

# Satan's Fools Are Satan's Tools

by  
Larry D. Harper



“Satan’s Fools Are Satan’s Tools”

First published in ***The Voice of Elijah***®, April 1994

Copyright © 1994, 2001 by The Elijah Project

Mesquite, Texas

Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE,  
© 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1987, 1988.

The Lockman Foundation.

Used by permission.

Boldfaced segments of scriptural passages represent the emphasis of the author.

World rights reserved. No part of this publication may be stored in a retrieval system, reproduced, or transmitted in any way by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, photograph, magnetic recording, or any other—without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Address all correspondence to:

The Elijah Project

P.O. Box 870153

Mesquite, Texas 75187

**voiceofelijah.org**

# Satan's Fools Are Satan's Tools

*L*et's begin by defining a few basic terms. An idiot is one who confidently carries on concerning something he knows nothing about. However, an idiot is greatly surpassed in ignorance by the imbecile who assumes he has learned some great esoteric truth while sitting at the feet of the idiot. The moron, by way of contrast, doesn't even bother to sit. Like a talking parrot, he repetitiously recites—at the most appropriate (or, most often, inappropriate) time—the trite phrases he has heard the idiot and the imbecile use.

The Church has seen its share of idiots, imbeciles and morons over the past two millenia. Yet during the past three centuries there has been a profound resurgence of the spectacle wherein idiots teach imbeciles whose rubbish is repeated by a vast crowd of morons. And each new generation is just as firmly convinced as the last that they have, by their great erudition, somehow attained some worthwhile knowledge concerning the Truth that is hidden in the Scriptures.

Satan, meanwhile, has been watching the proceedings with absolute glee. Like the father of all fools that he is, he actually believes he is going to triumph by means of the confusion generated through the half-witted speculations of the best minds this world has had to offer. Amazingly, he has, until now, assumed God's Church was rapidly approaching its ignominious end. On the face of it, one would have to agree with his assessment of the situation. The evidence in the Church would lead one to believe all that remains to be done is to read the eulogy and lower the casket.

Anybody with a shred of common sense can see that the Church today, in all its various and sundry forms, is nothing more than a farce. It has become, under the stewardship of Satan's agents, a mocking caricature of the Church established by the Apostles of Jesus Christ. How did we get into such a mess? Contrary to what one might assume, it was easy. All we

had to do was, like mindless morons, repeat the folly of idiots and imbeciles who explained things about which they knew next to nothing. As the ongoing accretion of various oral traditions put forward by idiots, the Church today is, for the most part, the visible product of our great confidence in our ability as rational beings. Unfortunately, that confidence is seriously misplaced.

God did not create us to find truth on our own. He created us to learn the Truth from Him. If that were not the case, the revelation He provided in the Scriptures would not even be necessary. Therefore, those who have sought, or are still seeking, to find truth for themselves are nothing more than idiots. And none are more foolish than those who take such great pride in their own stupendous mental capacity that they look for truth within themselves.

## *Satan's Fool*

One such sagacious fool was the man Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855). Kierkegaard was a Danish author who thought he was a genius. And the imbeciles who have sat at his feet over the past century and a half, standing in awe of what they see as his prodigious mental capabilities, have unquestioningly accepted his own arrogant assessment of himself.

I could have said "the philosopher Søren Kierkegaard" but the term hardly applies. As a philosopher of any note, he qualifies only in the sense that he rivals the best of them in his ability to use a tumult of words to obfuscate rather than to clarify. His one great claim to fame (as far as the Church is concerned) relates specifically to his introduction of the "leap of faith" nonsense you hear bandied about from the pulpit nowadays.

Søren Kierkegaard (I will call him S.K.) was a Pretender of the worst sort. His followers have claimed he was, and have apparently even thought he was, a

Christian, although he never claimed to be. The confusion arises because his followers have had a different view of what it means to be a Christian than most who came before them. Hence, the Pretenders since Kierkegaard who have accepted his lunacy have merely chosen to assume he was a Christian. Some have even accepted his own misguided assumption that he was a "prophet." Their estimate notwithstanding, on his sudden demise in 1855 at the age of 42, S.K. was still—to put it in his own terms—only "becoming a Christian."

S.K. was certainly a unique individual. There is no disputing that. However, whether his uniqueness was due to mental illness is a point of some contention. I personally believe he was totally insane. At the very least he was a manic-depressive who died in a state of neurotic hatred and ill temper, estranged from more than a few of his former friends and family members. It is a well-known fact that the Kierkegaard family had a history of depression and suicidal tendencies. Those affected included his father, his older brother and a nephew who actually succeeded in killing himself. In his personal journal, S.K. records his own thoughts of suicide on several occasions. At one point he was apparently caught with a gun in his hand and had to be physically prevented from going through with the act. S.K. also mentions having heard audible voices talking to him, which would indicate he was psychotic. My own pessimistic view of his unstable mental condition comes from reading his writings. Any individual who had Satan sitting on his shoulder dictating to him as S.K. most assuredly did would have had to be somewhat less than sane.

I mentioned above that S.K. was a Pretender, that is, that he had never been born again. His father was a leader among the Moravian Brethren, a group which emphasized that experience. And S.K. was himself a contemporary of the great revivalist Charles Finney (see "Charles Finney: My Conversion to Christ," *The Voice of Elijah*, January 1992), so he knew something of the Holy Spirit's working in the Church. Yet S.K. rejected the revivalist movement. He condemned what God was doing among True Believers in his own day, choosing instead to believe the fabrication Satan had whispered in his ear.

For the most part, the widespread revivals of the Second Great Awakening bypassed Denmark. They touched the Danish church only through the person of Nikolai F. S. Gruntvig (1783–1872), a True Believer who

had been born again in 1811. Gruntvig proclaimed what he called "the great natural law of the spiritual life," that is, "the necessity of the spoken word for the awakening of life and the transmission of the spirit." In other words, Gruntvig believed "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ" (Rom. 10:17). As a result, he was unable to secure a pastorate in the Danish state church and worked for some years outside the organized church.

S.K. found the spiritual movement Gruntvig established in Denmark to be completely repugnant. From that we may assume he did not believe the new birth experience was even a viable option. Now I ask you: If Kierkegaard had never been born again, and did not accept the fact that one could be born again, what in the world could he possibly have to teach any born-again Believer about the basis for their relationship to God? As you will discover shortly, he had less than nothing at all.

The problem with which S.K. concerned himself in his later years was how to "become an individual" by "finding God" intellectually within himself through introspection. He has for that reason rightly been called "the father of existentialism." Yet what he advocated is a downright risky venture, isn't it? What if God isn't in there? What if Satan is? You can understand the risks a fool like that would run, looking inside himself for some "subjective" Truth. (See "Mystics, Meatballs, and the Marvelous Works of God," *The Voice of Elijah*, April 1993.) Nevertheless, the fellow took the risks, egged on by the master of delusion himself. And he left a written record to advise any other dolt who cared to (or dared to) follow in his footsteps.

The sad fact regarding this madman's search for subjective truth within himself is the fact that his views have had a far greater impact on our generation than they should have, or would have, had it not been for the imbeciles who picked up his idiocy and echoed the sentiment. His writings are significant only because they influenced the thinking of men like Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) and Karl Barth (1886–1968). The writings of these men and those who were influenced by them have, in turn, shaped the thought of all Christians in our time, conservatives and liberals alike.

As True Believers, we should at least seek to identify and root out the basic distortions Satan successfully introduced into the Church through the stupidity S.K. propounded concerning a subject about which he

knew nothing whatsoever. You will, after all, encounter Pretenders throughout the Church today who still spout his insane conclusions as though they were the Gospel Truth.

## The Liar

The basic presupposition behind the thought of S.K. is that "the truth" necessary to "find God" resides in every person. Consequently, Christian faith is not based in objective Truth because the only valid Truth resides within the individual. The person has only to discover the Truth through his own insight and decision to believe. Hence, there is no need for anyone to teach any Christian doctrine as objective Truth. As the idiot S.K. was fond of saying, "truth is subjectivity" and "subjectivity is the truth." Listen to what he said:

*Christianity has declared itself to be the eternal essential truth which has come into being in time. It has proclaimed itself as the Paradox, and it has required of the individual the inwardness of faith in relation to that which is an offense to the Jews and a folly to the Greeks—and an absurdity to the understanding. It is impossible to express more strongly the fact that subjectivity is truth and that objectivity merely repels, even by virtue of the absurd. And indeed it would seem very strange that Christianity should have come into the world just to receive an explanation; as if it had been somewhat bewildered about itself, and hence had entered the world to consult that wise man, the speculative philosopher, who can help by furnishing the explanation. It is impossible to express with more intensive inwardness the principle that subjectivity is truth, than when subjectivity is in the first instance untruth, and yet subjectivity is the truth.*

*(From his "Concluding Unscientific Postscript," R. Bretall editor, A Kierkegaard Anthology, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946, p. 222)*

The folly of S.K.'s position lies in the fact that, in making such statements, he has thereby presented the doctrine "subjectivity is truth" as objective Truth. So much for subjectivity being the truth. Where can he and his moronic followers go from there?

S.K. was not a Christian in any sense of the term. He certainly did not act like one. Throughout his life he sought out controversy and contention, lashing out bitterly in his writings against any who disputed with

him. Finally, he died refusing to admit those with whom he had quarreled into his hospital room. Although S.K. piously proclaimed Christian love as the ideal, he deliberately ruined the reputation of one man, causing him to withdraw to Spain in disgrace where he died soon thereafter as a pauper. What sort of Christian love is that?

I mentioned above that the lunatic S.K. hated the revivals he saw happening in the Protestant Church. More than that, however, he apparently hated the Church itself. He despised the success Martin Luther had achieved in establishing the Lutheran Church as a counterbalance to the error of the Roman Catholic Church. He laments the fact that Luther did not die as a martyr before he could establish a following. Yet S.K. goes back even further in history to condemn the baptism of those first True Believers who believed at Pentecost (Acts 2:41). How can one help but hear in this man's craziness the whining of Satan as he rails against the victories God has achieved in history?

S.K. simply did not believe that Jesus Christ was God. Therefore, he set about creating a counterfeit "Christianity" for the benefit of those who, like himself, could not believe that particular doctrine. In other words, he was just another fool doing Satan's dirty work by creating a delusion. And imbeciles enamored by his eloquently stated ignorance have carried on his work after him. Consequently, you can find all sorts of moronic Pretenders in the Church confidently holding forth on a subject—what it means to be a Christian—about which they know nothing whatsoever.

S.K. often speaks concerning the "offense" of Christianity as though he understands what Paul meant in the following:

*But I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? Then the stumbling block of the cross has been abolished.*  
(Galatians 5:11)

The Apostle was referring to the death of Jesus Christ on the cross as one of the things that kept the Jews of his day from believing the Truth of the Old Testament Gospel of Jesus Christ. However, S.K. twists the terminology to suit his own ends. He uses "offense" to refer to the "stumbling block" one discovers in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. He does so because he finds that concept particularly "offensive."

Satan was able to use S.K. to achieve his own ends because the man evidently had some neurotic need to live up to his father's expectations. Psychiatrists have suggested he secretly hated his father but publicly paid him homage because of the guilt and shame his hatred evoked. To understand how Satan manipulated S.K., you must understand his father was a Pretender who wrestled with an inordinate amount of guilt. That feeling of condemnation drove him to impose a harsh Christian discipline upon his children. His son Søren apparently rebelled against not only his father but also the Church. In his early years, S.K. rejected Christianity outright, finding he simply could not believe Jesus Christ was God. Look at what he said:

*What now is the absurd? The absurd is—that the eternal truth has come into being in time, that God has come into being, has been born, has grown up, and so forth, has come into being precisely like any other individual human being, quite indistinguishable from other individuals.*  
(Bretall, p. 220)



During his relatively short lifetime, Søren Kierkegaard managed to engage in bitter disputes with most of the literary and religious figures in Copenhagen. None of those disputes was more vicious than the one he initiated with Copenhagen's 19th century equivalent of *The National Enquirer*, a popular gossip magazine called *The Coursair*. Before the acrimony died down, *The Coursair* had published numerous caricatures of Kierkegaard like the one above. As a result of the ridicule to which he was subjected in this dispute, Søren Kierkegaard became the object of public scorn. Prior to the dispute, Kierkegaard had been accustomed to taking public walks around Copenhagen every afternoon. Afterward, public ridicule restricted him to coach rides in the country. Worse yet, the name "Søren" became a euphemism for "stupid" as parents began to tell their children, "Don't be a Søren!"

Later on, however, S.K. found himself wrestling with the same load of guilt his father carried. In desperation, he sought some way to believe in Jesus Christ in spite of his unbelief. His contrivance is nothing less than Satan's lie, but it is ingenious to say the least.

## The Lie

Christianity has always said that one must believe in Jesus Christ to be a Christian. Yet S.K. realized he didn't believe. Therefore, our psychotic "genius" decided the only way to believe when one did not believe was to subjectively "decide" to believe. That's where his "leap of faith" nonsense comes into the picture. If one can't find any reason to believe, one can always just say they believe. Isn't that a marvelous piece of baloney? Can you see how that sort of nonsense would lead to all sorts of Pretenders coming into the Church in our own day? Doesn't it also sound suspiciously like the ambiguous "profession of faith" you hear some preach today? If all those people who "profess" to be Christian have actually repented and been born again, why don't they just say so? It's because they don't really believe. They only "profess" to believe. But why do they hide behind a "profession of faith"? That one is easy to answer.

You see, Satan set out to accomplish a couple of specific objectives through S.K. and his followers. First, he used them to argue that reason cannot be used as a basis for Christian faith. They willingly argued that case because they themselves could find no reason to believe historic Christian doctrines. However, you should keep one thing in mind in that regard. Their arguments, as sophisticated and abstruse as they are, don't actually demonstrate the fact that no rational basis for believing the historic tenets of Christianity exists. They just demonstrate those numskulls weren't smart enough to find it.

As I've said before and as you will undoubtedly hear me say time and again: Absence of presence is not the same as nonexistence. So the philosophers and liberal theologians of this and past centuries may well have shown that a rational basis for belief was absent at the time they set forth their much ballyhooed ruminations. That does not mean a rational basis for Christian belief does not exist now, nor that it is not known to some. It just means those folks were too dumb to discover it on their own.

We already know from the negative attitude he had toward Martin Luther that S.K. rejected the things accomplished during the Protestant Reformation and that he considered them contemptible. That being the case, we should ask why he would take up the most basic doctrine of Protestant Christianity—salvation by faith—and make it the basis for his own goofiness. The answer lies in the fact that he was driven to it by Satan, the author of his insanity. Satan wanted to use him to distort the Reformers' doctrine of salvation by faith.

The founders of Protestant Christianity held that the most logical position—and the only rational position—was belief in the historical Jesus as the Son of God who died as an atonement for sins. Indeed, as I have shown in an earlier issue of *The Voice of Elijah*, John Calvin believed the only truly rational person was the person who had been born again through faith in Jesus Christ. (See "The Natural Man Is An Idiot (When It Comes To The Truth)," *The Voice of Elijah*, October 1993.) You can see from that how, if Calvin's position is true, it completely precludes the idiocy put forward by S.K. that one could somehow "find God" within oneself as some sort of "subjective truth." According to Calvin, the unregenerate person lacks the ability to understand the Truth concerning God.

Although S.K. spoke in terms of salvation by faith, he did not base that concept on the thought of the Protestant Reformers. Instead, he accepted the philosophical nonsense prevalent in his own day as a valid starting point. That included the thinking of the philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). Kant argued that mankind has no rational basis for knowledge of God's existence or nature. At the same time, however, he insisted that belief in God is completely rational. S.K. accepted Kant's argument that knowledge of God has no rational basis. But he took Kant's position one step further. He argued that belief in the incarnation of Jesus Christ could only be valid if it was "subjective," that is, completely irrational. He insisted that such belief can only depend directly on what he called a subjective "leap of faith," which he defined as a sudden, subjective decision to believe. Here is some of his verbose discussion of the topic:

*Without risk there is no faith. Faith is precisely the contradiction between the infinite passion of the individual's inwardness and the objective uncertainty. If I am capable of grasping God objectively, I do not believe, but precisely*

*because I cannot do this I must believe. If I wish to preserve myself in faith I must constantly be intent upon holding fast the objective uncertainty, so that in the objective uncertainty I am out "upon the seventy thousand fathoms of water," and yet believe.*

(Bretall, p. 215)

S.K. held that the individual's subjective decision to believe results in a personal inward transformation whereby one "becomes an individual." That sounds somewhat like the new birth. However, in contrast to John Calvin and the other Reformers who knew that the new birth was a single act of self-surrender, S.K. contended it was a process—a continual striving to bring the idea of God into every area of one's existence. Knowing nothing whatsoever about the new birth experience, S.K. now proved himself to be the ultimate fool, dogmatically explaining something about which he knew nothing at all.

## *The Ridiculous*

Having looked at how S.K. tried to discredit reason as a basis for faith, let's now take a look at the second thing Satan sought to accomplish through the folly of this one little man. Satan used S.K. and the moronic philosophers who followed him to completely redefine the term *faith*. He needed them to do that so that he could blend their new definition of the term into the mysticism he was cultivating among evangelical Christians coming out of the revivalist wing of Protestant Christianity. Satan knew that if he could put a variety of lies together in one big pot, he would have concocted a potent witch's brew he could use to completely delude some future generation. Unfortunately for many in our time, that future is now.

We'll talk more about the Christian mysticism Satan has foisted off on evangelical Christianity some other time. Right now I want to show you how Satan used S.K. to twist the Truth of Protestant Christianity into a weird distortion that philosophers and liberal theologians have successfully disseminated throughout all segments of the Church. Let's look first at how Satan used his agents to question the validity of reason as a basis for faith.

S.K. knowingly and intentionally distorted the historic meaning of the term *faith*. When he realized he did not and could not believe the Truth of Christianity,

he merely changed the rules of the game. He did that by redefining the term *faith*, turning it into something it had never been. Before S.K. advocated his warped understanding of the term, Christian faith had always been focused objectively in Christian doctrine. That's because Christians had always understood the term *faith* in the Scriptures *meant* nothing more than "belief." Moreover, it was generally understood by Christians that the content of Christian belief could be found in specific theological doctrines. As a matter of fact, throughout the long history of the Church from the time of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, the term *faith* had never *meant* anything other than belief in theological doctrine.

To be sure, there had been theological disputes among Christians over the appropriate content of Christian faith. But until then, the debate had always been concerned with which Christian doctrines were true and which were false. Even during the years when S.K. was postulating his ridiculous notions concerning faith, other scholars were still debating whether faith—that is, belief in certain theological doctrines—could have any rational basis in empirical fact. S.K. sought to change all that. In Kierkegaard's view, faith should not be based in Christian doctrine at all. It should be founded on the belief that one is "becoming" what one ought to be. Listen to this:

*For Kierkegaard, what I recognize first is not that I ought to accept certain doctrines. Rather I recognize that I have an obligation to become something which I am not and cannot become on my own; hence I must believe in the objective reality of the condition of becoming what I ought to be.*

(C.S. Evans, *Subjectivity and Religious Belief, Grand Rapids: Christian University Press, 1978, p. 121*)

Did you get that? Kierkegaard said all you have to do to be a Christian is believe you are becoming what you know you ought to be. If you do that, you believe all that is necessary to be a Christian. Listen to me, True Believers! You know more than a few Pretenders who think like that today, don't you? Now you know who their spiritual father is. For S.K., faith was not being definite about *what* one believed, it was being definite *that* one believed. In other words, if you can delude yourself completely into believing you believe, you are a Christian! All you have to do then is go on saying you

believe and everything will be okay. You True Believers can now understand how a vast majority of the Pretenders around you came to roost in the Church.

S.K. insisted one could "find God" only by being totally honest with oneself. However, since he personally did not believe in Jesus Christ, that became rather difficult. The only way he found that he could say he believed in Jesus Christ was to lie to himself, telling himself he believed when, in fact, he didn't. In other words, he convinced himself via a multitude of words that he believed when he actually didn't believe. If that isn't the characteristic of a deluded individual, I don't know what is. Come to think of it, however, I've met more than a few "Christians" today who fit that description perfectly.

Do you know why people today pretend to be Christian? It's because Satan's agents are still issuing the invitation: "Hey, Pretenders! Come on out and worship with us next Sunday. It doesn't matter *what* you believe, it only matters *that* you say you believe." Does that sound a lot like Søren Kierkegaard? Sure it does. And it should. Fools have been heeding his call in droves over the past century. As a result, even conservative Christianity is no longer what it was just thirty years ago. The spiritual descendants of this raving lunatic have no interest in learning the Truth of the Scriptures because they have bought into the asinine conjectures of one of Satan's own. Don't be deceived. The writings of Søren Kierkegaard have had an impact on our generation more deleterious than any the Church has ever before experienced. Had the matter been left up to him, S.K. would have almost certainly become a humanist. However, Satan had definite plans for this bitter little man. He intended to use him to cut the heart right out of Christianity. To do that, however, Satan knew S.K. had to continue to argue that some part of Christian doctrine was true. That was the only way his humanist views could masquerade as Christian. That's why S.K. contradicts himself. Listen to what he says:

*Christianity is no doctrine concerning the unity of the divine and the human, or concerning the identity of subject and object; nor is it any other of the logical transcriptions of Christianity. If Christianity were a doctrine, the relationship to it would not be one of faith, for only an intellectual type of relationship can correspond to a doctrine. Christianity is therefore not a doctrine, but the fact*



*that God has existed.*

(E.L. Miller, *Classical Statements on Faith and Reason*, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 167)

Let's ignore the fact that his reasoning is a bit circular and that he is doing his usual philosophical "stand 'em on their head with ambiguous statements that are, for the most part, windbaggy" routine. He ignorantly (and quite confidently) states, "Christianity is therefore not a doctrine, but the fact that God has existed." Never once does he realize he has made "the fact" a "doctrine" by setting it down in print. As one who has thoroughly analyzed Kierkegaard's writings put it:

*His position was, indeed, one of the most paradoxical it is possible to conceive. In the very attempt to deny that truth is doctrine, he set up the doctrine that truth is not a doctrine! That truth is existential is to be proved not by the printed page, but by the life, and this evidence was sadly wanting in his case.*

(E.L. Allen, *Kierkegaard: His Life and Thought*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935, p. 156)

The point is, a knowledge of the existential philosophy S.K. sought to inculcate in his audience can only be acquired subjectively if, in fact, "subjectivity is truth." If S.K. had wanted to be true to his philosophical system, he would have omitted all mention of God and spoken solely in terms of individual self-actualization as the theoretical goal of all humanity. However, that was not Satan's intent for his "prophet." Satan wanted S.K. to create a philosophical delusion whereby he could convince himself he believed something about Jesus Christ that he did not actually believe. That way, he would not only deceive himself, but his philosophical goofiness could be used to carry away millions in our own day. Satan has been phenomenally successful in that regard. Christians today who have never heard of Søren Kierkegaard are seeing things exactly the same way he saw them.

## The Absurd

S.K. liked to talk about the incarnation of Jesus Christ as "absurd." Yet, in seeking to discredit Christian doctrine as essential to Christian faith, he discloses his own views are what is absurd. You see, our moronic

"genius" overlooked the simple distinction that exists between faith and hope. The biblical view concerning the relationship between these two is that since we believe certain things to be true, we have hope:

*In the same way God, desiring even more to show to the heirs of the promise the unchangeableness of His purpose, interposed with an oath, in order that by two unchangeable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have strong encouragement, we who have fled for refuge in laying hold of the hope set before us.*

(Hebrews 6:17-18)

Hope is the subjective inwardness S.K. makes so much of. In his desperate desire to get rid of the need for believing certain things to be true, he rather stupidly described an irrational hope as though it were faith. As one writer has stated Kierkegaard's views:

*Faith operates on the farther side of explanation, and its motto is "I do not understand, yet I trust."*

(*Ibid*, p. 51)

The same writer has summarized Kierkegaard's position this way in another place:

*The most the intellect can provide is a greater or less degree of approximation to the facts. For we can put no trust in the sophism that "knowledge and being are one." They never can be. There is always an ultimate residuum of uncertainty, a disquiet which only the "will to believe" can lay to rest. We must act even when we do not know, and we cannot wait till our knowledge is complete, for long before that goal is reached death will have made useless such poor knowledge as we have. The intellect may guide us to within sight of what we seek, but at that moment it will turn back, leaving us standing before a frightful chasm. The brave man will shut his eyes and leap. Truth is the not-yet-proved over which a man cries, "This shall be true; for without this I cannot live."*

(*Ibid*, p. 151)

I'm sorry to have to tell you this folks, as enamored as this generation is by the folly of Kierkegaard and his ilk, but that's not faith. It's hope. I'll admit hope is a near kinsman to faith. But that's as far as I'll go. I may hope a rich uncle will die and leave me his multiplied millions. That doesn't mean I can somehow

believe that will happen without being a complete lunatic on the order of Søren Kierkegaard. I don't even have a rich uncle.

When you boil all of this fool's peculiarly pious and pompous philosophical pronouncements down to their basics, hope is about all you can come up with. The "existential truth" he makes so much of is nothing more than the defiant raging of a madman held prisoner by his own pride and arrogance. Fortunately for us, he has long since gone swaggering into hell saying, "I will be saved because I hope I will." Countless fools in our own generation willingly follow in his footsteps because they have no content for their faith and they want none. They would rather take this lunatic's "leap of faith" because it requires them to believe nothing more than *that* they believe. I have news for you folks. It's a very loooooooooooooong leap across the abyss.

## The Truth

Now I want to talk directly to those of you who are True Believers. By that I mean those who have come to God on the basis of fear, confessing your sins to God with a contrite repentance prompted by an honest desire to avoid the wrath of God. I'm not talking to all those fools out there who have believed Satan's lie that tells them God is not a God to be feared. Don't be deceived. The Scriptures plainly state God hates the wicked and plans to destroy them:

*The LORD tests the righteous and the wicked,  
And the one who loves violence His soul hates.  
Upon the wicked He will rain snares;  
Fire and brimstone and burning wind  
will be the portion of their cup.  
(Psalm 11:5-6)*

That passage is reason enough for anyone but the completely sinless person to fear God. The only reason all those fools out there won't admit the fact that fear is necessary for anyone to come to God is because they have never admitted they are a part of the wicked. In other words, like the idiot Kierkegaard, they've never been born again. I admonish you True Believers. Wake up! Pretenders like that are all around you! Only an abject fool would claim the God of wrath described in the Bible is not a God the wicked should fear. Ergo: A "Christian" who has never experienced "fear and trem-

bling" is nothing but a Pretender:

*So then, my beloved, just as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your salvation with fear and trembling.  
(Philippians 2:12)*

Before the wicked person can repent, he must be given some reason to repent. That's logical, isn't it? That's also what the hellfire and brimstone preaching of the great revivalists John Wesley and Charles Finney was all about. It gave the multitudes who came to God through their preaching an incentive to repent. So don't be confused. The Pretenders today who preach "God is love" are Satan's own. They are the spiritual descendants of those who came out of the many counterfeit "revivals" Satan has concocted over the past century and a half. You don't have to be taken in by the charade of Pretenders any longer. If a person doesn't believe in a God of wrath who will destroy those who fail to live a holy life before Him, that person doesn't believe in the God of the Bible.

Just as a final word on the topic: You also should not be put off by those mindless slaves of Satan who toss out the following verse as some sort of ridiculous "proof" of their inane position:

*There is no fear in love; but perfect love casts out fear, because fear involves punishment, and the one who fears is not perfected in love.  
(1 John 4:18)*

It has never occurred to some folks that, in writing that statement, the Apostle John obviously understood some sort of fear that "involves punishment" would initially be present in the Believer's life. If fear were not present to begin with, how could love ever "cast it out"? Satan's stooges are blind. They have never, and will never, see the stupidity inherent in their absurd beliefs. Yet to become free from their delusion, you must understand that Satan has, over the past century and a half, been able to instill in us all a fundamental distortion of the *meaning* of the term *faith*. What's the Big Deal?

Now that I have provided you some of the basic information you need to know and understand in *Not All Israel Is Israel, The Advent of Christ and AntiChrist, The Mystery of Scripture*, and *The Way, The Truth, The Life*

seminar tapes, I want to put you on notice concerning what Satan has been able to accomplish through Søren Kierkegaard's lunacy. I'm sure most of you have heard about Kierkegaard's "leap of faith." You may have even heard conservative ministers preach against it. Kierkegaard's nonsense was just a diversionary tactic on Satan's part. It was a strawman he set up to give conservative Christian theologians something to rail at while he tore up the very foundation of Christianity itself.

The postulate of Kierkegaard you probably have never heard anyone argue against is the idea that faith is a subjective decision. That's because that insidious belief has infiltrated all segments of the Church through the notions held by society at large. It is a prevalent belief in our time because Satan has successfully instilled it not just in the Church but in the whole of our society. Listen to people when they talk about faith. See if they don't understand faith to be contentless—that is, a subjective existential act.

You see, Satan has known for some time that God intends to restore *The Apostolic Teaching* in order to provide a solid basis for the faith of those True Believers living at the time of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. Knowing that, he set out to discredit the notion that Christians must believe any definite theological content in order to be saved. Nothing could be more warped and distorted. Yet you will find a multitude of "Christians" today who are willing to argue that case.

The Pretenders in the Church will readily admit that one must believe Jesus Christ died for our sins. Some will even argue vehemently for this theological doctrine or the other, as though they are firmly convinced that *what* one believes is supremely important. Don't be deceived. The Book of Proverbs tells us the argumentative person is nothing more than Satan's fool (Prov. 13:10; 17:19; et. al.). He is only interested in showing what he knows.

Most Christians will also readily and illogically grant (as Kierkegaard ignorantly did) that one must believe some bare minimum of objective Truth in order to be a Christian. Yet they will inevitably try to restrict that Truth to the barest of essentials. Moreover, they will probably also view faith as a subjective decision that has no necessary connection to the definite theological content they defend. That is all part of Satan's lie. The Truth is, we are saved by *what* we believe, not by the fact *that* we believe. Everybody believes some-

thing about God. But only those who believe the Truth about the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be saved. If that were not true, Christian missionary activity would make no sense. A heathen person could, just as Kierkegaard idiotically contended, "stand in relation to" the truth within them just as easily as any Christian.

Another aspect of the Truth is this: The only way anyone can be born again is to come to God with fear and trembling, honestly confessing sins out of the belief that He is a God with an absolute hatred for the wicked. That is one of the bare essentials of the Truth one must believe in order to be saved. Now you can understand why Satan has fought so hard to instill in us all the notion of an all-forgiving god of love? If you came to God out of fear, because of a broken and contrite heart, I have news for you. You are part of a distinct minority in the Church today. The Pretenders all around you don't believe in the same God that you do. Their god is a benign, benevolent being they can spit on and curse at all week yet still approach without fear of any kind on Sunday. That's a comforting delusion, isn't it? I wish them nothing but the sweetest of dreams in the here and now, because their eternal nightmare has yet to begin.

If one can only be saved by believing the Truth found in Christianity alone, it makes sense that anyone who sincerely wants to be saved would be concerned about whether or not *what* they believe is true. I submit to you, therefore, that anyone in the Church who is not concerned about such things is, by definition, a Pretender. However, having said that, I also submit to you that anyone who wants to argue about such things is also, by definition, a Pretender. The Christian life is not, as Kierkegaard would have us all believe, the mere confession that I know what I ought to be. Truth is something to be believed and lived by. If someone knows what they ought to be, then that is what they will be if they actually believe the Truth.

A final word to you True Believers: If someone wants to believe the lies they have been taught by the Pretenders in the Church, I suggest you not try to dissuade them. The time is too far spent for theological arguments. You should believe those things you know to be true and live accordingly. Otherwise you show yourself to be nothing more than Satan's fool. And Satan's fool is a ready tool to be used by him whenever he so chooses. ■