

## General Topics :: Universalism

### Universalism, on: 2006/10/9 0:01

As in Adam all died, so in Christ, all are made alive-- is this not true? Is it not true that Jesus died for all of our sins? So you throw at me some passages from Paul. Okay, sure. But how do you know that isn't against Jesus? So then you throw at me some passages from Jesus, well how do you know it was from Jesus? Furthermore, are you sure that Bible in your hands is as inerrant as you think it is? If so, and if you say revelation, what can you base that on if you presuppose that the Bible is already inerrant? Visions and dreams are experienced by Shamans as much as Christians. Because Universalism covers a broad array of issues-- i.e., most Universalists do not take the Bible as inerrant, we must cover these if we are to cover Universalism-- that essentially, all are universally saved and cleansed with the blood of Jesus either now or after death because of the gravity of Jesus' death-- that it being so so so so huge, that it is compelled to basically save everyone, no matter their standing in the now, due to the blood of Jesus.

Try not to be too broad.. "it's just all about faith" or "the Bible says so"... "it makes sense to me"... dig down deep into why you believe God has appointed (depending on your eschatological viewpoint) people to be saved through Jesus by an act of free-will (or compulsion, if your hyper-calvinistic leaning) only and that others will not be able to enter into this either due to election or choice and will be sentenced or sentence themselves to a eternity of Hell-fire separation from God because they refused to repent and turn to God during their short-lived lives.-- Is this seemingly culturally used as a moral 'control agent,' or whatnot and Hell just has no true validity, as many Universalists propose? Understand this view is rampant among American and English Evangelicism even though it may not be apparent on face-value.

Discuss, keep it friendly. :)

Jordan

### Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/9 5:03

O.K. lets try and reason it a little. First off you quoted scripture to prove your universalist stance. How do "YOU" know that that scripture you quoted is really scripture? What if it's not? Then the belief you proposed cannot be proven either. Address this and then we can maybe move on.  
God bless, John

### Re:, on: 2006/10/9 8:31

Quote:  
-----Universalism-- that essentially, all are universally saved and cleansed with the blood of Jesus either now or after death because of the gravity of Jesus' death-- that it being so so so so huge, that it is compelled to basically save everyone, **no matter their standing in the now, due to the blood of Jesus.**  
-----

If I may since this argument can turn sour in a heartbeat:

Rom. 5:1 Paul says this:

**"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ"** Romans 5:1 (KJV)

**Q.** Why is peace possible? **A.** Because of His shed Blood.

If it can be seen that Paul is NOT just speaking to the Romans and that He means it applied to the righteous everywhere regardless of the knowledge of Jesus Christ. With that approach to our understanding permitted we can state simply the justified are those who have faith in God and have lived with whatever light of Him made real to them. I trust this simple faith in God is sufficient for my Yak shepherd friend in Siberia who died never hearing of the kingdom of God from a missionary or passing evangelist. I believe it is.

Jesus came to redeem the righteous and turn sinners from their wicked ways. Will the wicked turn from their wicked ways?

ys without a fear of God? If there is no faith in a God sufficient to establish the hope of redemption and people live without such a hope or by some other false hope, how can they be saved? Who will be turned to God? Who can He then turn to Jesus? Will Jesus find faith when He returns? May the redeemed say so; speak of Him from their lives by being "broken bread and poured out wine".

"And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth? **And he sake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others**" Luke 18:7-9 (KJV)

To whom is His shed Blood applied? The righteous everywhere; those who \*live with the hope of redemption with a Godly testimony.

\*live = keyword meaning to live out one's life in awe of God. He alone will be the judge of the heart of that individual.

**"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works".**

Rev. 20:12-13 (KJV)

Universalism? For the righteous everywhere? Yes.

:-)

**Re: Universalism - posted by Chariot, on: 2006/10/9 14:31**

Quote:

-----most Universalists do not take the Bible as inerrant, we must cover these if we are to cover Universalism  
-----

Quote:

-----dig down deep into why you believe God has appointed...  
-----

At the outset of this discussion were already presented with an epistemological crisis. The rug is being pulled from beneath our feet (i.e., how do you know the bible is inerrant?) while being asked to "dig down deep."

As one who was a former agnostic and a borderline atheist - i cant help but think of that verse from 1 Corinthians 1:19, "For it is written, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise; the intelligence of the intelligent i will frustrate'" Honestly, i can't dig down deep without any recourse to the Bible.

It will be interesting to see how this topic proceeds. As one who was on the brink of total skepticism, and one who tried to dig deep without any sure foundation, i learned that in the innermost recesses of self, you could draw just about any conclusion or interpretation you wanted to. And to paraphrase another writer, "in the realm of knowledge, what your left with is dueling texts and interpretations" - Shaman verse Christian revelation, Biblically based doctrine verse nonbiblical doctrine.

In short, God must plant the revelation in your heart, from there we study Scripture and formulate sound doctrine.

keeping it friendly,  
Rob

;-)

**Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/9 14:42**

Quote:

-----Jesus came to redeem the righteous

Ormlly,

Where does scripture say 'Jesus came to redeem the righteous'?

Quote:

-----To whom is His shed Blood appied? The righteous everywhere;

The way you've worded this, you are saying people are righteous BEFORE the Blood is applied to them.

Have I understood you correctly?

**Re:, on: 2006/10/9 16:17**

Quote:

dorcas wrote:

Quote:

-----Jesus came to redeem the righteous

Ormlly,

Where does scripture say 'Jesus came to redeem the righteous'?

Quote:

-----To whom is His shed Blood appied? The righteous everywhere;

The way you've worded this, you are saying people are righteous BEFORE the Blood is applied to them.

Have I understood you correctly?

If you read me properly you would have. Unfortunately you didn't.

**Re: Universalism - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/10/10 0:15**

1Co 15:22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

2Co 5:14 For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead:

2Co 5:15 And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.

2Co 5:16 Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.

2Co 5:17 Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

2Co 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;

2Co 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

2Co 5:20 Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

2Co 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Heb 11:13 These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Re:, on: 2006/10/10 8:35

Quote:

-----

crsschk wrote:

1Co 15:22 For as in Adam all die,

-----

This is so because no righteousness from us can ever save us **to** the presence of God. This is Adam's sin Paul is speaking of in his letter that only the Blood of Jesus could deal with.

Quote:

-----even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

-----

Now we get down to what Jesus did for those who not only lived with the hope of redemption but even more so for those privileged to live in this time called the "Church age" having to do with the new birth experience and His indwelling life made a reality to those who hunger and thirst.

Quote:

-----2Co 5:14 For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead

-----

Indeed! And when resurrected many will not live with Him forever because of their wickedness and rebelliousness or otherwise rejection of God and His light given them from the beginning.

Quote:

-----2Co 5:15 And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.

-----

A message to present day company of disciples **capable of hearing** the revelation of Christ to understand it as Paul lived it.

More of that revealed truth to those who have ears to hear:

Quote:

-----2Co 5:16 **Wherefore** henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.

2Co 5:17 **Therefore** if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

2Co 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath **reconciled us to himself** by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;

-----

And of the righteous with the hope of God within them he says:

Quote:  
-----2Co 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.  
-----

This should be us:

Quote:  
-----2Co 5:20 Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.  
-----

Quote:  
-----2Co 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.  
-----

Yes! cf. John 17:20-23 (NASB-U)

"I do not ask on behalf of these alone, but for those also who believe in Me through their word; that they may all be one; even as You, Father, are in Me and I in You, that they also may be in Us, so that the world may believe that You sent Me. "The glory which You have given Me I have given to them, that they may be one, just as We are one; I in them and You in Me, that they may be perfected in unity, so that the world may know that You sent Me, and loved them, even as You have loved Me.

Quote:  
-----Heb 11:13 These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.  
-----

And to whatever degree anyone everywhere, not just Israel, expressed by their life to consist of believing in a God who sees all and is a rewarder of righteous works, is the degree to which they will be found in Him. Their acts of righteousness is the thing that will be judged either unto eternal life or eternal death. In this is God alone the revealer of the heart; the judge and rewarder and will be no respecter of persons in that day. cf.Rev. 22.12

In this can be seen that evangelism ISN'T to be so much about the condition of the soul, though it is, but the ushering in of the kingdom of God and the making of disciples to it that the righteous soul can embrace that which he has hoped for and rejoices for its arrival to his understanding ---street preaching notwithstanding.

Of course let it be clear that all this is my understanding. I don't believe I violate anyone else's.

Great selection of scripture, crsschk!

:-D :-D

Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/10 9:21

Quote:

-----If you read me properly you would have. Unfortunately you didn't.

Dear Ormly,

I have no idea what and how you believe your response has contributed to my understanding.

Sorry. Perhaps you didn't understand my questions?

I will reword them if required.

Re:Reconciling - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/10/10 10:10

Quote:

-----2Co 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath comm  
itted unto us the word of reconciliation.

This articulation has great meaning to me personally, had almost forgotten of it while drawing out all these references ... About a year and a half ago and have made mention of this elsewhere, but, had been doing some work around Los Angeles, a very exhausting time, a world wind of activity. It was the first time meeting up with Greg (Who runs this site for everyone else) as well as another unseen brother who frequents here and is also a outdoor preacher to the homeless ...

But it was on the plane trip back, musing and thanking God for everything that had transpired, a great peace and a great ... depletion, a sense of being spiritually spent, a sweet joy and a great love .. just quiet, restful worship and prayer. Cannot say honestly that I 'hear' from the Lord in some of the more often expressed ways often, it is usually more of the 'impression' of things ... I digress. I asked the Lord; "Lord, what *is it* that You are doing"? And by that meant not my personal circumstance but everywhere. And the return was as loud as it gets and the fastidiousness of response grabbed me; "I am reconciling the world unto Myself".

I was dumbfounded and just wept. Praise God.

Re:, on: 2006/10/10 10:20

Quote:

crsschk wrote:

Quote:

-----2Co 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath comm  
itted unto us the word of reconciliation.

This articulation has great meaning to me personally, had almost forgotten of it while drawing out all these references ... About a year and a half ago and have made mention of this elsewhere, but, had been doing some work around Los Angeles, a very exhausting time, a world wind of activity. It was the first time meeting up with Greg (Who runs this site for everyone else) as well as another unseen brother who frequents here and is also a outdoor preacher to the homeless ...

But it was on the plane trip back, musing and thanking God for everything that had transpired, a great peace and a great ... depletion, a sense of being spiritually spent, a sweet joy and a great love .. just quiet, restful worship and prayer. Cannot say honestly that I 'hear' from the Lord in some of the more often expressed ways often, it is usually more of the 'impression' of things ... I digress. I asked the Lord; "Lord, what *is it* that You are doing"? And by that meant not my personal circumstance but everywhere. And the return was as loud as it gets and the fastidiousness of response grabbed me; "I am reconciling the world unto Myself".

I was dumbfounded and just wept. Praise God.

Oh that we might see and understand beyond what we believe to be because of our traditional way that does not speak of intimacy, the heart, but legalism, the letter, that we call it "faith".

May God help us to see it, crsschk.

:-) :-(

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/10/10 11:25**

Ormlly wrote:

Quote:  
-----I trust this simple faith in God is sufficient for my Yak shepherd friend in Siberia who died never hearing of the kingdom of God from a missionary or passing evangelist. I believe it is.  
-----

To declare a person like this redeemed is a form of judging. To determine a person's eternal destiny belongs to the realm of God, not ours nor anyone else's, including Ormlly.

It might be of interest to you to know that God knows who will accept him and He can and does reveal Himself to persons who are beyond the reach of the Gospel. We do not know how often it happens - people familiar with the Muslim world will tell you it is still happening - but there are some documented cases. Consider: Sammy Morris - the black boy from Africa in the early 1900s; Jayapradha Bendela, FL - a six year old girl from India (still living, is now in her 50s AND she is planning to come see us in a month!!); Bilquis Sheikh, the Muslim lady from Pakistan. Bilquis described this event/process in her book "I Dared to Call Him Father".

Since God knows who will respond to him, He will supernaturally reveal himself to the unreachable at the proper time. God is bigger and greater than man and is not limited by man's limitations. This however, does not cancel Jesus' last command: "Go ye...teach all nations.." Matthew 28:19

ginnyrose

**Re:, on: 2006/10/10 11:34**

Quote:  
-----  
ginnyrose wrote:  
Ormlly wrote:

Quote:  
-----I trust this simple faith in God is sufficient for my Yak shepherd friend in Siberia who died never hearing of the kingdom of God from a missionary or passing evangelist. I believe it is.  
-----

To declare a person like this redeemed is a form of judging. To determine a person's eternal destiny belongs to the realm of God, not ours nor anyone else's, including Ormlly.

It might be of interest to you to know that God knows who will accept him and He can and does reveal Himself to persons who are beyond the reach of the Gospel. We do not know how often it happens - people familiar with the Muslim world will tell you it is still happening - but there are some documented cases. Consider: Sammy Morris - the black boy from Africa in the early 1900s; Jayapradha Bendela, FL - a six year old girl from India (still living, is now in her 50s AND she is planning to come see us in a month!!); Bilquis Sheikh, the Muslim lady from Pakistan. Bilquis described this event/process in her book "I Dared to Call Him Father".

Since God knows who will respond to him, He will supernaturally reveal himself to the unreachable at the proper time. God is bigger and greater than man and is not limited by man's limitations. This however, does not cancel Jesus' last command: "Go ye...teach all nations.." Matthew 28:19

ginnyrose  
-----

Its so nice to know someone agrees with you but even nicer if they recognise it. Oh well, can't have it all, I suppose, half is better than nothing.

:-(

**Re:, on: 2006/10/10 14:43**

Hi all, I don't say "too much" on here so therefore if I'm putting this in the wrong area, I'm sorry. I'm going to venture out.

I investigated Universalism a few years ago and have kinda poked at it since Carlton Pierson went to that side but I'm still not sold that this is "the way." I mean, what if you are wrong and someone you should have sounded the alarm to and told them to repent - you didn't and therefore, they lost their soul? Their blood is on your hands.

I've been on many religious "bandwagons" in my time but I think we need to be careful about this one. I received an email this week and because of it, I just unsubscribed because of a statement someone made in it.

A man called Tim W. wrote this in one of the universalist emails I received. If this is how they truly believe, I can't subscribe to this belief....

My life has changed, and I've experienced so much freedom in my soul and in my mind. Understanding God's infinite Love continues to baffle and liberate me more every day.

Because I'm a pianist, and a Southern Gospel Music lover - I take the ferry over to a nearby City about once a month or so to help a Gay Affirming church there with their music. I've had several conversations, and visits with the Pastor who is a friend of mine - and, have come to observe some things that just make me shake my head.

1. While wanting to embrace freedom from the law (especially where sexual orientation is concerned), they still hang on to the need for repentance and salvation. Every Sunday night, a call is made to say the "Sinner's Prayer". They can't seem to realize that even this very requirement is the act of mixing law with grace.

Tim W's statement ended.

This is what got me, "they still hang on to the need for repentance and salvation." If this is the crux of what they believe, then they are headed down the wrong path, imho.

Joel 2.12

“Now, therefore,” says the LORD, “Turn to Me with all your heart, With fasting, with weeping, and with mourning.”

Mark 2:17

When Jesus heard it, He said to them, “Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance.”

Luke 13:3

I tell you, no; but unless you repent you will all likewise perish.

Acts 26:19-20

“Therefore, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision, but declared first to those in Damascus and in Jerusalem, and throughout all the region of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, turn to God, and do works befitting repentance.



Lisa

**Answer questions - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/10/10 21:53**

Jordan,

Thingsabove and Chariot asked you some interesting questions...would you mind answering them? I would love to see y our response.

I am also curious: are you asking these questions - about Universalism - because you are dealing with someone who is challenging you or are you asking them for yourself?

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/11 8:03**

Does anyone know whether Univesalists believe in hell?

**Re: Answer questions, on: 2006/10/11 12:37**

ginnyrose,

I've been busy lately (currently on vacation, you could say) so I'm sorry for not responding to anyone's questions sooner.

..

I am asking these questions as someone who is just asking them... I don't take an active stand on Universalism, if that is what you were wondering, but I am interested in discussing it nonetheless.

dorcas,

From my understanding, Universalists for the majority do not believe in Hell. But there are a lot that believe Hell is a temporary place for people that have lived unreconciled to God-- and then God works on their soul in Hell. But God sending people to an eternity in Hell? That's simple atheism, the Universalist would say.

thingsabove,

(incase you fail to recognize, I am writing as a Universalist for the sake of the discussion, not really as myself)

I don't take what I quoted as really Scripture, because the Bible was written by erroneous men, one cannot take it as the very Word of God, literally. And thus one must use reason (logos) in identifying their theology. It is not black and white. Not much can be proved from the Bible thus, but much can be proved from reason (science, for example). To the Univer salist, the Bible is to be taken more as a bunch of fairy-tales put together, nothing more. So one can use it to illustrate a point, but one does not take it as de facto God's word. So it doesn't change the Universalist's stance because the stance of the Universalist is based on reason, science, or the mind, and not on what the Bible says. To them reason says that G od, the God they believe in to be all-merciful, is not going to punish the wicked to eternal hell-fire no matter their sin.

Chariot,

And then how are you aware that that revelation is God's and not your own making? Are you ever able to come to a poin t where you \*know\* that God has revealed Himself to you? Most people would say that's unedifying to ponder, and futile to discuss. But I would like to say that it is not.

Jordan

Re:, on: 2006/10/11 15:04

Quote:

-----  
jordanamo wrote:

ginnyrose,

I've been busy lately (currently on vacation, you could say) so I'm sorry for not responding to anyone's questions sooner...

I am asking these questions as someone who is just asking them... I don't take an active stand on Universalism, if that is what you were wondering, but I am interested in discussing it nonetheless.

dorcas,

From my understanding, Universalists for the majority do not believe in Hell. But there are a lot that believe Hell is a temporary place for people that have lived unreconciled to God-- and then God works on their soul in Hell. But God sending people to an eternity in Hell? That's simple atheism, the Universalist would say.

thingsabove,

(incase you fail to recognize, I am writing as a Universalist for the sake of the discussion, not really as myself)

I don't take what I quoted as really Scripture, because the Bible was written by erroneous men, one cannot take it as the very Word of God, literally. And thus one must use reason (logos) in identifying their theology. It is not black and white. Not much can be proved from the Bible thus, but much can be proved from reason (science, for example). To the Universalist, the Bible is to be taken more as a bunch of fairy-tales put together, nothing more. So one can use it to illustrate a point, but one does not take it as de facto God's word. So it doesn't change the Universalist's stance because the stance of the Universalist is based on reason, science, or the mind, and not on what the Bible says. To them reason says that God, the God they believe in to be all-merciful, is not going to punish the wicked to eternal hell-fire no matter their sin.

Chariot,

And then how are you aware that that revelation is God's and not your own making? Are you ever able to come to a point where you "know" that God has revealed Himself to you? Most people would say that's unedifying to ponder, and futile to discuss. But I would like to say that it is not.

Jordan  
-----

Since man's reasoning is as shifting sand, your standing with it seems quite foolish; futile at best. Surely, with your certainty about things, especially the Bible and its testimony of those who have dealt with God, you can come up with a better deal for yourself. Gird up your loins and be a man. Begin by thinking.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/10/12 7:42

Jordan,

Thank-you for answering my question(s). So you were on vacation? And now I am fixing to leave for the weekend as well and will likely not see your response to my post until next week.

Jordan, it seems to me the heart of Universalism is rooted in disbelief in God, fueled by a distate for the concept of hell: God would not send anyone to hell permanently: he is TOO loving! At the core one is using his own wishes, likes to determine reality and that, brother, is very serious. It is deplacating the Jehovah God from his throne and putting yourself there! This is direct violation of the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." I really do not think you want that, do you?

I can well understand why you may want to believe in Universalism: you may have loved ones who will miss heaven and for them you grieve. This is understandable...I can identify with that. But that will not change reality, brother! That is why Jesus allowed himself to suffer at the hands of man in order to redeem us from that pit.

Jordan, I am going to ask you to try to visualize the crucifixion, and then try to feel the pain that Jesus did. Can you? The best I can do is remember how painful the first childbirth was I had. Not good, but a start, nevertheless. Jesus suffered so much for us to make it so one does NOT have to go to hell. Now to say hell is temporal flies in face of Biblical evidence and for this reason Jesus suffered to redeem us. Do you understand this?

Quote:

-----I don't take what I quoted as really Scripture, because the Bible was written by erroneous men, one cannot take it as the very Word of God, literally. And thus one must use reason (logos) in identifying their theology. It is not black and white. Not much can be proved from the Bible thus, but much can be proved from reason (science, for example).  
-----

Is this your opinion? Sorry, but I get a tad bit confused when reading your post...

Now let me ask you some more questions:

Where does the concept of eternity come from?

Where does the concept of goodness come from?

Where does the knowledge of evil come from?

Where does the idea of a Supreme Being come from?

Why do you have a fear in your heart about hell?

Why do you have a sense that you may be in error? and want a discussion? Where does that come from?

Why do you feel the need to disprove the validity of the Word of God?

This is just to get your started. Think....and if you have more questions, come back and there are many on this forum that will be delighted to help you.

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 13:04**

Gah, I thought I might be taken wrongly... let me reiterate, I do not believe in Universalism. I only said that sort of to be a n 'devil's advocate' for the sake of the discussion, sorry for not being more clear!

Not being the devil's advocate now, :-) the Universalist follows his reason, his mind, which by default is already corrupted by the fall, and thus the reason he uses will never amount to anything. His reason might even make sense, and may have certain "facts" to back it up. However, we must have God's reason (logos) imputed & imparted unto us-- i.e., born again. The failure of the Universalist is thus hubris-- pride, ultimately. He fails to recognize that his reason amounts to nothing, that he is in need of the Savior's cleansing. This is why so few of the intellectuals (or, "rich"), comparatively, are saved, and so many of the poor and meek come to know Jesus.

IT is an age-old debate though. One cannot really refute what a Universalist says, because his basis is on the corrupted man's reason. The only way I suppose you could refute him would be to show him God's reason laid throughout in the Bible, pray that God puts His reason upon his heart, and then let him choose for himself which God he will serve. The God of the Bible: mysterious, sovereign, just, virtuous, holy, mysterious, righteous, true, and again, mysterious. His ways are not our ways. But the god of the Universalist is one of the flesh, the god that makes sense to the human, dead, mind.

This "god" has crept into most of the church. It is the "god" that they presume to worship come Sunday-morning. Universalism is more universal than the Church of Universalism or the Unitarian Universalists, it is found in most churches, right at the pulpit. "he" may be found in the scriptures, twisted & diluted, and "they" will enjoy and drink of "his" cup, "they" will go through "his" 'communion', go through "his" 'praise' and this "god" will do as much as the gods of old, nothing but miraculous gimmicks-- but this god is will never be as mysterious, awe-ful, holy, and righteous as Yahweh.

"he" doesn't make sense to us Christians. "he" is not worthy to be served. It is like someone from a different family saying that their father is your father. We, though, know and hear our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be His name. His kingdom shall come, His will shall be done. In earth, as it is in Heaven. Amen. :-)

Jordan

**Re: - posted by dantejones (), on: 2006/10/13 17:07**

Ormlly,

Hey, dantejones here...Your position on Universalism is one that makes me ponder, and one that doesn't sound all that bad and really doesn't, to my mind, compromise the integrity of Scripture, but there are a few concerns that make it problematic....

1. As I believe Ginnyrose said, God has supernaturally revealed himself to people in places without the Gospel

2. Many religions don't conceive God monotheistically (or even theistically) as we, the Jews, and the Muslims do, so being righteous by the code of Hinduism, where the ultimate goal is to become part of "God" - an impersonal, undifferentiated force - cannot work. Obviously, they'd have to be repentant, but that usually involves Christ being revealed at some

point.

I would like to believe in something like Universalism, but there are a few critical points where it just does not hold together with experience and common sense from a Biblical point of view

Re:, on: 2006/10/14 6:26

Quote:

-----  
dantejones wrote:

Ormlly,  
Hey, dantejones here...Your position on Universalism is one that makes me ponder, and one that doesn't sound all that bad and really doesn't, to my mind, compromise the integrity of Scripture, but there are a few concerns that make it problematic....

1. As I beleive Ginnyrose said, God has supernaturally revealed himself to people in places without the Gospel

I said that. ginnyrose agreed with me, though she placed it in the realm of the supernatural while I kept it in the realm of the natural, which is supported by scripture. "The heaven's declare His handiwork".

Quote:

-----  
Quote:

-----2. Many religions don't conceive God monotheistically (or even theistically) as we, the Jews, and the Muslims do, so being righteous by the code of Hinduism, where the ultimate goal is to become part of "God" - an impersonal, undifferentiated force - cannot work.

Why not, if that is all one is offered? From God's perspective, is righteousness different because of religion? Is sin imputed to the righteous blind?

Quote:

-----Obviously, they'd have to be repentant, but that usually involves Christ beong revealed at some point.

Indeed. That is true. Repentance only means to change directions. The righteous will do that because of their quest for God and to be pleasing to Him. The wicked never will. Is there enough of Christ "sensitiveness" within us that we can influence such folk? Do we ever even think to speak of it in that li

Jesus said to them, "If you were blind, you would have no sin; but since you say, 'We see,' your sin remains." John 9:41 (NASB-U)

Quote:

-----I would like to believe in something like Universalism, but there are a few critical points where it just does not hold together with experience and common sense from a Biblical point of view

I am not a Universalist. I could never be one simply because of the scriptures. To be a Universalist is to ignore much of what the scriptures say to the contrary. George McDonald, one of my favorite authors who wrote much concerning our creation in Christ, was himself a Universalist. I never knew that and it amazed me when I discovered it. C.S.Lewis, Tolkien, ... Oswald Chambers, to name a few were some of the cross section of writers who were so affected by McDonald's writings. Go figure, Chambers being one of them and yet in Chamber's writings I discovered something of the intimacy of God, desired by God and made possible to us, not revealed by most other writers aside from McDonald. Chambers embraced a real cross section of thinkers including G.Campbell Morgan, one of his favorites, who didn't embrace the Pentecostal experience Chamber's craved and later entered into.

The conclusion to the matter can be that all writers and thinkers have some truth to be gleaned however, all don't have all the truth. The only book that does was written by 50+/- authors. It contains all the truth and even then requires the Holy Spirit to make it known to us. Universalism isn't mentioned except as it applies to the righteous who are justified by faith in God.

Having said that, I believe the new birth experience takes the righteous into a deeper realm of knowing God as Father. That's what I believe Jesus taught and the reason He spent 3+ years speaking of it. I believe that is the thrust of evangelism given us to understand. I believe the early church, with its creeds and by then their lack of understanding, usurped the commandment, setting itself up to be the thing to be understood, leaving us with the great need of restoration to the original intent of the Father in Jesus..... and in the fullness of time, enter Martin Luther who began such restoration with it continuing to this day. "Few there be that find it." Matt7.14

Thanks for the inquiry, Dante, and I hope that explains my position and is a help to anyone who can't explain theirs.

Go here and stand amazed as I did:

<http://www.lifechangers.org/docs/HeartGeoMcDonald.pdf>

;-)

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/10/16 10:34**

Jordan,

Appreciate your post...you did have this poster confused: where you playing "the devil's advocate" or were you asking serious out of your own heart?

You made a very important point and that is the dependance on reason to determine what is 'Truth', which is so faulty, rooted in self which is rooted in rebellion against God.

I appreciate your article. Thanks for posting.

ginnyrose

**Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/17 14:50**

Ormly said

Quote:

-----I believe the new birth experience takes the righteous into a deeper realm of knowing God as Father.

Hello Ormly,

I'm still trying to understand how a person can be righteous under the New Covenant, without being born again.... I see that one doesn't have a relationship with the Father *unless* one is born again.

However, I also see that in the Old Testament, there were many who were 'righteous' through faith.... many of whom had very clear encounters with God, His presence or an appearance of some sort, or angels.

Is this the way you separate 'the righteous' in your thinking ..... into Old and New Covenant 'believers'?

**Re:, on: 2006/10/17 15:27**

Quote:

-----

dorcas wrote:

Ormly said

Quote:

-----I believe the new birth experience takes the righteous into a deeper realm of knowing God as Father.

-----

Hello Ormly,

I'm still trying to understand how a person can be righteous under the New Covenant, without being born again.... I see that one doesn't have a relationship with the Father *unless* one is born again.

-----

So, under the new covenant everyone who does the righteous deed while never hearing of the gospel of Jesus to become His disciple, is damned?

Quote:  
-----However, I also see that in the Old Testament, there were many who were 'righteous' through faith.... many of whom had very clear encounters with God, His presence or an appearance of some sort, or angels.  
-----

Has faith changed??

Quote:  
-----Is this the way you separate 'the righteous' in your thinking ..... into Old and New Covenant 'believers'?  
-----

I contend, the new birth experience to be more than salvation. I believe Jesus spent three and half years explaining that which the church has since misconstrued. I am almost convinced the new birth experience to be by invitation only. If I am correct it gives me the answer for the worthless presumption that abounds. It certainly explains my own and thus my failure to have realized God in my life at an early time.

#### Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/17 15:49

Quote:  
-----So, under the new covenant everyone who does the righteous deed while never hearing of the gospel of Jesus to become His disciple, is damned?  
-----

In a way, I'm sorry to answer your question with a question, but, I have to, I think, because I don't know how a person can be under the New Covenant without having believed into Jesus?

And I have no idea to what 'righteous deed' you refer which could be a substitute for faith in Jesus Christ (during the era of the New Covenant).

Please define 'the righteous deed' and how you deem it possible to be 'under the new covenant' with out ever having heard of Jesus? :-D

EDIT: Ormly - my apologies for the omission I've just corrected.

Does it alter your answer in any way?

#### Re:, on: 2006/10/17 17:34

Quote:  
-----  
dorcass wrote:

Quote:  
-----So, under the new covenant everyone who does the righteous deed while never hearing of the gospel of Jesus to become His disciple, is damned?  
-----

In a way, I'm sorry to answer your question with a question, but, I have to, I think, because I don't know how a person can be under the New Covenant without having believed into Jesus?

And I have no idea to what 'righteous deed' you refer which could be a substitute for faith in Jesus Christ (during the era of the New Covenant).

Please define 'the righteous deed' and how you deem it possible to be 'under the new covenant' with having heard of Jesus?  
-----

No. You think about it ... given the multitudes who never will and yet live righteous lives believing there is a God who sees and rewards..

Read your Bible for a better understanding of what it says..

Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/18 6:35

Hi Ormly,

You said: '...and yet live righteous lives believing there is a God who sees and rewards..

Read your Bible for a better understanding of what it says..'

I believe I know what the Bible says about the righteousness which saves a soul, that's why I need your help to understand your thesis better.

I am aware of Paul's comments in Romans 2, but, those Gentiles who might thus be 'saved', would not be 'under the new covenant' as we are discussing here.

So, as I read what you've said (and my Bible), I hear this:

that because there are people who *believe* they can be righteous - live righteously (without Christ), and do what they believe is right in God's sight (without believing in Jesus) **because** they believe God 'sees and rewards', God **WILL** 'see and reward'.

Have I got that right? ..... in no way do they have to adjust their theology to coincide with God's..... *He* will be understanding of their good intentions and faith towards Him, and on the basis of *their* belief system, He will reward them accordingly?

If I've understood you, please would you give just one scripture which supports this thesis (because I don't have any.....) ? Thanks. :-)

Re:, on: 2006/10/18 7:10

Quote:

-----  
dorcass wrote:

Hi Ormly,

You said: '...and yet live righteous lives believing there is a God who sees and rewards..

Read your Bible for a better understanding of what it says..'

I believe I know what the Bible says about the righteousness which saves a soul, that's why I need your help to understand your thesis better.

I am aware of Paul's comments in Romans 2, but, those Gentiles who might thus be 'saved', would not be 'under the new covenant' as we are discussing here.

So, as I read what you've said (and my Bible), I hear this:

that because there are people who *believe* they can be righteous - live righteously (without Christ), and do what they believe is right in God's sight (without believing in Jesus) **because** they believe God 'sees and rewards', God **WILL** 'see and reward'.

Have I got that right? ..... in no way do they have to adjust their theology to coincide with God's..... *He* will be understanding of their good intentions and faith towards Him, and on the basis of *their* belief system, He will reward them accordingly?

-----

No, you don't have it right. That is not what I am saying. They have no theology. Why do you seem bent on mistrusting what is written? You add words and thus misrepresent what is said or implied, thus accusing me of saying something wrong. These people of whom I write are humble folk who live with a hope of being considered righteous enough because they believe, what they consider, evidence of a God and **they don't know anything about Jesus Christ because they have never heard of Him**. All they know are the stars in the sky. Get my drift?

The idea of old covenant-new covenant in this is a moot issue. The Blood of Jesus saves the righteous this side of the cross and the other side, as well. God knows the righteous, those from the beginning who would/will be His. He knows the hearts of men. Ever hear of the story of the "Rich man and Lazarus"? (cf. Rom 5.1)

If you believe God is a just and loving God, there should be no difficulty in understanding what is written, especially in the Bible.

Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/18 7:58

Dear Ormly,

I feel you are attributing more ire to me than I feel. I'm not - really not - misconstruing what you say..... I'm trying to find out where your thesis intersects with biblical theology..... which is why, when you make a very short statement of a few sentences, unsupported with a single Bible verse, your posts always leave me with many unanswered questions. And today, I am truly happy that you've answered one aspect of my confusion.

Quote:  
----- they don't know anything about Jesus Christ because they have never heard of Him. All they know are the stars in the sky. Get my drift?  
-----

I believe I do. But, according to Paul, such people are not redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, they are judged by God on how they were guided by their consciences.

Romans 2

14 for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves,

15 who show the work of the law written in their hearts, **their conscience also bearing witness**, and between themselves thoughts accusing or else excusing

16 in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.

Acts 17

30 "Truly, these times of ignorance God overlooked, but now commands all men everywhere to repent,

31 "because He has appointed a day on which **He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He has ordained**. He has given assurance of this to all by raising Him from the dead."

These two scriptures, although they mention Jesus, do not allude to a need for faith in Him by those who might be saved .

I don't have time to add a few of the many other scriptures which insist that faith in Jesus Christ is necessary for salvation..... so, in those I've mentioned above, have I found the mainstay of your thesis correctly?



Re:, on: 2006/10/18 8:09

Quote:

-----  
dorcass wrote:

Dear Ormly,

I feel you are attributing more ire to me than I feel. I'm not - really not - misconstruing what you say..... I'm trying to find out where your thesis intersects with biblical theology..... which is why, when you make a very short statement of a few sentences, unsupported with a single Bible verse, your posts always leave me with many unanswered questions. And today, I am truly happy that you've answered one aspect of my confusion.

Quote:

----- they don't know anything about Jesus Christ because they have never heard of Him. All they know are the stars in the sky. Get my drift?

-----  
I believe I do. But, according to Paul, such people are not redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, they are judged by God on how they were guided by their consciences.

Romans 2

14 for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves,

15 who show the work of the law written in their hearts, **their conscience also bearing witness**, and between themselves thoughts accusing or else excusing

16 in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.

-----  
By His Blood applied or not applied, men will be judged accordingly. Some will be raised to eternal life while others to eternal death. His Blood applied will make the distinction needed.  
"When I see the Blood I will pass over you".

Quote:

-----Acts 17

30 "Truly, these times of ignorance God overlooked, but now commands all men everywhere to repent,

31 "because He has appointed a day on which **He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He has ordained**. He has given assurance of this to all by raising Him from the dead."

These two scriptures, although they mention Jesus, do not allude to a need for faith in Him by those who might be saved.

I don't have time to add a few of the many other scriptures which insist that faith in Jesus Christ is necessary for salvation..... so, in those I've mentioned above, have I found the mainstay of your thesis correctly?

-----  
Read me again, for the first time.

What does Romans 5.1 say?

Re: Thru a glass darkly and the Book of Acts, on: 2006/10/18 8:51

Brothers, sisters,

I've been reading thru this thread, and trying, trying to understand what's being discussed here, and I can't. That's not your "fault", it's my shortcoming. But I still can't understand what's being discussed.

I don't get "ism's" (Praise God)

I been reading thru the Book of Acts, what great days those were! That's when the Church was something, even though the Way had the Roman Empire on one side, the Pharisees on another and Greek philosophy and pan-theism (ism!) on another just hemming it in, and what Power these men and women had.

I read how Peter and Paul would say, "believe that Jesus is the Christ (Messiah) and that God raised Him from the dead and you will be saved.

I read of the word "repent", which would mean to "turn".

I read of the instructions that the council in Jerusalem sent out to those who believed that to follow Jesus they must be circumcised, and the instructions sent out were pretty simple: abstain from food sacrificed to idols, abstain from the meat of strangled animals, abstain from blood, and abstain from sexual immorality.

I read of how how believers pooled resources and gave to the others who had not.

I read of how they prayed and laid hands on one another. I read of disagreements, Paul and Barnabbas, that were later healed.

I read of how Apollos who was a man who was a great speaker, well versed in Scripture knew the Lord, but only knew of "John's baptism", yet was open to the baptism in Jesus' Name, and did thus.

I could go on and on, this Book of Acts is a Template a Holy Template of the Church, the Body of Christ, is to BE.

and man o man, today, you got everybody cutting Scripture every which way but loose, theologian's picking nits and nitpicking picks, street preachers screaming at the "wicked" preaching hellfire and damnation, politicians and their harlots daring to play with Holy Things to seduce the gullible and the religious.

You what theology?

here ya go: turn to God, which is to repent, believe that Jesus is Messiah and that God raised Him from the dead and you will be saved.

and then you know what, let the Holy Ghost fill you, that's a Gift from God and He'll take care of the rest.

Would to God that tongues would cleave to the roofs of mouths, and folks just quit arguing Scripture, would to God that well-intentioned believers quit falling all over themselves to "damn the wicked sinners to hell". God will take care of His.

"oh but neil, we gotta preach the Gospel to all mankind".....THEN PREACH IT!

here it is, believe that Jesus is Christ and that God raised Him from the dead and you will be saved, repent and turn back to God, be baptized and ask for the Gift of the Holy Ghost, which will empower you to love the unlovable and forgive the unforgivable, just as YOU now have been forgiven.

Once you do that, the Kingdom of God is here, now, not yet.....

"oh neil, what about "Christian perfection", aren't we to lead sinless lives?"

oh liars, who made you Christ?!?...you are without sin? LIARS!! we all sin, everyday! Why do you think it's called "Grace"? Why do you think the Blood of Christ is available 24/7?

Anybody who says he leads a sinless life is a liar in the sight of God.

Man, I wish we could be like the Churches in Acts.....in fact, why don't we do away with calling the Faith "Christianity", and call it what they called it in the leading of the Spirit in those days...."the Way"?

I'm done now.

thank you and may God bless you today is my fervent prayer, Bartle

Re:, on: 2006/10/18 9:30

Quote:  
-----oh liars, who made you Christ?!?...you are without sin? LIARS!! we all sin, everyday! Why do think its called "Grace"? Why do you t  
hink the Blood of Christ is available 24/7?  
-----

Sinless perfection being what it is, a false teaching, however, are we not called to be perfect; to be holy as God is Holy?  
If you say yes, which would be the truth, then where should our efforts be pointed .... to not do the thing which is sin and  
by not doing it believe we are being (made) holy or rather to love God with the whole heart and do anything thing from th  
at love attitude toward Him?

Jesus said:

"And He who sent Me is with Me; He has not left Me alone, for I always do the things that are pleasing to Him." John 8  
:29 (NASB-U)

Will this not also apply to us per our obedience to the Great commandment?

Where should our efforts be spent?

:-D

spent?, on: 2006/10/18 10:06

Quote:  
-----Where should our efforts be spent?  
-----

to adhere to the Two greatest Commandments as Jesus outlined.

To love the Lord your God with all your heart, all your strength, all your soul and all your mind, and to love your neighbor  
as yourself.

out of this vertical and horizontal relationship(the Cross) will come the outflow of a yielded up life to Messiah.

To read the Bible.

To pray as the Spirit leads, and the heart cries.

to forgive as we been forgiven. forgive all and love all.

on earth as it is in Heaven.

and finally to rest in God.

Thats my "theology".

coz I believe God.

bartle

**Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/18 10:10**

Quote:

-----Read me again, for the first time.

What does Romans 5.1 say?

-----

Romans 5:1

Therefore being justified **by faith**, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:

It says we must have faith in Jesus Christ to be justified in God's sight.

**Re:, on: 2006/10/18 11:26**

Sorry, that's not what it says. You are adding words that aren't there. That seems to be a habit with you.

Try again. I'll you give two outta three.

**Re:, on: 2006/10/18 15:22**

Romans 5:1

Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:

Ormlly,

You know what it says. I know what it says. I - as usual - have no idea what you are reading there that I can't 'see'.

Please enlighten me .....?

I used the word 'sight'..... How did this 'add' to the meaning?

I didn't mention 'peace' because that is the most *obvious outworking* of justification by faith.

Romans 4 last few verses:

22 And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.

23 Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him;

24 But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;

25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

These last verses (of chapter 4) are what the 'Therefore' of Romans 5:1 is *there* for.

I hope you can explain more clearly what it is, in your opinion, I'm not getting by the guesswork you keep asking of me....

..

EDIT: I know you think you are reading what's in scripture, but so do I (think I'm reading what's in scripture), so I need you to paraphrase - in what you would consider a *correct* way - the verses you believe I am missing or misinterpreting, before I can have *any* idea what distinction you make in your thinking ..... Thanks! :-)

**Re: spent? Universalism, on: 2006/10/18 15:42**

bartle said:

Quote:  
-----to adhere to the Two greatest Commandments as Jesus outlined.  
To love the Lord your God with all your heart, all your strength, all your soul and all your mind, and to love your neighbor as yourself.  
out of this vertical and horizontal relationship(the Cross) will come the outflow of a yielded up life to Messiah.  
-----  
I loved the simplicity of your whole answer..... :-)  
  
And you've reminded me of something which has caught my eye before, to which very few draw attention..... Please be ar with me.....

Some weeks ago, when I was reading John's gospel very slowly and with much prayer for new revelation, I realised those two Commandments, simply on the basis of *many* Bible 'pictures', which come in threes..... need a third.... to be complete. I knew that John says 'His commandments are not grievous' (1 John 5), and I took in a lot more in John's epistles than I've ever been able to compute before.... But, the 'third' Commandment, I found here, in John 15 (v 12):

- 7 If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.
- 8 Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.
- 9 As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love.
- 10 If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love.
- 11 These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and your joy might be full.
- 12 **This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.**

Do you see what I mean?

**Re:, on: 2006/10/18 16:22**

Romans 5:1  
Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:

Quote:  
-----  
Ormlly,  
  
You know what it says. I know what it says. I - as usual - have no idea what you are reading there that I can't 'see'.  
  
Please enlighten me .....?  
-----

I sure do see and know what it says and I have to believe you do also. So why add words to it make it say what you want it to say, your additional words to be accepted as its new meaning?

The fact you have no idea and need enlightenment is no surprise and something that, in my estimation, is not a strong enough acknowledgement of your lack.

You say you want answers from me? --- I don't believe answers from me will suffice your problem.

Sorry, I'm not the one.

Rule #1. Honesty, regardless of lack.

**Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/18 17:14**

Ormlly said

'The fact you have no idea and need enlightenment is **no surprise** and something that, in my estimation, is not a strong enough acknowledgement of your lack.

You say you want answers from me? --- **I don't believe answers from me will suffice your problem.**

Sorry, I'm not the one.

Rule #1. Honesty, regardless of lack.'

Hi Ormlly,

I see you're back to saying I have a 'problem'.

You imply you know something I don't know, but you are not willing to spell it out for all to see. Meanwhile, I'm suppose d to keep guessing? And even when I ask for straightforward information, you're **not willing to give it?**

You consider this helpful?

Well, I'm not sure if you're allowed to make up your own rules of engagement in these forums..... I'm pretty sure you're n ot..... so, I ask.....

- 1) How am I being dishonest?
- 2) Why cannot or will not you answer the questions?
- 3) What meaning did I ADD to Romans 5:1?

Your posts to me are littered with accusation and innuendo, and little which is concrete to agree or refute.

I can either go on believing you don't understand scripture in the way you would like me (us) to believe.... and you're just bluffing .... or, I will continue to press you for the exact answers which you imply are unmistakable, but which cannot be.. .. or there would be no discussion at all.....

Lastly, I could conclude that you don't have anything to say which would enlighten me, and that's why you're changing th e subject *again*.

**Re:, on: 2006/10/18 17:26**

Quote:

-----3) What meaning did I ADD to Romans 5:1?  
-----

Meaning??? Notwithstanding changing my words, you changed the words of the scripture!!! which changes the meaning !!!!

Quote:

-----I can either go on believing you don't understand scripture in the way you would like me (us) to believe....  
-----

Us? Who is "us"? I have no problem being understood by others. You must mean just "you".

Quote:

-----.... and you're just bluffing .... or, I will continue to press you for the exact answers which you imply are unmistakable, but which can not be.... or there would be no discussion at all....  
-----

Bluffing?? about what? Press ahead but you can expect little from me when I see your misrepresentations.

Quote:

-----Lastly, I could conclude that you don't have anything to say which would enlighten me, and that's why you're changing the subject a gain.  
-----

#1. I never changed the subject. It's always been about your dishonesty. I've only given you enough that you now know it. .. *maybe*.

**Re: Universalism, on: 2006/10/19 6:06**

Dear Ormly,

I don't know what you're talking about....

I have heard numerous Bible expositions where the preacher reads a verse and then successfully or unsuccessfully tries to put it into other words to communicate more clearly its meaning to the congregation. He is never accused of adding to the word of God. Everyone knows he is not *changing* scripture.... is not suggesting that folks should go home and use his words instead of God's.

So the question remains, in my mind, as to whether you acknowledge Romans 1, 2, 3 and 4, (which chapter divisions and verses are, as you know, man-made additions to the original text) and accept that the 'Therefore' of Romans 5:1 is a **direct** reference to **us who believe in Jesus Christ**.

Romans 5:1 cannot be taken out of context, for instance, to say that people who believe in God, but who have never *heard* of Jesus Christ, are 'justified by faith'.

Even faith in God only, has a name..... Deism. Deists are not going to be in heaven. These are people who justify to themselves their capacity to know God and what pleases Him, *very specifically without reference to Christ*.

The passage in Romans 2, v14 particularly, refers to people who have never heard of **God**, but who have been guided by an innate desire for righteousness.

I do agree with you that the death of Jesus Christ accomplished many things in the invisible realm which are not elucidated clearly in scripture..... More, those of us who know Him, find out how far-reaching was the influence of His death, as we navigate our time in this world as pilgrims.

However, there is a world of difference - a real world of difference - between what Paul said in Acts 17:31 -

He has appointed a day on which **He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He has ordained**. He has given assurance of this to all by raising Him from the dead,

and Romans 2:14, 15, 16

... are a law to themselves, who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and between themselves thoughts accusing or else excusing in the day when **God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ**, according to my gospel.

and your thesis that **therefore** people who only believe in what you call (without defining it) 'the righteous deed', or who have heard that God 'rewards' believers in Him somehow, will be saved (or are saved or are being saved) by their faith in their personal doctrine.

I believe I have understood your thesis correctly, and that my questions which you have not answered, are good questions, intended to bring to your attention a fuller display of Bible verses which are unsupportive of your thesis.

It is not a problem to me, that you hold to this variety of Universalism, as I believe you yourself know the Lord, but, if you are *teaching* that people who have access to the truth about Jesus, (whether through Bible reading, hearing the gospel preached or attending church in a limited way but doing 'good works' when they can), do *not* have to bring themselves under His Lordship and saving grace, then I believe that is dangerous both to theirs and your salvation.

To a much earlier post, in which I asked what you meant by 'under the new covenant' and you replied that it was 'a moot point' since everyone who is saved is saved because of Jesus death (NOTE: I am not attempting to quote exactly; that was the meaning I picked up from your choice of words), I hear this, which you have said in other threads, and disagree, mainly because the Old Testament saints were saved by faith *before* His death, and the important thing was their obedience within their *relationship with God* whom they knew personally and acknowledged completely.

In my understanding, this puts those to whom Paul refers in Romans 2:14 in a very unique category within the New Covenant era, and one which he personally set out to obliterate as much as he could, by preaching the gospel to the Gentile

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/10/19 9:05**

Locking this thread. The combative nature has turned once again between two contestants, something the both of you need to recognize as this is not the first of the disputing with each other.

Lay down the swords of contention and try something truly incredible, pray for each other.