to the Ephesians, Paul says not that the beginning of salvation is of grace but by grace you are saved, not of works lest any man should boast." So there Calvin uses a justification verse in context of sanctification which is filled with New Calvinist M.O. all the time. It's amazing what totally inept Christians can find out on their own when they stop taking the word of men, especially Reformed theologians and say to themselves, "You know, even though I'm incompetent, just for the heck of it, I think I'll read it more for myself." You know, I've been listening all these years about what a great guy Calvin is and what he believes. You know, just for the heck of it, I think I'll put my nose in the *Calvin Institutes* and read it for myself." It's surprisingly fun.

Now the story of the New Calvinism in the second gospel wave begins with the long debated dilemma amongst the Seventh Day Adventists, believe it or not. And this gets us back full circle in regard to my teachings.

Let me just disregard the notes and summarize this. But the Seventh Day Adventists, call it denomination whatever you want to refer to them as, their whole doctrine was founded on this golden chain of salvation that's linear. Therefore, throughout Seventh Day Adventists' history, there's been this debate on how we properly co-labor with God to finish our justification because the two are the same. And the Seventh Day Adventists had all of these different debates going on and theories for how that's done and supposedly in accordance to the Scripture. But a major theme in all that was the idea that

Christ forgives us and saves us for all of our past sins, but with the enablement of the Holy Spirit, we are enabled to finish our own justification.

Now Christians don't have a problem with being enabled with the will of kingdom living. We do have a problem with being enabled to finish our justification. That's a problem. That's impossible because for one thing, we can't keep the law perfectly. So the Seventh Day Adventists have this thing called the investigative judgment where the prime goal of the Seventh Day Adventist was to ready yourself for the judgment with the help of the Holy Spirit. So there's this underlying angst amongst the SDA faithful. It was kind of an angst that was building up under the surface because deep down no one was buying it. They saw their own sins every day and their own perfections every day. So this whole preparing yourself with the help of the Holy Spirit, of course, to be ready for that one final judgment was kind of a don't ask don't tell amongst the Seventh Day Adventists, but you have this pressure building underneath.

So a Seventh Day Adventist theologian comes along, a well-respected one, and he saw overall in SDA theology, in preaching in SDA churches a devaluing and a continuing de-emphasis on the teaching of being ready for the final judgment. And that was very unsettling to him. So he set out to investigate this and found out by and large that the SDA faithful were not buying it. So this man named Robert Brinsmead, a very intelligent man, noted the fact that there was this Seventh Day Adventists motif that taught that the Seventh Day Adventists were the gatekeepers of Reformation theology. So he said, "I know. I'll immerse myself in Reformation theology." And he came up with an illustration that he thus thought - well, it was his contention that through these studies that he rediscovered the true Reformation theology. And the truth of the Reformation theology that had been lost was the fact that we don't have to prepare for any judgment to be found just in the last day. When we come to that judgment, Christ stands in our place.

So this underlying angst amongst the Seventh Day Adventists just explodes because to them, do you think that was good news? I would think so. Wow! I don't have to do anything to prepare for this judgment that I know is bogus anyway because even with the help of the Holy Spirit, this ain't gonna happen. I'm not gonna withstand the judgment. It's a bunch of hooey.

So there's this exploding movement called the awakening movement. And what happened after that is Robert Brinsmead teamed up with a think-tank because Robert Brinsmead said, "You know what? The reason that's true authentic Calvinism has been

lost through the years is it's not properly systematized." And two other Anglican theologians by the names of Geoffrey Paxton and Graeme Goldsworthy agreed with him, and later they were joined by a guy named Jon Zens, and they started the think-tank called the Australian Forum, and they systematized this doctrine. And boy, were they ever right, because it eventually became what we have today in New Calvinism. But if you would pan over to the screen, here is an illustration from their theological journal that is a pictorial of the crux of the doctrine. The righteousness of Christ remains totally outside of the believer, even in salvation.

Now let's not stray far away from my major theme. Do you think that is a good illustration of the incompetence of man? I would say so. Well, we're not [UNINTELLIGIBLE] 00:21:53 left side. You probably can't read it, but the man with Christ within is Romanism, perfectionism, dualism, legalism, antinomianism, optionalism, Pentecostalism, evangelical subjectivism. And then on the right side where Christ is totally without, you have grace, justification, perfection because it's not anything to do with us. You say, "Well, how that does work?" No time to get into it in this conference, all right? They have a way to make it sound good. But this is it. This is it.

Now I'm going to conclude with this, because my wife, Susan Dohse, and myself are writing a couple of books that's going to delve in to how they make this work, how Calvin and Luther made it work. And we're going to into this in detail in the second volume of *The Truth About New Calvinism and the Reformation Myth*.

This chart is from *The Truth About New Calvinism, Volume 1* where I go into detail how New Calvinism got from the Australian Forum to where it is today, to New Calvinism. I traced it all the way back. Then I go into some detail about how they make this work and how Christ supposedly obeys for us in sanctification in the latter chapters.

Here is the chart I want to finish it with. And by the way, when I wrote *The Truth About New Calvinism*, I wasn't concerned whether New Calvinists contention or Robert Brinsmead contention that they were really teaching authentic Reformation theology. I wasn't my main concern. My main concern was now in this day. I wanted to know the contemporary source of it, which lead to the Australian Forum.

Now when I first met John Immel for dinner to discuss the Reformation manuals, I must interject here that I owe him much of what I've learned about this over the past couple of months. We were having dinner, and I started off the conversation by handing him a

copy of *The Truth About New Calvinism*, and I'll never forget this, he would page through and kind of skim over, take a bite of his appetizer, take a drink of his soda, read a couple of pages and kind of skim through. I think he stopped on page 43, dead in his tracks, put his pop down, put his appetizers down, looked closely at this illustration that I believe is on page 43 in the book, it's a spiral bound book, he folded it back to reveal just that one page, laid it down on the table, took it, slid it in front of me, and said, "That's what Luther and Calvin believed." Really? So that set me on a path. I most certainly didn't take his word for it. But much of what I presented in this conference comes from what I learned after John Immel pointed me in the right direction.

Now I close with this. We don't have time to get into all this in the conference, but this is it in a nutshell. But Susan and I will delve into this in great detail in the two books that we're writing. Augustine took the basic philosophies that drove Platonism and integrated it in to biblical theology. Luther and Calvin got their gospel of incompetence from Augustine. And I submit to you that the chart presented by the Australian Forum is the epitome of that gospel of incompetence.

Now due to the fact, you see there under recovery movements, the wave-looking thing that goes up and down, this movement of reformed Reformation doctrine dies out from time to time. Quickly, why does it die out? Because doing the gospel over and over and over again and experiencing the things that Susan experienced in her life gets old and people start asking questions. Secondly, 7-Eleven music gets old. What's 7-Eleven music? It's seven verses about Jesus repeated eleven times, okay? The gospel, if you will. And thirdly, along with this doctrine of incompetence, this gospel of incompetence always comes spiritual tyranny, control, like Calvin's Geneva. New Calvinism is hardcore, Geneva style Reformation doctrine. It's an attempt to return back to those roots. It dies out because of those factors that I just related to you. Then there are recovering movements. Those are the high point. Go over the Australia Forum. And what you can call the crux of this doctrine of incompetence, Reformation theology, it's primarily known in those circles as the centrality of the objective gospel outside of us. That is the technical name for Reformation theology and what the Australian Forum, in fact, rediscovered. And unlike the other recovery/discovery movements, the Australia Forum systematized it and thus it launched it into oblivion.

Will it die out again? We don't know because it's never been articulated and systematized and embellished professionally and masterfully as it has in our day. But this we can do. We can rise up and prevent it from ever coming back. We can hasten the death that it's

always died because the spiritual tyranny of it has run its course. And in our day, spiritual tyranny and spiritual abuse is big on the radar screen in our day in the church. Why is that? It's because of those recovery movements. The truth of the doctrine finally catches up to them and history catches up to them; people get sick of the tyranny. They get sick of the Gnostic-like cybernetic loot that keeps recycling the gospel. And it dies.

Now we can do two things as a church. We can rise up and we can hasten that rightful death. And then we can educate Christians and keep it from coming back. And I pray with all my heart to God that He strengthens us and enables us to do that. Thank you for your attention.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]