

JOHN 2

Luke 4:17, "When he was given the book of the Prophet Isaiah, and when he opened the book, he found the place where it was written. The spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor. He has sent me to heal the broken-hearted. She proclaimed liberty to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to set liberty to those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. Verse 21, "And he again say to them, today, this scripture was fulfilled in your hearing."

So what does this passage have to do with what I'm about to talk about? And the answer is not one thing. I am practicing my Neo Reformed proof-texting. Screw you [UNINTELLIGIBLE] 00:01:08

The advantage of being able to stand behind a pulpit to demand that people submit to your authority is you can tell them whatever you want, and they can't argue back. They must submit to what you say. They have no opinion in the matter. It doesn't matter what comes out of your mouth next. And this is exactly how tyrants and despots the world over have ruled the masses. They have defied the people, defied them to challenge what they say.

I'm going to go ahead and review since this is a building process. In the first session, I introduced the concepts that there is a science to thought, and we're not going to expand on what that specifically means. But as a brief review, here's what we're going to talk about. We're going to talk about philosophy specifically and what that is.

Now some of you I'm sure have heard these statements: "Give it over to the university. No one can know anything for sure. Jesus died for our sins." As I said in the first session, people hear philosophy and they tend

to think of a bunch of college people sitting around in rooms batting back ideas that are largely useless, things that are irrelevant. That has a lot to do with what has happened to philosophy. In the middle 1700s, a man by the name of Immanuel Kant got a hold reason and wrote a book about it called *The Critique of Pure Reason*. His function within that book was to reduce reason effectively to ash. That was his goal. He wanted to destroy man's competence and reason. He was trying to give back faith and subjectivity back into the Christian religion. He was trying to take reason out of human thinking.

The result of saying that thinking doesn't mean anything is that eventually people say thinking doesn't mean anything. If you tell people long enough that thinking is irrelevant, then eventually they go, "Yeah, thinking is irrelevant," which is why the average fifteen-year-old sitting in math class says, "Why do I need to know this?" Or the average eighteen-year-old sitting in advanced history class says, "Well, why do I need to know this? Why isn't it okay that I'm stupid?" Now they don't say that. Because they feel entitled to what they do know, their mastery of the latest Xbox game, their knowledge of whatever is in pop culture, they feel very entitled to that. But they see no causal relationship between their given body of thought and their given body of action. No one has ever explained to them that the content of their thinking is in fact a cohesive whole.

Now individual thoughts, stray thoughts, everybody has them, they don't amount to much. But full philosophical statements have enormous power. "Give it over to the universe." This is actually a philosophical statement. Notice the relationship - if you've ever read *The Secret* or heard about the book, *The Secret*, this is in reference to the concept of *The Secret*, give it over to the universe. This is the philosophical statement designed to summarize the elements of quantum physics and the mystical assumption that the universe is a conscious creature and is aware of your need.

"No one can know anything for sure" is a philosophical statement that presupposes that there is no objective truth. It is a summation of Friedrich Hegel and Immanuel Kant's full philosophic conclusions. When you hear somebody insist to you that you can't know anything, that there is no absolute in life, they are really referring to a deep intellectual history, a deep intellectual tradition that goes back to the mid 1700s.

"Jesus died for our sins." Believe it or not, that did not come from a first or second century thinker. That actually emerged, this thought right here, that summation actually emerged well in the third century. That thought is actually a summarization of the doctrine of original sin, federal guilt, atonement, and the ratification of a new covenant. Now original sin comes from Saint Augustine. The first record is by the name of Irenaeus. Irenaeus' theology is not Augustine's theology. It's not Augustine's original sin. Federal guilt is the presumption that Adam ultimately is responsible for the simple destruction of the whole race. Atonement, the doctrine of atonement is ultimately discussed from effectively the fourth century on, and the ratification, the concept of the ratification of the new covenant. These are all evolutions of thought that have been reduced to the statement, "Jesus died for our sins."

Note the layers upon layers upon layers in understanding, in each of these statements how many sub-layers they really represent. This is philosophy. This is what philosophy really does. This progression from the assumptions all the way through to the final summation that ultimately ends up on a bumper sticker. When you see a bumper sticker say, the common one now that says "coexist" written out in formula or symbols, what that's really saying is why can't we all just get along? With all the harmonious, with all the spiritual faiths represented by these symbols, why can't we all just get along, right? That's what they're really after. But you must specifically understand every specific understanding of faith represented by those symbols to give the bumper sticker

meaning, right? This is the ultimate power of philosophy, how we take ideas, very big, very large ideas and ultimately roll them down so that you and I can have a conversation [UNINTELLIGIBLE] 00:07:40 Jesus died for our sins.

The Gospel According to John Immel 3:1-3. By the way, for those of you who don't know, I'm John Immel. This is my observation about how ideas go together with human action. "All people act logically from their assumptions. It does not matter how inconsistent the ideas or insane the rationale. They will act until the logic is fulfilled. Therefore, when you see masses of people taking the same destructive actions, find the assumptions and you will find the cause."

Humans are the sum of their collective ideas. Humans are built to think, to engage the world we live in with our mind. The command from the beginning, be fruitful and multiply, rule and subdue the earth presupposes a mastery of the earth. It presupposes the ability to master the earth. And it specifically presupposes that you are charged with the responsibility to master the earth. The one thing that sets man apart above all else is that man is not specifically designed to live in any given environment. He must alter his environment to live in it, which means he must think. He must manipulate his environment to his advantage. Every other creature, every other animal is specifically built within its design within its environment. Man is not. Man is utterly separated from all the rest of creation, set at its pinnacle as a master of that creation by virtue of his rational mind.

This means by necessity we must understand the difference between good and bad ideas. So when I talk about philosophy, I'm not talking about vain concepts, vain philosophies or intellectual beach balls. I am specifically referring to how we know what we know. The nature of existence is called metaphysics. How we know what we know is called epistemology. How do we value what we know is called ethics. And how

we interact with people is called politics. If you can picture this in your head, starting from here, this is the beginning of the path down to mass of action. Here are our metaphysical assumptions. They are the things that are above the physical realm that we must come to understand, the concepts that we must come to understand that are in fact transcendent specifically of here now. We must come to understand this. Then once we understand this, then we understand epistemology. Then man understands how he knows what he knows. Once he understands his existence, he then understands how he interacts with that existence. That ultimately produces his values.

Think of it this way. How do you know you should drink water? What's the value of water? It keeps you alive. Your specific metaphysical truth that your body needs water to survive makes water good. Those are your ethics. Now let's ask this question. Once we have our ethics, how do we know how to interact with human beings? That is the study of politics. This is the driving force of human existence. From the most rudimentary to how man understands, to how man derives his specific set of values, to ultimately how man interacts with the rest of the world, the other individuals in the world.

What does this have to do with this conference? Everything. Absolutely everything. The existing, emerging fight over Neo Calvinism, the Neo Reformed movement in the United States is specifically built upon what we're specifically about to talk about today. The nature of human existence is in fact imbalanced. Who we are as a species, what we are as defined by this body of doctrine has determined over the course of history the ultimate destruction of our race. Bold statement. You'll understand it in a minute.

I want you understand a specific principle. The major metaphysical premise, your foundation assumptions determine your epistemological qualification. We've talked a lot about incompetence in this meeting,

right? The second point there, epistemological qualification. That's where we decide who's qualified to do what? Epistemological qualification defines ethical standard. So once you decide how competent you are, that determines what your ethics are. The last one is ethical standards prescribe political culture. Let me try to break that down a little more. I'm sympathetic. I get it. This is high level stuff. I understand that. But like the teacher that has to set the bar higher, we need to get the mastery of what this actually amounts to you. You've got to elevate your expectations on what this means. Hence, the heady conversation on some pretty deep issues.

Principle restated, foundational assumptions determine how effective man is to understand his world, defines moral value, prescribes government force. Now watch. This is Plato. This is one of the first men to actually author a full philosophical statement about the world that was successfully comprehensive. There were others prior to him, but Plato has dominated the vast percentage of western history. Western history meaning the history that ultimately is the heritage of the United States. Plato had probably dominated it more than anyone. And here is Plato's premise. This world is a mere reflection of other worldly forms. In other words, this right here doesn't really exist. There's actually a purist, true bottle of water some other place. And I get this here, and whatever this is, this is imperfect. It's a form of something else. This determines man cannot know truth because he experiences the imperfect shadow world. The metaphor is man stands in a cave. There is a fire in the cave that ultimately casts a shadow on the wall. All man sees is in fact that shadow. That's all man truly understands about the nature of the world. The last part of this defines only select men of the highest character and a longstanding study can achieve enlightenment.

Now watch what happens. When you make these first three presumptions, look what it leads to. This prescribes that philosopher kings should govern the great unwashed. Do you see the progression? Do

you see it match? The moment you decide man is incompetent, the moment you decide that truth is beyond his capacity, that only means a select few are somehow able to know the truth, they are uniquely qualified to force the rest of us to whatever their understanding is.

This is how it works. Watch. Karl Marx. Karl Marx said, here's his metaphysical premise, history is a community fight over resources. This determines that the community establishes truth. This defines all members of the community must work for the common good, which is the collective will. And last, notice, this prescribes a government that forces each person to provide according to his ability, to be given to each according to his need. Notice that the metaphysical presumption ultimately turns part of a culture enslaves. That's how it works.

Watch. Augustine. Augustine said original sin means the Fall of Man. Give the implication of the power of that idea. Man is fully and entirely disqualified. The nature of sin so fully corrupt who and what he is that ultimately man cannot know any good. In other words, you can't know that water is good for you. The nature of your depravity so corrupts what you are that you can't define good. Now watch the vicious nature of what this does. Man has no ethical standard because he has no good. He can never act with good on his own. By definition, the moment you say that, what must happen? This prescribes God the Father and the Holy Mother Church is the mother disciplining wayward humanity. Anybody who has even this much knowledge of Catholic history knows this is where the disaster of the Dark Ages comes from, the massive tide [SOUNDS LIKE] 00:18:32 of human destruction, the warfare that lasted effectively from almost 600 AD as it washed across the face of the earth. What is it? Pope Innocent III? One of those bloodthirsty men? No. Cardinal Richelieu in the modern age? Bloodthirsty. Where does this come from? This is not an accident. This follows exactly from the metaphysical presumption. When you presume that the masses of humanity are functionally incompetent,

you can arrive at no other conclusion that man must be compelled by force. The progression of ideas drives you to this point every single time.

This is my contribution to the discussion of philosophy in the world. Here's what I've identified. The first three elements of all causes of tyranny follow exact this way. All tyranny is derived from two primary presumptions. I call it universal guilt and mass incompetence. Universal guilt basically says because man is pervasively guilty of some primary moral inferiority, he has no redeeming quality in and of himself. That concept plus mass incompetence, that he is incapable of [UNINTELLIGIBLE] 00:20:03 saving his own action requires him to need dictated good. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the source of all tyranny.

Every time you hear a despot speak, a tyrant, an autocrat, ultimately listen to him long enough and you will hear them tell you how incompetent you are and how guilty you are. In the modern age, or the primary leading example in our current culture is our entire determination to go green. There are conservationists out there telling people, of course, to be good stewards. Most of our current political culture says man is polluting the world and destroying it. He is incompetent to do anything else. We must revert back to a primitive state where the world is somehow saved. Listen to the same themes: universal guilt, mass incompetence. What is the result? The political forces must come into play to destroy anything that's effectively modern. Get rid of cars. Get rid of oil. Get rid of power. Get rid of coal. Anything that drives man back to a primitive state.

Universal guilt equals the metaphysical presumption. Mass incompetence equals man's epistemological determination. In other words, man can't get the point. He is incompetent at his root. Whatever this thing does, he doesn't get it. The only thing that's left is dictating good. And this prescribes the function of government.

So now let's get back to the Neo Reformed movement. Now this should make abundant sense. This is John Calvin. Pervasive depravity has wholly corrupted the whole of human existence. This determines that all good, all good, is the product of God's specific sovereign action. Notice the generation gap that this places between good and man. Notice how far this removes man from his very environment. This defines that man's life is a predetermined in action and in outcome. The predetermination, the predestination that is taught within this doctrine resides right there. And last, this prescribes an elect few who are divinely appointed to shepherd the flock in God's behalf. The discussion that we continue here that is emerging throughout American piety is how often the average pew-sitter has a collision with an elder, a deacon? And how often they are villainized, tyrannized, suddenly brutalized, or not so suddenly brutalized?

Now Americans, we live because of developments that I will address in the third session. We live with ontological certainty of religious freedom, that big word that means we're actually positive we should be entitled to our own faith. We've never suffered a religious war in the United States. Exactly. And as a result, we tend to fracture and divide long before it becomes a fight, long before it becomes [UNINTELLIGIBLE] 00:23:49, long before it becomes bloodshed. But this word 23.56* Calvinism? No. They've never conceded tyranny [SOUNDS LIKE] 00:24:02. Violence? Civil force? This is where it goes. It can't hold it. The very causal relationship, I addressed this of course, in the first session. The dynamic of throwing a ball, once you let it go, a series of forces come into play that drive the ball to a given end. This is exactly the same thing. The dynamic of the progression that you see here is as absolute as throwing the ball. The gravity that I talked about in the first session ultimately comes from the force of the ideas that drives man down this exact path.

And you can see, John Calvin, total depravity equals mass incompetence. Irresistible grace of the T.U.L.I.P. acronym, irresistible grace equals

universal guilt. The implication behind irresistible grace is ultimately that prevailing manifestation of humanity is in fact incompetence. So he must be given a specific grace but only a select few that will get there, which means that select few, limited atonement, they're the ones that get to dictate the good. They're the ones that get to will the force to compel a given body of outcome.

For those of you who are familiar with the acronym T.U.L.I.P., with what you've heard me talk about here, the progression of philosophy and how it fits together, go ahead and think. Search or evaluate [SOUNDS LIKE] 00:25:58 Take each of the doctrines and start to pull them apart. The total depravity, the unconditional election, the irresistible grace, the perseverance of the saints, begin to pull those doctrines apart and notice how they fit into the progression that I've discussed. Now you can grasp where this all comes from. It's not an accident. It heads in the exact same way every time. And every time this body of doctrine has risen its ugly head in the world, with one exception, it, it has led to bloodshed and destruction. It goes to political force. It goes to civil force. This is where it ends. And now you understand where tyranny really comes from.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]