

## FALSE GRACE & OSAS

Tonight I would like to look at some of the religious confusion that comes from embracing the *false* grace which is such an integral part of the gospel of Antichrist. Last week I mentioned a woman blogger who is under the influence of this grace. She posts short articles on her blog which promote false security from various different angles. The one I mentioned last week was just one example. In an article entitled *Back, Then Forward*, she uses the following passage in Ezekiel to promote it—“*Nevertheless I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant*” (Eze. 16:60).

In an article entitled *Divine Cultivation*, she uses the following passage in Isaiah to promote it—“*I the Lord do keep it; I will water it every moment: Lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day*” (Isa. 27:3).

In an article entitled *A Shepherd Secures Them*, she uses the following passage in Zephaniah to promote it—“*They shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid*” (Zeph. 3:13).

In an article entitled *Song Of Confidence*, she uses the following passage in Psalms to promote it—“*Though I walk in the midst of trouble, thou wilt receive me: thou shalt stretch forth thine hand against the wrath of mine enemies, and thy right hand shall save me*” (Ps. 138:7).

And in an article entitled *He Never Fails*, she uses the following passage in Joshua to promote it—“*I will be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee*” (Josh. 1:5).

Since the Bible is full of statements regarding the faithfulness of God, and the fact that His heart towards His people is to do them good and not evil, it’s very easy to go through the Scripture (either the Old or the New Testament) and highlight these kinds of statements. But unless you present the rest of what the Scripture says concerning what *we must do* in order to remain under God’s protection, you are guilty of handling the Scripture deceitfully (II. Cor 4:2) and of corrupting it (II. Cor. 2:17).

Last week, I also read an article this woman wrote regarding the doctrine of Eternal Security, called *The Safest Place*, in which she stated very clearly that she believes this error. Now, it just so happens that this woman reads another woman’s blog on the web, and she frequently comments on the articles that are posted. It’s very interesting to see the kind of comments she makes because some of them directly contradict her own belief in Eternal Security. For instance, when commenting on an article this other blogger posted about the false “Kingdom Now” teaching, she wrote the following:

“I was involved in this [Kingdom Now error] until the Lord opened my eyes. I got involved when I accepted a modern-day false gospel over 30 years ago. I was also ignorant because I didn’t study God’s word for myself. I relied on others to teach me. Everything you say here is true. **My friend who also calls herself a "believer"** is still relying on other people’s books. I am so saddened when she writes and tells me that they are starting a new bible study at her church and they are using so and so’s book. Ugh... When I tell her to study God’s word for herself I get no response. Lord have mercy. I can only pray for the Lord to open her eyes as he did mine. **Satan is devouring the Saints and they don’t even know it.** May God have mercy and open their eyes and call them to repent.”

Notice that she said Satan is devouring *the saints* and they don't even know it. Of course, I agree with that statement but it certainly doesn't correspond to her belief in Eternal Security. What happened to the "protecting power of trust in God", which she talked about in the article I read last week?

Didn't she say—*God's care of believers is sure?*

Didn't she say—*God **Himself** is the guardian of the gracious?*

Didn't she say—*Under His sacred wing there is safety even when **every danger** is abroad?*

What happened to the keeping power of God, which she talked about in her OSAS article? I thought the saints were secure? I thought we were safe in the palm of God's hand?

Didn't she say—*It's **impossible**, even for the fiend of hell, to pluck us out of God's hand?*

Didn't she say—*Christ will **never** lose the sheep He bought with His own blood?*

Didn't she say—*The phrase: "they shall never perish" **guarantees** that we will never perish?*

Can Satan really "devour" a person who is being protected by the power of God? Can Satan "devour" a person, the care of whom is sure? Can Satan devour a person when it's impossible for him to snatch that person out of God's hand? Can Satan devour a person who will never perish? This woman is walking in religious confusion. She doesn't know what she believes.

Well, you might say, maybe she doesn't really consider the ones who are being deceived right now to be genuine Christians. Maybe she is using the term "saints" but she really doesn't believe they are saints. You can see how this might be possible, considering the way she described her friend. She said: "my friend who *calls* herself a believer"—which suggests that she really doesn't think her friend is a genuine believer. Of course, that is a possibility; but it's not the case. In response to another article one month earlier about religious leaders justifying sin, she contradicts her own doctrine again. She writes:

Sin can never be justified; sin is judged. The Saints of God are justified when they repent of their sins and follow Christ. Sanctification follows justification. The Saints of God are sanctified through Christ. No blood-bought saint of God should ever deliberately sin. We do fall along the way and sin, and then we must confess our sins and He is faithful to forgive us. **No man can tell us what is sinful. That comes through the Holy Spirit.** Some people think chewing gum is sinful. . . You see, when we concentrate on the 'sins' that others think are sins in the eyes of God, we miss the point. I was clean on the outside, but my insides were as rotten as a maggot. Even rottener. The Holy Spirit has shown me things that were hidden deep down buried inside me that I didn't want to know about myself. That's where He's been cleaning me up. Oh, I looked really good on the outside, but inside I was dead men's bones. Thanks be to God that He is cleaning me up and I don't have to rely on myself or others pointing out my 'sins'. **I would surely miss a lot of hidden sin and end up in Hell!**

Here, she's not talking about her friend but about herself. I hardly think she sees herself as deceived and therefore, not a genuine believer! She says that after becoming a Christian, if she depended on herself or others to tell her what sin was, she would "*surely miss a lot of hidden sin and end up in Hell*". So the confusion and double-mindedness are real.

Well, you might say, maybe she posted those comments on the other woman's blog before she became fully convinced the doctrine of Eternal Security was true. That's possible; except for the fact that the articles and comments are all dated. She posted her article about Eternal Security on *June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009*. She submitted the above comment and the previous comment to the other woman's blog on *June 29<sup>th</sup>* and *July 21<sup>st</sup>* respectively. So the comments she made about the saints being devoured, and her ending up in Hell if she depended on others to tell her what sin is, were made *after* she publicly stated in the strongest possible terms that she believes Eternal Security.

I'm going to return to this woman's quote in a little while in order to examine another error she is promoting, but since she is *not* a minister and she isn't famous, and since she has no credentials or theological training, some people might not consider her confusion particularly relevant. After all, she's just an ordinary woman who, by her own admission, was raised in a false religion (Catholicism), and even after leaving that religion she became involved in a Protestant sect that was just as false.

So let's take a look at some people who *are* well known and recognized as ministers, and who *do* have credentials and theological training, who could never be put on the same par with a double-minded, ex-Catholic nobody. Everyone is familiar with the names Charles Ryrie, Dwight Pentecost and John MacArthur. These men are famous. They all have credentials. They all have a title before their names. They have all gone to seminaries and had extensive theological training, as well as training in the original languages of Greek and Hebrew. So in dealing with these men, we are definitely not dealing with unknown or untrained "nobody's". These are some of the leading theologians of today's Religious System.

All these men believe and propagate the Eternal Security delusion and they have all had to defend it in writing at one point or another. Examining what they have written will reveal the confusion *they* walk in as well; for you see, the Scripture is God's Word, and God does *not* make mistakes. His doctrines do not contradict one another. If we stick faithfully to that Word, our theology will be the same way—there will be no contradictions in it. But since the doctrine of Eternal Security is totally unscriptural, people must twist and pervert the Bible in order to defend it—and the fact is, unless you pervert the Scripture *as perfectly* as God originally gave it, you will end up with all kinds of inconsistencies and confusion. This confusion can be seen when OSAS theologians and preachers try to answer a simple question regarding salvation. The question is: *How is one saved? What does it take to become a Christian?* Charles Ryrie and John MacArthur explain very clearly what is necessary to become a Christian. They say:

"Salvation is conditioned **solely on faith in Jesus Christ**. Nearly 200 times faith, or belief, is stated as **the single condition** in the N.T. (John 1:12; Acts 16:31). That faith must be placed in Christ as one's substitute for the Savior from sin. It is not easy to believe someone whom you have never seen about the most important matter of eternal destiny, but this is the only way to be saved...Through the ages other requirements in addition to faith have been wrongly added. Some of these are; surrender to the Lordship of Christ, Baptism, Repentance, Confession."

**The Ryrie Study Bible**  
p. 1950 26

"They believed that by doing certain works they could gain God's favor. Virtually all other world religions teach the same thing: that man must live up to some religious code or ethical standard to be saved. Unredeemed man finds it difficult to comprehend that salvation is a free gift of God's grace, unearned and undeserved, **appropriated by faith alone**...Justification by faith...initially ushers us into salvation. When you **believe** in the Lord Jesus Christ you obtain salvation and an inheritance...If one wholeheartedly believes in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ, he is justified (made right with God). There is no work or self-effort involved - it is simply a matter of **believing** what God has done in Christ."

**MacArthur's Bible Studies - Eternal Security**

*pp. 9, 10, 26*

According to these men, there is only *one* condition that must be met in order for a sinner to be saved. That *single* condition is "belief". Becoming a genuine Christian is conditioned *solely* on belief. Surrender (ie: making Jesus Lord), baptism, repentance, confession of sins—none of these things are necessary to be saved (though everyone agrees they *should* be present). However, if it's true that we are saved *solely* on the basis of belief, then it is also true that while all these other things should be present, they don't have to be present. When we believe in Jesus, we are saved.

Dwight Pentecost teaches the same thing. In a discussion on whether or not repentance (ie: sorrow for sin) is necessary for salvation, he reiterates the position of MacArthur and Ryrie. He also makes it clear that salvation is a simple fact to be believed, mentally. He says:

"If conditions were placed by God to salvation, Satan might take away those conditions so that men would not be saved. But since **there are no conditions**, and **salvation is a simple fact to be believed**, Satan's method of deceiving men has been to add to the simplicity of the gospel...**Repentance is not a prerequisite to salvation**; for if repentance is required, Salvation is based, at least in part, upon works...Some will teach that salvation is by faith and good works, or salvation is by faith plus church membership, or salvation is by faith plus repentance. These are attempts to darken the mind of man who needs to be saved..."

**Things Which Become Sound Doctrine**

*pp. 61,62*

All three of these well-known, well-respected, and well-educated men agree that the *only* thing that's required for a sinner to become a child of God is that he "believe" the truth of the gospel. This is their understanding of what it means to be "saved by grace". To them, this *is* the gospel. Those who say anything else is necessary for salvation are preaching a false gospel. For them, this is the great theological battle line they are defending. Notice what both Pentecost and Ryrie say:

"**It is here that the great doctrinal battle has been fought** as to whether salvation is by faith **alone**, or whether salvation is by faith **plus something**. There are approximately 150 passages in the New Testament that tell us that salvation is by faith alone; that salvation is the gift of God to one who will accept Jesus Christ as his personal Savior...The word of God makes it very clear that salvation is based upon the value of the death of Christ apart from anything that the individual might add to it."

**Things Which Become Sound Doctrine**

*pp. 69, 70, 71*

"The importance of **this** question cannot be overestimated in relation to both salvation and sanctification. The message of **faith only** and the message of **faith plus commitment of life** cannot both be the gospel; therefore, one of them is false and comes under the curse of perverting the gospel or preaching another gospel."

**Balancing The Christian Life**

*p. 170*

Pentecost says there has been a great doctrinal battle going on between scholars as to what is necessary to be saved. The battle is over the question of whether we are saved by faith alone—which is defined by them as mental assent to the truth—or whether we are saved by mental assent to the truth, plus something else. The concept that there are any conditions other than mental assent to the truth, in order to be saved, is a concept that these men not only reject, but militantly oppose.

Again, all these men have stated clearly and unequivocally that the *only* condition of salvation is belief—meaning, accepting the gospel mentally. Ryrie goes so far as to say that anyone who does not accept this view is guilty of preaching another gospel. That means, those of us who reject the OSAS lie are cursed and on our way to Hell; for that is what Paul said of those who preach *another* gospel. And what of our standing once we *have* believed? We are eternally secure, of course! Speaking of God's grace, which keeps us saved, MacArthur and Ryrie say:

"Salvation is not the result of any worthiness on our part. Once we are saved we stand in grace...Many people believe that once someone is saved by grace **he has to keep himself saved by keeping the law**. But Romans 5:2 says that once we are truly saved, we stand in grace - firmly fixed in an environment of grace...We abide in an environment of grace. We're secure in that environment. **We didn't do anything to get in; we can't do anything to get out.**"

**MacArthur's Bible Studies - Eternal Security**

*pp. 18-19*

"The work of God [grace] guarantees that the gift of God (salvation), once received is possessed forever and **cannot be lost**"

**So Great Salvation**

*p. 155-156*

MacArthur says that once we are saved, we stand in grace. We are firmly fixed in an environment of grace. We abide in the environment of grace and we're secure in that environment. We didn't do anything to get into that environment and we can't do anything to get out of it. Ryrie says that God's grace guarantees that once we receive the gift of salvation, that gift cannot be lost.

So then, how do we get into this secure environment of grace? How do we get into that place from which we can't do anything to get out? How do we get this gift that cannot be lost? Well, according to all of these theologians, the answer is the same—by *believing* the gospel with the mind. According to them, salvation is "a simple fact to be believed". This is what they have stated over and over again. Believing in Jesus (with the mind) is the *only* condition that is required to *enter* the covenant of grace. Believing is the only condition that's required to *remain* firmly fixed in that environment. Believing is the only condition that's required to *remain* secure in that environment. Believing is the only condition that's required to *receive* the gift of salvation, which once received, cannot possibly be lost.

If this is true, I have a question: On what basis do these men declare that the people who end up cut out of the Vine or falling away from the faith, were never really saved to begin with? How do they *know* the one who falls away never *really* believed the gospel? They all say the same thing about those who fall away. They say the people who fall away were never really saved to begin with—they just *thought* they were saved. True Christians won't ever fall away.

Well, in order to maintain that the people who fall away were never genuine Christians to begin with, you must assume they never really "believed" the gospel to begin with—isn't that true? Right here is where the confusion and double-talk begins because there is no way anyone can prove that a person who *says* he believes the gospel, doesn't really believe the gospel. So everything these men try to use as a yardstick to *judge* whether or not a person actually "believes", serves only to contradict their fundamental position regarding what it takes to become a Christian in the first place! For example, this is what Mr. MacArthur says regarding how you can judge whether or not a person who *says* they believe the gospel, really believes the gospel and has become a genuine Christian as the result.

"We **prove** we belong to God when we **hold firm our confidence in that hope**. **Perseverance is the proof** of salvation. Those who are truly part of the house of God will not depart from the faith. The one who wanders into sin and believes he'll be glorified no matter how he lives **proves** he never belonged to the household of God."

**MacArthur's Bible Studies - Eternal Security**

*pp. 33*

Notice that MacArthur says perseverance—not belief—is the proof that you are really a Christian. Yet he has said repeatedly that salvation is conditioned solely on belief. He has said over and over again that when we believe, we *are* saved. Isn't requiring perseverance the same as adding *another* condition to the single condition of belief? In using perseverance to judge whether or not a person is a true Christian, isn't MacArthur using a yardstick other than the single condition of belief? How can he say the only condition for salvation is believing, and then turn around and use perseverance as a yardstick to judge whether or not a person has really believed? That's double-talk! He has just added another condition to salvation. If mental assent to the truth is the only condition that is required for salvation, then it's the *only* condition. But now, we must not only believe, we must *also* persevere to the end to be a Christian!

But perseverance isn't the only additional condition MacArthur adds to the single condition of belief for salvation. Please notice what else he said in that quote. He said the one who: "...wanders into sin and believes he'll be glorified no matter how he lives, proves he never belonged to the household of God". What does that statement mean? It means that just because you have entered the unconditional covenant of grace, and just because it's true that once you have entered that irrevocable standing, nothing you do can negate your salvation, this does not mean you can live any way you want to live. The person who draws that conclusion or lives that way only proves that they do not really belong to God. In other words, you must *live like* a Christian in order to *be* a Christian. If you do not live like a Christian, this proves that you are not really a Christian.

Don't look now, but MacArthur has just added *another* condition to salvation! To the single condition of belief, he has added the requirement of living like a Christian. So now there are actually *three* conditions to salvation, not just one. In order to become a genuine child of God, we must: (1) believe the gospel with

our minds, (2) persevere to the end, and (3) live like a Christian. If we fail at any of these three points, it proves we were never really a genuine believer to begin with. We just thought we were. When you get right down to it, MacArthur is preaching a *conditional* salvation after all, even though he declares he's not. Mr Ryrie adds other conditions to the single condition of belief as well. He says:

**"Every Christian will bear spiritual fruit.** Somewhere, sometime, somehow. Otherwise that person is **not a believer**. Every born-again individual will be fruitful. Not to be fruitful is to be faithless, without faith, and therefore without salvation....Every Christian will bear fruit; **otherwise he or she is not a true believer**"

**So Great Salvation**

*pp. 45-46*

Notice that Ryrie says bearing fruit—not belief—is the proof that you are real Christian. Yet, he has said repeatedly that salvation is conditioned solely upon belief. When we believe, we *are* saved. When we believe, we have received a gift that can never be lost. Well, isn't requiring fruit the same as adding *another* condition to the single condition of belief for salvation? In using fruit (or the lack thereof) to judge whether or not a person is a true Christian, isn't Ryrie using a yardstick other than the single condition of belief? How can he say the only condition for salvation is belief, and then turn around and use fruit as a yardstick to judge whether or not a person has really believed? That's more double-talk! If mental assent to the truth is the only condition that is required to become a Christian, then it is the *only* condition! But Ryrie is telling us there are two conditions. We must not only believe, we must *also* bear fruit to be a Christian.

I agree that a true Christian must bear fruit and live like a Christian. The problem is, these men are only presenting half the truth. A true Christian who has *begun* to bear fruit can have that fruit *destroyed* and end up lost (*Jude 1:12*). Also, a true Christian who *has been* living like a Christian can *stop* living like a Christian, return to world, and be lost (*II. Pet. 2:20-21*). But this isn't really my point. What I'm trying to highlight tonight is the confusion these men walk in. It's impossible to maintain that there is only ONE condition and MULTIPLE conditions for salvation at the same time! Saying that both these things are true at the same time is double-talk and religious confusion.

All this confusion comes from trying to put a square peg in a round hole. It will never work. The square peg is the lie of Eternal Security and the round hole is the *complete teaching* of salvation presented in the Bible. Until these men get delivered from this error, they will continue to double-talk and contradict not only the Scripture, but their own statements as well. Since they are under the power of seducing spirits—which are preaching *another* gospel through them—they will say and do anything to cover and protect that error. They will twist the Scripture; they will deliberately mis-represent and mis-apply passages; they will twist the meaning of the original languages; and they will lie to you with a straight face.

Before moving on, I want to go back and look at something our illustrious blogger said in her last comment. She said no man can tell you what sin is. The reason I want to point this out is because if you remember, last week I said that one of the reason's God is giving so many of His people over to the power of Antichrist is because of their *rebellion*. The gospel of Antichrist is a gospel of rebellion because the false grace it promotes, produces rebellion in those who accept it. This false grace instills unscriptural and soul-damning ideas in our minds. One of these ideas is that obedience to all *external* commandments, *external* standards of righteousness, or *external* moral codes, is futile and constitutes legalism.

Sometimes this idea is presented in the theological framework of trying to keep the Law. But most of the time it's presented as the concept of religious *peer-pressure*. The idea is that since we are all individuals and only God knows our hearts, no one should ever try and tell anyone else *how* God wants them to live or *what* God considers as sin in their lives. We must never try to make anyone conform to *our* idea of what sin is or *our* standard of righteousness. Every person must find out what sin and righteousness is for himself, directly from the Holy Spirit. False grace tells you that if ever any man or religious leadership tries to define what sin or righteousness is for you, in order to conform you to that standard, this equals religious peer pressure. Whenever one person tries to tell another person what sin or righteousness is, it's just their religious "flesh" trying to *impose* their own standard on other people.

I've noticed this idea being expressed quite a bit by people who have come out of the Church System. Biblical standards that are established by churches are mocked and equated with legalism. They are viewed as attempts to clean the outside of the cup, while leaving the inside unclean like dead men's bones. Like so many of the false teachings that are snaring God's people in this hour, there is a measure of truth in this whole idea—but just enough to deceive people.

One fairly well-known minister, who has been out of the Church System for quite a while, wrote an article that was geared specifically towards those who have left the Church System, but who may still be under the influence of some of the system's ways and ideas. His contempt for the religious standards some churches still seek to maintain was expressed this way: "*You've submitted to the ultimate form of peer pressure—the pressure to conform to the expectation of the religious leadership and your fellow believers, thinking that by doing so you were submitting to God*". <sup>1</sup>

Personally, I can't see how this could apply to main-line or liberal churches, or mega-churches, or seeker friendly churches, or even to most Charismatic churches right now. The fact is, there are *very few* churches that actually try to impose any kind of *Biblical* moral code or standard of righteousness on anyone. That type of congregation is a vanishing relic. The only "legalism" most of today's churches are propagating is the idea that you must attend their church every week and keep tithing.

In the vast majority of today's churches, no moral code is being maintained; no standard of righteousness is being enforced. Everyone is free to do what they like and live any way they please. The ways of the world have been brought into the churches and they have been incorporated into their services. Couples who live together, but who are not married, are welcome in these churches. Even homosexuals are welcome in many of them. There is certainly no dress code—people come dressed any way they like. They can believe what they like and they can associate with whoever they like. They can smoke and be a member of the church; they can drink and be a member of the church; they can go to the race track every night and be a member of the church. The leadership of these churches aren't telling the people they "*can't*" do anything. Just the opposite is true! They are preaching a false "grace" to them. They are telling them they can do anything they please and live any way they please.

The fact is, even if some of those who have left the Church System did run across a fellowship that was trying to uphold a Biblical standard of righteousness, they would never consider the possibility that this standard was a *good* thing, or that it might have actually come from the Scripture because false grace tells them the only thing conforming to an *external* standard of righteousness will accomplish is to make you appear righteous on the outside, when all the time you will still be wicked on the inside.

This is exactly what our illustrious blogger is saying. She says no man can tell us what sin is. She has been set free from all the legalistic bondage of the Church System and now, no man, no elder, no religious leadership—nobody but the Holy Spirit is ever going to tell *her* what sin is! Well, I have news for this poor woman. She's walking under the influence of *false* grace and the fact is, if she persists in that attitude, she's just as likely to end up in Hell anyway because that whole attitude is nothing but *rebellion*. She is walking in rebellion under the guise of living under grace.

First of all, the Scripture tells us very clearly what sin is—maybe not in every area of life, but certainly in many areas. Secondly, sometimes God *does* use people to speak to us because we are too blind and deaf to hear Him speak to us directly. Sometimes the Spirit *does* send a man to tell us something we are involved in is sin in God's eyes. Sometimes God *does* use men to correct us and bring us out of self-deception. So the statement that no man can tell you what sin is, is not only false, it's a statement of rebellion and it reveals an unteachable spirit—which is precisely *why* God allows people like that to be deceived.

The idea that obedience to any kind of *outward* standard, or that conformity to any kind of *external* moral code, automatically equals legalism, and that it does nothing to clean the *inside* of the cup, is a very subtle perversion of the Scripture. This is a perfect example of how these seducing spirits can take a truth and twist it until it becomes a lie.

It's true that God's goal for us is that we learn how to be guided and ruled by the *internal* government of our spirit man. As we yield to the work of purification and sanctification in our lives, the Holy Spirit forms *Christ* in us, which is the nature and character of God. The ultimate goal of all this is that we come to “the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (*Eph 4:13*). When we have reached *that* goal, the character and the nature of God, which has been fully formed in us, will be the thing that governs our motives and thoughts and desires and actions throughout all eternity.

However, the fact is, Christ is not fully formed in us, nor do we learn how to be ruled by the internal government of our new man, over night. These things take time—and during that process we must remain under some kind of external government or we will end up like all these “grace” people who are walking in rebellion and are being turned over to Antichrist. This is especially true of babes in Christ, and those who are still young in the Lord. It's like when your child is growing up. The older he gets and the more mature he becomes, the less external rules and restraints you must keep him under. His *maturity* cancels out the need for cumbersome regulations because more and more he is regulating his own behavior.

The same is true of spiritual babies and spiritual children. As long as people are spiritually immature, they will need to be under some kind of *external* spiritual government because they don't yet know how to let the internal government of the new man regulate their desires and motives and behavior. There *is* a proper time and place for obeying external commandments and standards of righteousness. Until we have grown enough spiritually to where the *internal* government of our new man is leading and guiding our actions, we will need to be under some form of external spiritual government. The amount of this kind of government we need will be in direct proportion to how mature we are. The more our new man governs our desires and behavior, the *less* external government we will need to be under.

The Bible is *not* against obeying external spiritual government. Neither is it against submitting to external moral codes or standards of righteousness. What the Bible is against is: (1) obeying external standards or

codes in order to be justified; and (2) remaining in a perpetual state of immaturity wherein external spiritual government continues to be necessary *indefinitely*. Unfortunately, this is not understood by those who are under the influence of Antichrist's false grace. They think that once you are under grace, you no longer have to walk under *any kind* of government. Even some who realize we must still obey God after we have entered the New Covenant, have been influenced by this false grace nonetheless. One particular minister out here gives the same lecture, over and over again, about the futility of obeying external commandments, or conforming to religious standards that are still found in some (but not very many) churches. His speech always goes something like this:

*“The first thing that happens to a new Christian is that when he goes to church, he’s told that he must quit smoking, drinking, playing rock music, and whatever else the people in that church view as sin or unrighteousness. Peer pressure is applied and before long, he has been conformed to the standard of righteousness of that church. God may have wanted to do a work in some other area of his life first, before dealing with his drinking and smoking and rock music; but the church has hindered that work. Instead, they have conformed this new Christian to their own standard of righteousness. Now, the new Christian assumes that he has been cleansed on the inside because he has conformed his life to the religious code of that particular church. He now thinks that because he no longer smokes or drinks or listens to rock music he is clean on the inside, but the fact is, only the outside of the cup has been cleansed.”*

Has anybody ever heard someone talk like this? Do you see anything wrong with this view? If you don't, you should because the fact is, *new* converts need to be under some type of external government, just like natural babies need to be cared for. A baby Christian *needs* to be instructed in the ways of righteousness. He *needs* to be taught that God is not pleased with smoking, drinking, listening to rock music, and living like the world. He *needs* to be taught that God is not pleased with men who dress like women and act like women and have long hair like a woman. However, he needs to be shown these things from the Scripture, so he doesn't develop a habit of blindly following whatever he's told. He also needs to be encouraged to read the Scripture for himself and let the Holy Spirit speak to him and guide him. But if you expect a *baby* Christian to know how to govern himself like a *mature* Christian does, you're crazy.

There is nothing wrong with external spiritual government! What in the world do people think the New Testament is? The New Testament contains its own body of law. Literally hundreds of commandments were laid down in the New Testament by Jesus and the apostles, and these instructions form a *standard of righteousness* that they expected God's people to *conform* their lives to.

*If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that **the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.***

*I. Corinthians 14:37*

*And we have confidence in the Lord touching you, that ye both do and will do the things which **we command you.** . . . And if any man **obey not our word** by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.*

*II. Thessalonians 3:4 & 14*

Go through the book of First Corinthians sometime and jot down all the instructions Paul gave those brethren—and then answer this question: were the commandments he gave them THE LORD’S commandments (like he said); or do you think he was just imposing *his own* religious code on that church? Can you accept the fact that an *external religious standard* was being laid down for those brethren by God, not by Paul? How about when the leadership of that assembly applied Paul’s standard to the whole congregation? Do you think that when they did, they were guilty of trying to “*conform them to the expectations of the religious leadership*”? When they said: “Brethren, this is going to be the standard of righteousness our fellowship walks in, and if you will conform to this standard, then you will be obeying God”—was that wrong? Was that just legalistic church bondage?

When Paul told the new converts in Thessalonica to obey his instructions, was he trying to impose his own personal standard of righteousness on them; or was he laying down God’s standard of righteousness? And when the leadership of that assembly explained the commandments of Paul to the rest of the people and said *this* will be the standard of the fellowship, were they guilty of trying to “*conform them to the expectations of the religious leadership*”; or were they trying to conform them to the standard God Himself was laying down?

Those of us who have left the Church System need to realize they we are in danger of ending up walking in rebellion if we don’t learn how to recognize this false grace and *expunge* it from our lives. We are just as susceptible to this Satanic influence as are those who are still in the Church System. False grace may not be presented to us out here exactly the *same way* it’s presented to those in the system, but it’s just as false and it’s just as deadly. Many of those who have left the Church System are still being affected by this grace in ways they do not realize—so much so that even if they did happen to stumble across a true, New Testament fellowship, they wouldn’t be part of *that* church any more than they would be part of the churches they left because they have accepted the idea that they no longer have to submit to any kind of external spiritual government.

You see, a true, New Testament church would operate like the original churches did. It *would* have a Biblical standard that *everyone* in that assembly would be *required* to submit to and conform their lives to. In a true, New Testament church, those who refuse to submit to that standard or conform to that standard would not have to worry about deciding whether or not they should leave that fellowship. They would be thrown out by the whole congregation.

Yes, a true, New Testament church *would* tell new converts that if they wanted to be pleasing to the Lord, they would stop drinking and smoking and living like the world. You bet they would! And no, a true, New Testament church *would not* allow homosexuals and fornicating couples to attend their services—unless they were seeking deliverance from those sins—for you see, that’s part of the *external* standard of holiness the Early Church held. You better believe that a true, New Testament church would have a very strict religious code, and that everyone in that fellowship would be *required* to conform to it!

So if you view this kind of thing as legalistic bondage, or if the thought of being required to conform to any kind of Biblical standard makes you squeamish or angry, you need to realize you have been *infected* with Antichrist’s false grace. Those who refuse to submit to any type of external Biblical standard are filled with rebellion—which is the spirit of Satan, which is also as the sin of witchcraft (*I. Sam. 15:23*).

Yes, it's true—obedience to external commandments does not necessarily clean the inside of the cup. But then again, a true, New Testament church would *realize* that. They would *know* that conforming to the religious standard of the group does not necessarily equal having Christ formed in you. They would *know* that external government is only a temporary thing which is meant to provide a framework or an atmosphere which is conducive to the inner workings of the Spirit. They would understand what very few of today's believers understand—that an external government must be established in the life of the believer so the flesh will be *held in check* while the Holy Spirit does that sanctifying work on the inside.

Listen my friends, nobody is going to be cleansed *inwardly* if they are constantly walking in sin and worldliness *outwardly*. That's the lie false grace tells people. It tells them they can live any way they wish while God works with them—and it uses a partial truth to propagate this lie. Yes, it's true, the person who quits smoking and drinking and listening to the world's music may not be clean on the inside yet—but it's *also* just as true that God can't possibly cleanse you on the inside while you are freely indulging in all those things! Those who think God will even try to sanctify a person who lives in the flesh or lives like the world are under the influence of the false grace of Antichrist, not the true grace of Jesus Christ.

Just because God's goal is that we eventually be led and governed by our new man, that does not mean we never again have to submit to any *external* standards of righteousness! When people listen to this lie, it automatically leads them into a walk of worldliness and rebellion, and this in turn *stops* the whole process of sanctification. Moreover, it opens the door for religious delusion and self-deception.

You want to know why Christians are falling away right now? You want to know why so many of them are being turned over to a delusion, to follow *another* Jesus and *another* spirit? It's because they have put their filthy hands of flesh to the holy things of God! It's because they have turned the true gospel of grace into an Satanic counterfeit—and for this, they deserve to be cast into Hell!

*For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,  
Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live  
soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;*

*Titus 2:11-12*

I've found that the people who talk about God's grace the most, are usually the ones who understand it the least. Here is the difference between the grace of Christ and the grace of Antichrist. The grace of Christ teaches us how to *deny* ungodliness and worldly lusts. Please notice that Paul speaks of *worldly* lusts here, not the "lusts of the flesh". Many people who know all about the lusts of the flesh don't have the faintest idea how to get free from *worldliness*. Many who preach good sermons regarding the lusts of the flesh, can't preach the good sermons about worldliness because they have no idea what worldliness is. But if we are walking under the grace of God, that grace will be teaching us what worldliness is. It will be teaching us how to live righteously and godly in this present world.

The Greek term that is translated "denying" in this verse is "*arneomai*" (ar-neh'-om-ahee; Strong's # 720). It's a very strong *negative* word, meaning "to disavow or reject". Literally, it means "to say no". So after the grace of God draws us to salvation and justifies us, the very next thing it does is teach us to say *No!* In other words, the *first objective* of genuine grace, after the Cross, is to rid our lives of all worldliness and

ungodliness. This is the focus of God's grace, once we have been born again. This is what grace does, once we have become a child of God. It teaches us how to put everything that is worldly, everything that is ungodly, everything that is unclean and contrary to God's Holy nature, out of our lives.

The grace of Antichrist does just the opposite. It tells you not to worry about *worldliness* because Jesus loves you and accepts you just the way you are. It tells you that if you worry too much about trying to be good, you will be guilty of trying to *earn* God's love and *earn* God's acceptance by performance. It tells you to just believe the gospel and trust that Jesus will take care of everything for you.

False grace doesn't teach people how to be holy. Nor does it teach them how to be separate from the world. Nor does it teach them to say *No*. False grace is a *positive* grace, not a negative grace. People who walk under this grace don't like the word *No* because it's negative. They have no desire to walk around saying *No* to things all day. They don't want to know what they *can't* do; they only want to know what they *can* do. They want to know how much of the world they can have and still get to heaven. They want to know how much of the flesh they can have and still be a Christian.

But the fact is, the term *No* is actually a very positive word because when you say *No* to temptation, you are saying *Yes* to righteousness. When you say *No* to sin, you are saying *Yes* to godliness. When you say *No* to the darkness, you are saying *Yes* to the light. When you say *No* to Satan, you are saying *Yes* to Jesus. When you say *No* to the demons, you are saying *Yes* to the Holy Spirit. When you say *No* to the world, you are saying *Yes* to the kingdom of God. When you say *No* to your flesh, you are saying *Yes* to your spirit man. And when you say *No* to error, you are saying *Yes* to the truth.

The fact is, those who love Jesus the most will be those who say *No* the most! Every time I say *No* to the desires of my flesh, or my self will, or the world, or Satan and his demons, I am saying *Yes* to the Lord Jesus. I am saying—"I love you Jesus". You see, it's easy to *say* we love Jesus. Everyone who claims to be a Christian *says* they love Jesus. But the one who truly loves Jesus is the one who demonstrates that love by obeying Him—and a big portion of what it means to obey Jesus day in and day out, is learning how to say *No* to the things that grieve Him and the things He hates.

If you and I are not being taught on a daily basis how to say *No* to the things Jesus hates, then *neither* are we being taught how to live righteously, godly and soberly in this present world. If we are not being taught how to *deny* worldliness and ungodliness, then we are *not* under the grace of God—I don't care how much we believe in Jesus, or how much we sing and worship Jesus, or how much we say we love Jesus. We are walking under a false grace and we are deceived.

Let me call your attention to one more thing in this passage. Paul said the grace of God teaches us how to deny worldliness and ungodliness and live righteously. He didn't say God's grace would do these things for us. He said the grace of God TEACHES US how to do them. Grace TEACHES US what to do and what not to do in order to be pleasing to the Lord. The work of God's grace, once we have been saved, is to show us how to put anything that would hinder us from receiving the promises of God, out of our lives. If we listen to what grace is trying to teach us *and* obey it, then we will receive the promises. But if we turn a deaf ear to what grace is trying to teach us, or if we hear what it's saying but we choose not to obey, then we will not receive the promises. This is true grace. False grace tells us we will receive the promises whether we obey or not.

It's very important that we become skilled at discerning when a preacher or Bible teacher or writer is presenting us with only half the picture or half the truth—especially when they are using the Scripture. The trick that Satan uses most often to deceive people in the realm of doctrine is to present only one side of an issue. I see this all the time. It's done constantly by preachers and Bible teachers, not just when it comes to the doctrine of Eternal Security, but regarding every kind of theological issue.

Becoming skilled at catching this kind of thing not only requires the discernment of the Holy Spirit, it also requires that we spend many hours reading and studying the Scripture. If you don't know what the Scripture says, it's not possible to become skilled at detecting when someone is twisting it, or putting a false spin on it, or only presenting selected portions of it in order to hide it's whole counsel. This skill is particularly important when people start mis-using the original languages to support an error. An example of this kind of thing can be seen in the way Mr. Pentecost (and others) try to use the Greek language to support the lie that repentance is *not* necessary for salvation. He says that the term repentance:

"...brings to the mind of the average individual the thought of **sorrow for sin**...But there could be nothing further from the concept of the Word of God than the idea that repentance means sorrow for sins...we find that **the word translated 'repent' means 'a change of mind.'** It means literally, 'a turning about,' not so much a physical turning about as **a mental turning around**...our lord and John preached that there was a need for **a change of mind**: a change of mind concerning sins, a change of mind concerning righteousness, a change of mind concerning their need..."

**Things Which Become Sound Doctrine**  
pp. 66,67

If the view of Mr. Pentecost and his fellow theologians regarding what's required to become a Christian is correct, then they must come up with a reason as to *why* nothing but mental assent to the truth is required. If you are going to teach people that the message of John the Baptist and Jesus concerning salvation was: "*change your mind, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*"—then you will have to come up with a convincing argument to substantiate such a bizarre view. The argument they have come up with is to *mis-use* the original Greek language.

Mr. Pentecost says the Greek word "*metanoeo*" (met-an-o-eh'-o), which is translated "repent" in our English Bible, doesn't really mean sorrow for sin. It means: "to think differently or afterwards, or to reconsider". And sure enough, if you check this Greek word out in Strong's Greek Dictionary (# 3340) that is exactly what it says. Moreover, if you go to Vine's Expository Dictionary, it will give you the same basic definition Strong's Dictionary does. This fact would seem to support what these men are teaching. But you see, it doesn't matter what these learned men say about the definition of Greek terms. Even if what they say regarding the Greek is true (and many times it's not), the *whole counsel* of Scripture is what really matters—and the whole counsel of Scripture flatly denies this whole argument.

*Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.*

*Luke 17:3*

*Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.*

Acts 8:22-23

Jesus said if a brother sins against us and he comes to us and repents, we are to forgive him. He's not talking about the brother simply "changing his mind" about the situation—though a change of mind is *part* of the process. He's talking about the whole person, especially the heart. He is talking about the brother having a *godly sorrow* for the sin, being willing to confess it as sin, and asking forgiveness for it.

The same applies to Simon the Magician, who tried to buy God's power. When Peter told him to repent of his wickedness, he was telling him to do more than "change his mind". He was telling him to acknowledge that wickedness in his *heart*, for that's where the idea of buying God's power originated. He was telling him to recognize that desire as sin, confess it as sin, and ask God's forgiveness.

Repentance has to do with a turning about of the *entire* person. A change of mind is only *one part* of a process that affects the *whole* man. It must also include the heart if it is to have any eternal value because people can accept truth with their brains, yet not let that truth get down into the heart and change them. When the heart of a person is affected, a change of behavior takes place. That is why John told the Pharisees to bring "fruits meet for repentance" (*Matt. 3:8*). What Pentecost and other scholars try to do is isolate one aspect of the process of repentance, and then define that aspect as the *entire* process.

*Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death.*

*II. Corinthians 7:9-10*

Notice the chain-reaction that takes place in an individual that is brought to a place of true repentance. Truth enters the heart and the mind and produces a *godly sorrow* for sin, which in turn produces repentance, which in turn produces salvation. That is why, whenever you see genuine repentance in a person's life, you will also find godly sorrow. The two should go hand in hand. Technically speaking, godly sorrow and repentance are not identical, for Paul said one leads to the other. But godly sorrow will *always be present* if the repentance is genuine.

*Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*

Acts 2:36-38

When Peter preached the gospel under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, the people were “pricked in their heart”—not in their mind but in their heart. Something much deeper was going on at that point than an appeal to “believe” in Jesus with the brain. The message of John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles was not, “believe in Jesus and you will be saved”. Their message was, “repent and believe”.

The confusion these theologians walk in can also be seen by the fact that first Mr. Pentecost declared emphatically that repentance is *not* necessary for salvation. “Salvation is a simple fact to be believed”—he said. He also said that telling people repentance *is* necessary for salvation is an attempt to “darken the mind of man who needs to be saved”. He also said that teaching people they must repent makes us an accomplice in Satan’s attempt to “add to the simplicity of the gospel”. Then he turns around and tries to *define* repentance a change of mind. So after stating quite clearly that repentance is not necessary for salvation, he says repentance is just a change of mind.

Does anyone recognize the confusion yet?

If “repentance” is not necessary for salvation, then *neither* is a “change of mind” necessary for salvation; for that is what repentance is (according to him). If it’s true, repentance is not necessary for salvation, then guess what? We can all be saved *without* changing our minds! We can all be saved *without* repenting! We don’t have to change our minds regarding sin or salvation in order to be saved. We can be saved without turning around, mentally. The end result of this brilliant theologian’s doctrine—which he has the audacity to call “*Things Which Become Sound Doctrine* (sic)—is that we don’t even have to believe the gospel to be saved!

Of course, Mr. Pentecost would never accept that his “sound” doctrine is as “un-sound” as you can get because his mind has been taken captive by religious, seducing spirits. You could never sit him down and explain the *outcome* or the *sum-total* of his statements and positions—which are:

- ~ Belief is simply mental assent to the truth.
- ~ Belief requires a change of mind.
- ~ This change of mind is repentance.
- ~ Repentance is *not* necessary for salvation.

Got it yet? Belief is mental assent to the truth, which requires a change of mind, which *is* repentance, which is *not* necessary for salvation!

All this stupidity, all this religious confusion and self-contradiction, is the result of rejecting the clear and obvious teaching of the Scripture regarding not only the possibility of falling away from Christ, but the fact that in the last days multitudes of Christians *will* fall away. When we reject God’s truth, the only alternative is to accept Satan’s lies. Rejecting the truth opens our minds to the power of seducing spirits.

**Reference:**

1 - “Getting Babylon Out Of You” — Chip Brogden