

DECONSTRUCTING DECONSTRUCTION

Sermon Points

Week 2 - 8.21.22 | Ryan Huggins

Title: The Seduction of Deconstruction

Scripture: Luke 4:1-13

—

Main Point: As Christians immersed in a culture of false gospels we must open our eyes wide to the enemy's desire to lead us astray, the effectiveness of the tactics he often employs, and how to best combat those tactics.

- Progressive Christianity is a postmodern distortion of the gospel and it permeates our culture today.
- We should use the term “Reformation” instead of “Deconstruction” when we’re referring to our return to biblical Christianity.
 - **Reformation** is using the truth of the word as our authority to critique and restore the world’s failures to be the church as it was designed.
 - **Deconstruction** is using the church’s failures as an excuse to use the WORLD to critique The Word and The Church. It often exchanges the authority of the word for the authority of history, or sociology, or more often, self.

[Gen 3:1 ESV] (1) Now the serpent was more crafty than any other beast of the field that the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God actually say, 'You shall not eat of any tree in the garden'?"

- The first thing the Bible says about Satan is that he is “crafty”
- “The devil knows he doesn’t need the Church of Satan to get you. He just needs something shiny.” - Jared C. Wilson, *The Gospel According to Satan*
- If we truly believe Jesus’ work is about saving humanity through belief in himself, then we shouldn’t have a hard time believing that Satan’s work is about damning humanity through belief in ANYTHING else.

[Mar 8:31-33 ESV] (31) And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and be killed, and after three days rise again. (32) And he said this plainly. And Peter took him aside and began to rebuke him. (33) But turning and seeing his disciples, he rebuked Peter and said, "Get behind me, Satan! For you are not setting your mind on the things of God, but on the things of man."

- “He took hold of him...and embraced him...as impatient to hear that his Master should suffer such hard things. This was not the language of the least authority but of the greatest affection, of that jealousy for the welfare of those we love, which is strong as death. Our Lord Jesus allowed his disciples to be free with him, but Peter here took too great a liberty...Jesus said get behind me satan. Note, Christ sees amiss in what we say and do, which we ourselves are not aware of, and knows what manner of spirit we are of, when we ourselves do not...**the wisdom of man is perfect folly when it pretends to give measures to the divine counsels.**” - Matthew Henry

We should confront arguments of Deconstructionists because we should:

[Eph 5:11 ESV] (11) Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them.

Let's analyze a few statements made by 'Deconstructionists'

1. Question the question
2. Identify the claims (look for strawman arguments)
3. Hold to the straight edge of scripture to separate truth from lies
4. Identify the appeal
5. Discern the counterfeit remedy, apply the real one

— Richard Rohr's Statement

“How and why would God need a "blood sacrifice" before God could love what God had created? Is God that needy, unfree, unloving, rule-bound, and unable to forgive? Once you say it, you see it creates a nonsensical theological notion that is very hard to defend. Many rightly or wrongly wondered, "What will God ask of me if God demands violent blood sacrifice from his only Son?" - Richard Rohr

Rohr's Claim (strawman): To believe in the atonement is to believe God needed a blood sacrifice before God could love what God created. Subsequent claim: Thus making God needy, unfree, unloving, rule-bound, and unable to forgive.

Richard Rohr's claim flies against John 3:16:

[Jhn 3:16 ESV] (16) "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life.

- God loved us *therefore* he died for us. He didn't die for us *so that* he could love us.

'Deconstructionists' will try and get you to see God as a monster, and then...

"If you could imagine a god better than the one you worship, why not trade up?" -Bart Campolo

— Jen Hatmaker's Statement

"Loving people just makes sense to me. I am unable to separate policy, theology, rhetoric, theories, or interpretations from the people they affect. I lack all objectivity. I evaluate the merit of every idea based on how it bears upon actual people... And to be very clear, I believe loving people fits perfectly under the umbrella of loving God, so when "loving God" results in pain, exclusion, harm, or trauma to people, then we are absolutely doing the first part wrong. It is not God in error but us." - Jen Hatmaker

Claim 1) "Loving people fits perfectly under the umbrella of loving God."

Claim 2) "When loving God results in pain, exclusion, harm, or trauma to people, then we are absolutely doing the first part wrong."

Hatmakers Claim re-worded: If doing what God says (loving god), "results in pain, exclusion, harm, or trauma to people, then we are absolutely loving God wrong"

The way actions make people feel cannot be the determining factor for what "love" is, because:

[Heb 12:11 ESV] (11) For the moment all discipline seems painful rather than pleasant, but later it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it.

- If we do away with scripture as our standard in favor of subjective personal evaluations we've eliminated the very thing we need to define injustice and that gives us the authority to confront it.

—

1. We are more prone to believe lies when we are vulnerable.
 - a. Our vulnerable brothers and sisters need us to not only care about their emotional state but their spiritual heading.
 - b. The broken need the real gospel not a more palatable false one.
2. Satan will cater his deception to target your particular wiring, desires, weaknesses, insecurities, or pain.
3. When Jesus' faith was tested by the deception of the enemy he modeled a reliance on something steady to define what is true and good.