



## Scriptures and Doctrine :: All Men Everywhere

**All Men Everywhere - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/19 11:46**

It amazes me, that with all the arguments of God's sovereignty, not one person can answer this question:

If God is completely sovereign in salvation, and if His word does not return to Him void, how can He command all men everywhere to repent, and then they do not repent as He commanded them to?

**Acts 17:30 And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:**

Please do not post unless you can answer the question I asked. I know quite a bit about both sides doctrinally, I have studied TULIP and the opposing side, and I have yet to see anyone who believes in the complete sovereignty of God in salvation that can answer this question. Even James White does not answer it.

I wonder how many surprised calvinists there will be in heaven when they see Esau talking to Jesus.

**Re: All Men Everywhere - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/19 12:43**

Quote:

-----Acts 17:30 And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:  
-----

It's no different than God commanding all men not to commit adultery, or lie, or to love the Lord with all their heart, mind, soul, and strength.

The natural man cannot do these things, thus he must be born again or regenerated and receive justification by the faith produced in the new heart.

God sovereignly gives spiritual life to whom He will, when He will, and how He will. Even a skimming of Romans 9 makes that abundantly clear, unless one is attaching an agenda to it (i.e. nations and not individuals). The language of Romans 9 does not, and has never meant nations.

Consider the highlighted portion in light of what is surrounding it-

Rom 9:20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?

Rom 9:21 Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?

Rom 9:22 What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:

Rom 9:23 **And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,**

Rom 9:24 **Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?**

Is Paul speaking to nations and calling them "us", or is he referring to the people he is writing to?

Does Paul say anything there about a Jewish nation? or rather does it not say that the "vessels prepared before unto glory" were "called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles"?

Quote:

-----I wonder how many surprised calvinists there will be in heaven when they see Esau talking to Jesus.  
-----

Unless you have Scripture to show he'll be there, I don't think he will be. I'll be more surprised to see Finney there :-D

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/10/19 12:50**

Quote:

-----I'll be more surprised to see Finney there  
-----

Are you kidding here bro? He'll be there. Although in a way I agree...I might indeed be surprised to see him...because his seat will be so much better than mine. (paraphrasing Wesley...)

Praise God, even my own theology will finally be corrected and perfected in Glory.

Blessings,

MC

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/19 13:27**

Quote:

-----Are you kidding here bro?  
-----

I wish I was, but any man who makes salvation dependent upon their own works is in danger of missing the point of Christ's perfect substitution for sinners.

It amazes me that a man can deny that Christ actually saved anyone, that the cross was simply to show God's anger towards sin, and that man must earn Heaven by his own deeds, and yet be highly praised by so many.

I at one time bought into this thinking, and understand to a point why it seems so wonderful, because it's ME doing, and I feel I contribute to MY salvation.

But if indeed God requires a perfect righteousness to allow entrance into Heaven(which He does), then it cannot be found in myself or my actions, for in them will be failure, and weakness, and nothing that would be worth God's approval (outside of Christ).

The Scriptures declare that God has placed us in Christ, and He has been made wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption to us(1 Corinthians 1:30), and also that God made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

Finney's theology has more in common with Judaism than with the teachings of the New Testament. For in his theology, there is really no need for a bleeding Saviour, because man can do it on his own. Man can keep the commandments, man can build a ladder to Heaven.

Brother I know that this is not a popular view to have here, but Scripture is truth, and it does not matter what man says. I have been through, and seen firsthand the horrid effects of this man's theology upon souls, and the consequences produced in the modern church, thus as one who loves the brethren and seeks their spiritual health, I warn, and confront, simply that folks would really evaluate what they are reading, and if it measures up with the Bible.

Blessings brother compton.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/19 14:37

Quote:  
-----roaringlamb wrote:

Consider the highlighted portion in light of what is surrounding it-  
Rom 9:20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?  
Rom 9:21 Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?  
Rom 9:22 What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:  
Rom 9:23 **And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,**  
Rom 9:24 **Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?**

Is Paul speaking to nations and calling them "us", or is he referring to the people he is writing to?

Does Paul say anything there about a Jewish nation? or rather does it not say that the "vessels prepared before unto glory" were "called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles"?

-----  
Notice the word "even" in verse 24. That would mean it includes us individually.

Why is it at the Potters House in Jer 18:2-6, which is the coi-text to Romans 9:21-23, the vessle was the nation of Israel?

The Potter did not mare the clay Himself, but the clay became marred in His hands.  
The Potter(God) did all HE could do to keep the clay(Israel) from being marred. He sent Jeremiah(along with all the othe r prophets) and the clay(Israel) rebelled anyway.  
Therefore, the Potter had to reform the clay into a new vessel.

Israel was warned to repent and they did not, that is the clay being marred.  
God sent them to Babylon because of there repentance, this is the clay being reformed.

So, the answer to "Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, **Why hast thou made me thus?**"  
"Because you rebeled and did not yield to MY voice."  
God never make vessels of dishonor just because HE wants an "ashtray, diaper pail, spittoon, garbage container, or wh atnot" or just because HE wants to.  
The vessels of dishonor are vessels of dishonor by there own fault.

Re: All Men Everywhere - posted by intrcssr83 (), on: 2007/10/19 17:41

Quote:  
-----by BenWilliams on 2007/10/20 2:46:21

It amazes me, that with all the arguments of God's sovereignty, not one person can answer this question:

If God is completely sovereign in salvation, and if His word does not return to Him void, how can He command all men everywhere to repent, and then they do not repent as He commanded them to?

Acts 17:30 And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:

Please do not post unless you can answer the question I asked. I know quite a bit about both sides doctrinally, I have studied TULIP and the opposing side, and I have yet to see anyone who believes in the complete sovereignty of God in salvation that can answer this question. Even James White doe s not answer it.

I wonder how many surprised calvinists there will be in heaven when they see Esau talking to Jesus.

-----  
The underlying concept behind pelagian thinking and it's arminian offshoots is the concept that if God gave man an instr uction, man must therefore be able to fulfill it on his own; "If God is just, if God is righteous and God is holy, and God co mmands of the creature to do something,certainly that creature must have the power within himself, the moral ability wit hin himself, to perform it or God would never require it in the first place.Â"

To illustrate the fallacy of this thinking, I'd like to use the following analogy:

A man has an important appointment of which his attendance is compulsory. His only means of transport is to take the 9:00am train from his suburb into the metropolitan area. He arrives at the train station at 8:59am to find that the cost of the ticket will be \$4.50 for a one-way journey. He looks into his wallet only to find it empty. The train pulls in and knowing nothing else to do, he gets on anyway.

Halfway into the journey, a policeman and a transport officer boards the train to inspect tickets. Eventually they get to the man who decided to board without a ticket. The police officer says that there is a \$100 on the spot fine for evading fare. The passenger complains that he has no money to pay for it, to which the police officer says that failure to pay the fine within a specific timeframe will result in legal action by way of court.

Now let's think this scenario through. The fine required that the man paid \$100 for transgressing the law. Now, does the policeman and the transport officer first inspect the man's wallet to see if he will actually be able to pay the fine then give the charge accordingly?

No.

The fine and the consequences of failing to pay it is a reflection not of the passengers' financial status, but rather the standard of civil law which those who are under it are required to abide by.

The same is true with God's instructions. They are not a reflection of man's ability, but rather God's holiness. All men are sinful and thus "fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23).

So to, when God gives an instruction only to find that man cannot fulfill it on his own, he is more than just to declare his wrath, because he is Holy and cannot let sin go unpunished.

Simple.

**Re:, on: 2007/10/19 17:53**

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

...any man who makes salvation dependent upon their own works is in danger of missing the point of Christ's perfect substitution for sinners.

Hi Bro Lamb

What I find hard to understand is how anyone can think that Armenianism (which I assume you are opposing) is, by definition, doing this? Why the insistence on this dichotomy, as if there are only two camps, Calvinists who believe in Grace, and Armenians who believe in works)

Quote:

-----It amazes me that a man can deny that Christ actually saved anyone, that the cross was simply to show God's anger towards sin,-----

The Cross was indeed showing God's anger over sin, but also much more than that. Redemption is a many-faceted jewel. Why limit yourself to only one facet of it? What of Christ's victory over Satan, His disarming of principalities and powers through the Cross (Colossians 2:15)? What of His becoming sin for us so that we might be made the righteousness of God (2Cor 5:21)?

And so on...

Quote:

-----I at one time bought into this thinking, and understand to a point why it seems so wonderful, because it's ME doing, and I feel I can contribute to MY salvation.

But if indeed God requires a perfect righteousness to allow entrance into Heaven(which He does), then it cannot be found in myself or my actions, for in them will be failure, and weakness, and nothing that would be worth God's approval (outside of Christ).

The Scriptures declare that God has placed us in Christ, and He has been made wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption to us(1 Corinthians 1:30), and also that God made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.

So you do believe that after all! You gave the impression above that you didn't, which was why I referred to it...

It seems we agree more than we thought :-P

Quote:  
-----Finney's theology has more in common with Judaism than with the teachings of the New Testament. For in his theology, there is really no need for a bleeding Saviour, because man can do it on his own. Man can keep the commandments, man can build a ladder to Heaven.

Brother I know that this is not a popular view to have here, but Scripture is truth, and it does not matter what man says. I have been through, and seen firsthand the horrid effects of this man's theology upon souls, and the consequences produced in the modern church, thus as one who loves the brethren and seeks their spiritual health, I warn, and confront, simply that folks would really evaluate what they are reading, and if it measures up with the Bible.

-----  
I don't know much about Finney's theology, but do agree with you here. Even though I'm not a Calvinist!

Does that surprise you? ;-)

in Him

Jeannette

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/19 18:24**

Quote:  
-----What I find hard to understand is how anyone can think that Armenianism (which I assume you are opposing) is, by definition, doing this? Why the insistence on this dichotomy, as if there are only two camps, Calvinists who believe in Grace, and Armenians who believe in works?  
-----

No sister, I do not care what nick name a person goes by. My issue is with the unbiblical teaching that justification is not by faith, grace and Christ alone.

I grieve to see people toiling under the false assumption that they must be maintaining a clean slate from their own works in order to get to Heaven. Or in simple terms, confusing sanctification and justification.

Arminians(most I have met) have a different view of grace which is more Roman Catholic than Biblical. It seems they view an initial giving of grace to help kick off salvation, but it is utterly dependent upon the individual to maintain his or her salvation by their works, and if they do not, then even though they at one time received grace, they will(according to Arminians) be lost.

Roman Catholics believe pretty close to the same thing. God infuses grace to start the process, but you must cooperate with it in order to be saved. But because God requires perfection for a person to get into Heaven they have at least invented purgatory to give some a false hope of being purified.

Quote:  
-----Redemption is a many-faceted jewel. Why limit yourself to only one facet of it?  
-----

I will limit it in the same way that Paul did. I seek to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified, because that is the only hope I have in this world. If the work of Christ upon the cross did not actually pay for the sins of His people, then we are in deep trouble, because someone needs to pay them before we can get into Heaven. Along with this too is the fact that God must also have a perfect fulfillment of the Law in order to allow a soul into Heaven. Again if this facet of Christ's work is ignored, then we are in trouble, and must seek to keep the Law on our own.

Quote:  
-----I don't know much about Finney's theology, but do agree with you here. Even though I'm not a Calvinist!  
-----

Not at all, because the Bible is where we draw our answers, and it never contradicts itself.

Blessings to you sister

**Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/21 9:20**

BenWilliams said

Quote:  
-----If God is completely sovereign in salvation, and if His word does not return to Him void, how can He command all men everywhere to repent, and then they do not repent as He commanded them to?  
-----

Hi Ben,

Interesting you should pick on the word 'commands', as I was thinking about that very statement in Acts 17 from a different perspective, namely, that there is *power* in God's commands.

I don't agree that regeneration precedes repentance, (if that's what a true Calvinist believes), as that is not in line with the flow of Romans 1 into Romans 2, where the step of repentance most definitely comes between the wrath of God and being fit to inherit His kingdom, but there is another ancient place where God commands: the blessing, even *life for evermore*. I believe that verb 'commands' has the same power in it, whether it is to repent, or to live. It is the word of God '**repent!**' which creates faith in the hearer at the same time as conviction of sin and hope of salvation. It is one of the wonders of His communication with us that He intends to deliver us into a relationship with Himself, if we do not resist His workings.

I know this doesn't answer your question in the context which you hoped, but I wanted to offer that thought, that 'commands' is not so much an objective verb, but more a *calling forth from us* the kind of response Lazarus made, when Jesus implicitly commanded life back into his body.

Remember, there were those who refused to look at the brass snake which Moses held up on the pole for them. They died. Only those who would look, received healing and life.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/10/22 2:25**

Brother Benjamin from Aus. wrote:

Quote:  
-----The underlying concept behind pelagian thinking and its arminian offshoots is the concept that if God gave man an instruction, man must therefore be able to fulfill it on his own; "If God is just, if God is righteous and God is holy, and God commands of the creature to do something, certainly that creature must have the power within himself, the moral ability within himself, to perform it or God would never require it in the first place."-----

So when God spoke to Cain...

Gen. 4:6 So the LORD said to Cain, "Why are you angry? And why has your countenance fallen? 7 If you do well, will you not be accepted? And if you do not do well, sin lies at the door. And its desire is for you, but you should rule over it."  
"

Did He lie to Cain?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/22 10:20**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----It's no different than God commanding all men not to commit adultery, or lie, or to love the Lord with all their heart, mind, soul, and strength.

The natural man cannot do these things, thus he must be born again or regenerated and receive justification by the faith produced in the new heart.

God sovereignly gives spiritual life to whom He will, when He will, and how He will. Even a skimming of Romans 9 makes that abundantly clear, unless one is attaching an agenda to it (i.e. nations and not individuals). The language of Romans 9 does not, and has never meant nations.

-----

Perhaps I misphrased the question I was asking, let me try again to make the question clearer.

How can a just God command all men everywhere to repent, but not give them the ability to do so?

That has not, is not, nor ever shall be justice. If God is just, then everything He does must be just, not being just simply because he does it, but just because He is justice, therefore He cannot do anything apart from His own nature.

I want to ask another question as well, when did the pattern of Israel, and God's dealings with them change, so that we as gentiles would not experience the same God that dealt with them?

Throughout Old Testament scripture, God makes it abundantly clear that the ball is in the court of man, and that he is not only capable of controlling his own destiny, but he is responsible for it.

Lastly, the real question that all of this comes down to is this:

If we study the nature and character of God throughout the whole of the scriptures, will we find a God that is arbitrary, or a God that does everything with a reason?

The answer is simple, and I don't think there is any argument against it, God is not arbitrary at all, and never does anything without a reason. The Calvinist God is an arbitrary God, who chooses individuals randomly at will.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/22 11:19**

Quote:

-----How can a just God command all men everywhere to repent, but not give them the ability to do so?  
-----

God's justice is not in the slightest harmed by man's inability to do what He commands. Again consider the Law, and tell me who has ever kept that except for Christ.

Man must answer to God, not God to man.

Our original parents (Adam and Eve) were fully capable of keeping the covenant of works that they were given, or of breaking it and sinning against God. We know that they sinned, and thus brought forth children in their likeness (sinful, dead in sin etc.).

After the covenant of works was broken by Adam and Eve, God put forth a new covenant and a promise of a seed that would deliver His people, then He covered Adam and Eve in skins from a sacrificed animal, and people from that point to now are justified by believing in that Messiah that was foretold then.

The law was never meant as a means for man to gain Heaven. It instead shows man how incapable he is to do anything to gain God's favour apart from Christ. Until you stop looking at the Law as a way of salvation, I am afraid that you will co

continue to see God as unjust to command what man cannot do.

The other danger one must avoid as well is thinking that men are innocent, and somehow God owes them "a chance". If we truly believed that "all have sinned" then we must understand that God owes no man anything outside of damnation.

Quote:  
-----Throughout Old Testament scripture, God makes it abundantly clear that the ball is in the court of man, and that he is not only capable of controlling his own destiny, but he is responsible for it.  
-----

Yes, but the OT is God dealing with His people, not the world. So, you are correct in that God does take the responsibility of caring for His people. However the Amalekites, Hittites, etc do not have the same promises or care given to them.

If anything this should bring joy to our hearts as we God working with a sinful group of people, loving them when unlovable, and offering a way for them to come to Him.

Quote:  
-----The answer is simple, and I don't think there is any argument against it, God is not arbitrary at all, and never does anything without a reason. The calvinist God is an arbitrary God, who chooses individuals randomly at will.  
-----

Not at all, for even Scripture says that God chooses individuals-  
Ephesians 1:4 According **as he hath chosen us** in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

Ephesians 1:11 In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, **being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:**

God's election of people has nothing to do with them, or upon God's favoritism. God is God, and as Romans 9 says, He will have mercy upon whom He will have mercy. We are created by Him, thus we bow to His ways, not He to ours.

All things that happen are for His glory, and to work out His will. If one does not understand the mercy and love that is behind this, it can be very confusing and painful. Nevertheless, God is God.

Consider all Joseph went through, and the pain his father endured. Yet God was working His will so that His word would be fulfilled. Consider the agony Christ endured. Yet it pleased the Father to crush Him, to make Him the firstborn of many sons.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/22 12:35**

roaringlamb, have you ever considered that from Adam and Eve, all the way to Abraham, and then far past Abraham all the way to Christ, the scripture shows generation by generation how God has commanded each generation to walk in righteousness, and when they did, He rewarded them, and when they didn't He judged them. These were fallen people!

Have you ever found it interesting that God offered cain repentance, and cain did not take it. Yet God still showed him mercy? Cain was not granted heaven, but God dealt mercifully with him.

Have you ever wondered why the scripture teaches that hell was created for the devil and his angels, and not for mankind? And only after man sinned, did God judge that they should go to hell.

I just don't see how you can call what you believe justice. You say to me "but God does not answer to men" and I believe that truly, but is justice not justice? Is repentance not repentance?

Have you ever seen the evidence in real human beings of a man who is incapable of repenting? You cannot say you



have, because you cannot know. It is only for God to know you say.

If God is good, then everything He does must be good, or He is no longer good.

If God is righteous, then everything He does must be righteous or He is no longer righteous.

If God is just, then everything He does must be just, or He is no longer just.

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----God's justice is not in the slightest harmed by man's inability to do what He commands. Again consider the Law, and tell me who has ever kept that except for Christ.  
-----

Paul was blameless, according to the scripture.

John the Baptists mother and father were blameless according to the scripture.

The law could be kept, but not fulfilled. Only Christ could fulfill the law, because he kept it in spirit, as well as in action.  
-----

roaringlamb, the scripture does not say that after adam and eve sinned, man became incapable of choosing God. It does not say that anywhere.

Romans one is not directed at that specifically, and romans 1 does not say that all men are incapable of choosing God.

Quote:  
-----The law was never meant as a means for man to gain Heaven. It instead shows man how incapable he is to do anything to gain God's favour apart from Christ. Until you stop looking at the Law as a way of salvation, I am afraid that you will continue to see God as unjust to command what man cannot do.  
-----

I do not see the law as a means for salvation, the scripture very clearly teaches that faith is the only way a man can be justified.

But if God has not given the ability to all men to be saved, then He is unjust in commanding them to repent.

He has commanded "all men" to "repent", this goes further than what Romans 1 talks about when it says that God has revealed himself to all men, and given them a conscience, and all that it says, this goes way beyond that, whereas before, God was commanding the Israelites to repent, now He commands all men to repent.

If I walk into a room, and say to a group of one hundred people, all of you kneel before me, or you will be beheaded, but I have made some of those hundred people without joints in their knees. Am I just?

No, the answer is emphatically no, I have commanded my creation to do something that I have created it so it cannot do, and then I judge the creature for not complying with my command.

Do you see the logical fallacies that this is full of?

That is like God handing out glasses of water to a hundred people and saying, everyone drink the water or you will die, but He has taken the mouths of some of them away, so that they cannot drink.

My friend, you are not honest with yourself if you say that that is justice.

Are you aware that Psalms says that God has shown love to "every" man?

Do you call love, creating a creature simply to damn it to hell?

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/22 13:31

Quote:  
-----Have you ever found it interesting that God offered cain repentance, and cain did not take it. Yet God still showed him mercy? Cain was not granted heaven, but God dealt mercifully with him.  
-----

Yes God treated him with mercy as He does all men. He makes it rain upon the just and the unjust alike. The point of what God is telling Cain has to do with Cain's rejection of God's means of acceptance.

Cain wanted God to bend to his sacrifice, and his way approach to God. This has nothing to do with "free-will" and to make this passage mean this misses the point. Abel was accepted because his sacrifice was according to God's ways, Cain wanted to create his own worship of God and was rejected.

Quote:  
-----Have you ever wondered why the scripture teaches that hell was created for the devil and his angels, and not for mankind? And only after man sinned, did God judge that they should go to hell.  
-----

Here is the verse you are speaking of-  
Matthew 25:41 Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

Could you show me where it says hell was not created for men? Could you be reading into this passage something that is not there?

How do you know that God decided hell was for man only after he sinned? Consider that those who are saved, were chosen in Christ before the foundations of the world.

Quote:  
-----If God is good, then everything He does must be good, or He is no longer good.  
-----

But you are basing your view of good upon man deserving something from God, and if God does not give it to man, then He is not good.

God remains good no matter what we think or feel about him. He would remain good even if He never gave us a way of salvation, simply because His character is goodness, and holiness.

Quote:  
-----Paul was blameless, according to the scripture.  
-----

Well again, you are reading into Scripture your own ideas. Here is what Paul says-  
Philippians 3:6 Concerning zeal, persecuting the church; **touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless**

Then he goes on to say-  
Php 3:7 But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.  
Php 3:8 Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for w

hom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ,  
Php 3:9 And be found in him, **not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:**

Quote:

-----John the Baptists mother and father were blameless according to the scripture.  
-----

Yes according to the outward means, but not the inward righteousness. Even David wrote of how he was blameless in keeping the law, and being upright. That is why Jesus made it a point to bring up the law and its true intent in His Sermon on the Mount. All hope in human effort was to be done away with, so that men would accept God's means for salvation.

Quote:

-----roaringlamb, the scripture does not say that after adam and eve sinned, man became incapable of choosing God. It does not say that anywhere.  
-----

Well how about these words from Christ-

John 6:44 **No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him:** and I will raise him up at the last day.

No one will come unless God works to bring them. They will try to erect their own way of worship, and expect God to accept it just like Cain did.

Quote:

-----Romans one is not directed at that specifically, and romans 1 does not say that all men are incapable of choosing God.  
-----

Brother Romans 1 clearly shows that revelation from nature only serves as a means of greater condemnation. That is the point that Paul is making, and it parallels what the Apostle John had written here-

John 3:19 And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

John 3:20 For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd.

The natural heart will do anything to remove God, thus we have science to explain away God, or we have deification of nature rather than worship of the Creator.

Quote:

-----If I walk into a room, and say to a group of one hundred people, all of you kneel before me, or you will be beheaded, but I have made some of those hundred people without joints in their knees. Am I just?  
-----

Your illustration is flawed as it does not follow the Biblical account of what we are talking about. What if there were two people who could bend their legs, and move their joints, and you told them to kneel or die. Yet they chose not to, and died.

That is more like the truth, Adam and Eve could have obeyed, but they did not and death has reigned ever since.

It is your misunderstanding of original sin that causes your confusion, and I cannot make you believe it, God will reveal it to you.

Quote:

-----That is like God handing out glasses of water to a hundred people and saying, everyone drink the water or you will die, but He has t

aken the mouths of some of them away, so that they cannot drink.  
-----

Again, a flawed illustration. For God did not remove the mouths, but man by their sin has. Men are not born good, and then corrupted, they are born wicked, and must be made holy by God's grace. To be realistic with your illustration, you need to have the people not even wanting water, or seeking some other form of refreshment other than what God had commanded.

Quote:

-----Are you aware that Psalms says that God has shown love to "every" man?  
-----

So does this mean that all will be saved then? His love is displayed in that He allows even the unsaved to partake in His creation, He gives oxygen to them etc. This is His great mercy for all men, not immediately giving them the justice they deserve.

You act as if men are running around worried about their offence to God. Sadly this is not the case, but those who are worried are being bothered by God Himself, and are being drawn to Christ.

Men are not neutral towards God and able to decide one way or the other. Rather they are "haters of God", "children of wrath".

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/22 16:18**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----Yes God treated him with mercy as He does all men. He makes it rain upon the just and the unjust alike. The point of what God is telling Cain has to do with Cain's rejection of God's means of acceptance.

Cain wanted God to bend to his sacrifice, and his way approach to God. This has nothing to do with "free-will" and to make this passage mean this misses the point. Abel was accepted because his sacrifice was according to God's ways, Cain wanted to create his own worship of God and was rejected.  
-----

I am not talking about the sacrifices they offered, I am talking about verse seven when God says to a "fallen individual",

**Genesis 4:7**

**7If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.**

God says to him, "If you do well you will be accepted"

God also says to him, "You will rule over the desire of sin"

Now I want you to explain why God would come to Cain and say these things if they were not true?

Had God been the God of Calvin, God would have said to Cain, "Cain, know ye not that you are chosen of God?"

But that is not what God says, he tells Cain something that is true for "all men".

God says to him, "If you do well you will be accepted"

Now, either God is a liar, which we know he is not, or the story in scripture is untrue.

Now, either one of two things is true here, cain is a justified man before God, or cain is a fallen man before God.

If cain was already justified, then explain what happens to him after he kills able.

If cain is still a fallen man, then explain why God would tell him something that is not true. (He can be saved)

So either cain was one of God's chosen, or he was not.

If cain was chosen of God, explain what happens after he kills able.

If he is not one of God's chosen, then explain to me how God is not lying by telling cain he will be accepted if he does well.

-----

Quote:  
-----Could you show me where it says hell was not created for men? Could you be reading into this passage something that is not there?

How do you know that God decided hell was for man only after he sinned? Consider that those who are saved, were chosen in Christ before the foundations of the world.

-----

First of all, I'm not reading into that passage at all.

It says, "prepared for the devil and his angels".

No other passage in scripture states what hell was prepared for other than that, they only state what it will be used for.

Secondly, that is not what I meant by that. Yes God has perfect foreknowledge, so things were done before, or were they? No, they were done at the time they were done, and when it speaks of them having been done beforehand, it is speaking of the plans of God being set in place beforehand.

I don't know the exact time that God decided hell was for mankind who did not repent, but he did not reveal that to man until after man had sinned.

-----

Quote:  
-----But you are basing your view of good upon man deserving something from God, and if God does not give it to man, then He is not good.

God remains good no matter what we think or feel about him. He would remain good even if He never gave us a way of salvation, simply because His character is goodness, and holiness.

-----

First, man deserves nothing from God, in fact he deserves less than nothing, he deserves eternal damnation, because he is desperately wicked.

In this point you err in understanding me.

Your statement "God is good no matter what we think or feel about Him" while true, is used to make a flawed, and illogical point. God is not good because "everything He does becomes good because He does it", God is good, because everything he does is good, and because his goodness stems from a nature that is good.

I am not saying that God's goodness is justified by man's opinion of him, what I am saying is that anyone can claim to be good, but if the facts don't line up with the words, then something is wrong.

God cannot be good, and lie.

God cannot be good and steal.

God cannot be good and judge the innocent as guilty.

We know these things because He has told them to us, and then we see the truth of it. God has never lied to us, God has never stolen from us, and God has never judged an innocent man as guilty.

To clarify that point, so that we don't get distracted here, man is not innocent, man is guilty, he is condemned already in the eyes of God.

-----

To the next point, I'm not trying to ignore what you said, but everything you said concerning Paul, and John the baptist's parents, is basically pointless.

Paul, says that there was righteousness in the law, and that he was blameless according to that righteousness.

And the account of JB's parents is that they were blameless.

I'm not arguing that the righteousness in the law was man's righteousness, Paul states that clearly, but that does not negate the fact that they were righteous men. they were approved by God, until the lamb was slain, and at that point, the knowledge that they needed the righteousness of Christ came.

Paul says, "I was righteous!" and he says, "it was gain to me to be righteous".

-----

Quote:

-----Well how about these words from Christ-

John 6:44 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.

No one will come unless God works to bring them. They will try to erect their own way of worship, and expect God to accept it just like Cain did.

-----

I whole heartedly agree with that verse...

Where does it say that a man must come if he is drawn?

-----

Quote:

-----Your illustration is flawed as it does not follow the Biblical account of what we are talking about. What if there were two people who could bend their legs, and move their joints, and you told them to kneel or die. Yet they chose not to, and died.

-----

You still fail to see that in what you believe God is denying the person he commands the ability to carry out what he tells them to.

my examples are perfect in describing what you believe.

Here you have a God, who says to all men, "repent".

But then chooses certain individuals and says, "I will give you the ability to do what I have said".

And to the others He says, "I will not give you the ability to do what I have said".

That is like saying speak, but I will take your tongue. Breathe, but you cannot have lungs. Walk, but I'll leave your feet and ankles broken. Think, but without a brain.

It is absolutely unjust in every way.

You have two slaves chained to a wall, and you say, I command you to unlock your chains and you will be free, but to one you give a key and to the other you give nothing.

Oh no, this is not a God of justice. It is a deceiving God. No court, No judge would ever accept that as justice, because God has placed his understanding of justice in our hearts. While many are deceived from understanding justice, not all are.

Quote:  
-----So does this mean that all will be saved then? His love is displayed in that He allows even the unsaved to partake in His creation, He gives oxygen to them etc. This is His great mercy for all men, not immediately giving them the justice they deserve.

You act as if men are running around worried about their offence to God. Sadly this is not the case, but those who are worried are being bothered by God Himself, and are being drawn to Christ.

Men are not neutral towards God and able to decide one way or the other. Rather they are "haters of God", "children of wrath".

In answer to this question, you know that the only kind of love that the scripture shows God giving is agapeo, or agape love?

This is love, that I create you, that I kill you, and then that I torment your soul for all eternity.

No, not all men will be saved, but only those who reject Christ out of their own will will be damned.

If a man is not capable of making the choice on his own, that is because he is controlled by a demon, in which case, in every instance in the scripture, Christ held the demon accountable, cast it out, and set the man free.

And as we know from what Paul teaches, if the man from that point, of being free from the influence of demons does not walk in the truth, then the demons will return seven times greater.

So we see again how God gives the men who cannot choose, a choice. He frees their minds, and then allows them to choose.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/22 16:19**

Quote:  
-----roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----How can a just God command all men everywhere to repent, but not give them the ability to do so?

God's justice is not in the slightest harmed by man's inability to do what He commands. Again consider the Law, and tell me who has ever kept that except for Christ.

That goes against reality.

Try commanding a newborn to mow the lawn.

Man can only keep the law by walking after the spirit(Rom 8:4).

That is how man can obey God's command, which makes God just in the command.

Quote:  
-----roaringlamb wrote:

Our original parents(Adam and Eve) were fully capable of keeping the covenant of works that they were given, or of breaking it and sinning against God. We know that they sinned, and thus brought forth children in their likeness(sinful, dead in sin etc.).

**Romans 6:23** For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.  
If the gift God is spiritual life, then the death must be spiritual.  
Adam could bring forth children spiritually alive because newborns have not yet sinned to bear the wage of sin.

Quote:  
-----roaringlamb wrote:  
The other danger one must avoid as well is thinking that men are innocent, and somehow God owes them "a chance". If we truly believed that "all have sinned" then we must understand that God owes no man anything outside of damnation.

-----  
It's not that God **owes** mankind a chance, but God **is giving** all mankind a chance by HIS grace, and that chance is the atonement.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/22 16:43**

Quote:  
-----But then chooses certain individuals and says, "I will give you the ability to do what I have said".

And to the others He says, "I will not give you the ability to do what I have said"  
-----

Brother, God would never keep a man out of Heaven if he wanted to be there.

You again are operating under the unscriptural assumption that all men want to go to Heaven, but then a mean Calvinist Christ says, "sorry, you cannot come in!"

Men do not desire to be saved unless God gives them the desire, and God will never give that desire to frustrate or destroy a person.

You again are using emotional arguments that seem unfair when looked at through man's goodness, but strip away that goodness, and you will see rightly.

I do not wish to go round and round on this, because if you do not believe in original sin and its implications, we will continue to arrive at differing conclusions.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/22 20:20**

After years of looking at this debate, reading over and over the same arguments, I have come to a few conclusions. First, I will admit we do not know everything there is to know about election. Not everything, but enough to know that 5 point calvinism IS NOT the answer. As others have rightly already pointed out many scriptures, I will not repeat them.

It would be fruitless to begin again with all the scriptures that any clear thinking individual has not either considered if they truly looked at this false doctrine. It is so ridiculous it defies God given logic and reason, not to mention more importantly scripture as a whole. I can only equate it to a strong delusion, 2 Thes 1:11. Now I know the context here is not about calvinism, but "strong delusion" could be one reason. Another reference to be looked at could be 2 Cor.4:3-4 "whom the god of this world has blinded the minds of them who believe not". Again, I am not saying calvinists (hyper-5 point) are lost, I am just referring to the state of blindness by accepting a lie and refusing the truth. (I only use this for reference, not context, I know the context) And again, 1 Cor.1:19 - "For there MUST be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you".

My point is this - how could someone be shown the same scriptures over and over, and still stand on a doctrine of a man, (a murderer and one who showed little if any fruit of a true Christian, with the doctrine itself named after him)? There must be a supernatural element in this, and I do not think it is the true God either.

If God is the God of hyper 5 point calvinism, then he can not be the same God most Christians love and serve - they are two different Gods by definition. And, if the 5 point god is true, think about it, how could anyone really love a god like that, I said IF he is the 5 point God? A normal, rational, biblically thinking person could not. It defies reason and ability within to do so, unless there is some other contributing factor. I do not say any of this to offend or be unloving. I guess I read these things over and over, and I just don't get it. I don't understand something else, if a person really believes this, what is the motive to always push it? The only thing it teaches is God does not love everyone, He does not really want everyone to repent and believe the Gospel and be saved, He offers false hope and salvation to all who would come in repentance.



ce, but he really does not mean it, he does not want a child to come in child like faith, because only a highly educated theologian could come up with this faulty theory, and, well, why bother going on, I could make a list a mile long, and brighter minds have already refuted this better than I ever could. Calvinism, tell me, what does it do for anyone, but cause debate, confusion, uncertainty about God and who He is? It is not truth, it does not follow biblical themes, God's nature as a WHOLE, or the need of man as a WHOLE. A universal problem (sin) requires a universal cure (Salvation). If salvation is not available to all, then Satan and sin are greater than God and evil triumphs over good. Potential salvation must of necessity be available, and man's choice must be the deciding factor to accept or reject God's offer. He will have mercy upon whom he will have mercy - a favorite quote. But did you ever look up every instance where this was stated, and see that that mercy always was related to those who submitted and obeyed the Lord, that the condition of mercy was never a decree or arbitrary, but conditioned on what man or nation did with the commands of God? But typing here is in vain, my button has been pushed!

I pray we all come to the full knowledge of the truth, and I pray my Calvinist friends re-think their faulty position and heretical leader, Mr. Calvin.

God Bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/10/23 0:17**

I don't believe in Calvin, but I do believe what scripture says and God and His Christ.

God has chosen all things for His pleasure. You cannot say God did not choose Able over Cain. You cannot say God did not choose to hate Esau and love Jacob. Therefore you cannot say that God has not chosen before the foundation of the world that those chosen before the foundation of the world to be in Christ Jesus was not His plan before the foundation of the world. God does not choose anyone not to be in Christ. It is all man's choice to not be in Christ. None would choose Him, none is righteous, we even have to be made righteous in Christ and no other especially self.

No plainer than this: Ephesians 1:3-5 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will,

God chose Abraham, God chose David, God chose Judah, God chose Jacob, none of them chose God.

God chose Israel, and God choose those who will be in Christ. Yet it is not in God that any should be lost but we know there are, and God is righteous even in those that are. Not God's choice but man's. Without God choosing none would be saved.

The words chosen God occur in 23 verses.

Deu 7:6 For thou art a holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.

Deu 12:21 If the place which the LORD thy God hath chosen to put his name there be too far from thee, then thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock, which the LORD hath given thee, as I have commanded thee, and thou shalt eat in thy gates whatsoever thy soul lusteth after.

Deu 14:2 For thou art a holy people unto the LORD thy God, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth.

Deu 16:11 And thou shalt rejoice before the LORD thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the LORD thy God hath chosen to place his name there.

Deu 18:5 For the LORD thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes, to stand to minister in the name of the LORD, him and his sons for ever.

Deu 21:5 And the priests the sons of Levi shall come near; for them the LORD thy God hath chosen to minister unto him, and to bless in the name of the LORD; and by their word shall every controversy and every stroke be:

1Sa 10:24 And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the LORD hath chosen, that none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted, and said, God save the king.

1Ch 15:2 Then David said, None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites: for them hath the LORD chosen to carry the ark of God, and to minister unto him for ever.

1Ch 28:4 Howbeit the LORD God of Israel chose me before all the house of my father to be king over Israel for ever: for he hath chosen Judah the ruler; and of the house of Judah, the house of my father; and among the sons of my father he liked me to make king over all Israel:

1Ch 29:1 Furthermore David the king said unto all the congregation, Solomon my son, whom alone God hath chosen, young and tender, and the work great: for the palace not for man, but for the LORD God.

2Ch 33:7 And he set a carved image, the idol which he had made, in the house of God, of which God had said to David and to Solomon his son, In this house, and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen before all the tribes of Israel, will I put my name for ever:

Psa 33:12 Blessed the nation whose God the LORD; the people he hath chosen for his own inheritance.

Psa 78:31 The wrath of God came upon them, and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen of Israel.

Isa 43:10 Ye my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.

Isa 65:15 And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord GOD shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name:

Luk 23:35 And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided, saying, He saved others; let him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God.

Act 10:41 Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.

Act 22:14 And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth.

1Cr 1:27 But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;

1Cr 1:28 And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:

2Th 2:13 But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth:

Jam 2:5 Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?

1Pe 2:4 To whom coming, a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, precious,

You would say if I am not chosen why did He make me this way and tell me to repent if I could not do it.

Rom 9:20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed, Why hast thou made me thus?

Man will have no argument before God, even those who will be in the great white throne judgment of God. All man kind will be judged perfectly.

With out Christ all will be judged by their works and works has no life and is the Killer of the self-righteous sending them to Hell cast into the lake of fire with Satan.

If we are not in Christ we are dead to God. That is the New Testament Truth. The Old Testament Saints must be separated from the New and leave them to God. That is His decision and Judgement, not ours. That is why no one will ever reconcile those in the old with those in the new by commingling the Old Testament with the New Testament. You cannot commingle Law and the mercy of God with Grace and Jesus Christ our Savior.

Christ liveth in me: Phillip

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/10/23 7:15**

Quote:  
-----God has chosen all things for His pleasure. You cannot say God did not choose Able over Cain. You cannot say God did not choose to hate Esau and love Jacob. There for you cannot say that God has not chosen before the foundation of the world that those chosen before the foundation of the World to be in Christ Jesus was not His plan before the foundation of the world. God does not choose anyone not to be in Christ. It is all mans choice to not be in Christ. None would choose Him, none is righteous, we even have to be made righteous in Christ and no other especially self.  
-----

So brother Phillip, based on what you said, Abel was chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world.

Abel was righteous. Do you believe what you said?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/10/23 7:19**

Brother Patrick

Brother Ben asked this specific question of you...

Quote:  
-----Now I want you to explain why God would come to Cain and say these things if they were not true?  
-----

As I also asked, does God lie to Cain when He personally exhorts him and warns him of the choice before him?

In Christ  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 10:53**

**Psa 78:31 The wrath of God came upon them, and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen men of Israel.**

I find it interesting, that God's wrath fell on the "CHOSEN" men of Israel.

Just seems a little odd, that God would choose them, and then pour out His wrath on them, I thought the elect were immune to that kind of judgement, and only received chastening from the Lord to make them better.

Oh well, I would, as rookie said like to see the explanation to my question, but alas any time there is too hard a question, everyone runs for cover. Against a wall with a question, and no one will answer it. The only answers that are given, are typical mantras. It is sad.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/10/23 11:02

Rev 2:16 Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth.

i think this verse is strange too, why would God "threaten" them with "or else" when he know no one can do it unless they are chosen? maybe because we have a *choice*?

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 11:20

Quote:

-----Now I want you to explain why God would come to Cain and say these things if they were not true?  
-----

I thought I already had explained it.

Genesis 4:4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And **the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering:**

Genesis 4:5 **But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wrath, and his countenance fell.**

Cain is upset because God did not accept his offering, which was based upon his own way of worshiping God, but not according to God's design.

This leads us to the verses in question-

Genesis 4:6 And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wrath? and why is thy countenance fallen?

Genesis 4:7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

God is pointing out the obvious, if Cain would, then God would. But Cain could not, therefore God did not.

If anything, this shows the utter depth of Cain's depravity. To have God speak to you, and to simply ignore it? Hmm sound like Romans 1, where nature testifies of God's existence, and His creation of all things, yet men will not worship Him.

I think you guys are trying to read into this passage something that is not there as a means to defend a supposed free-will.

So in your view this passage says something like this, "if you from your free will do good Cain, I will accept you. However if you from your own free will choose to do evil, sin lies at the door. But if you choose good from your own free will, you will be saved, so choose out of your free will to do good Cain."

The fact of the matter is that Abel's sacrifice was accepted because it was one of blood, and without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sin. Cain's was a self effort to gain acceptance with God without blood. One of them believed that sacrifice and blood of another would cleanse them, the other believed his own works would save him. This is why John brings these two up in his epistle-

1Jn 3:12 Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. **And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous.**

There is nothing here that hints at what you are trying to make it say, and again I ask you, was Christ tempting or lying to the man with the withered hand when He told him to stretch it forth? Or in any of the miracles that Christ performed in which He commands someone to do something they obviously could not do in their natural strength?

Of course we know He was not lying, but rather demonstrating the very principle we are discussing, that God must enable men to obey His commands.

The Pharisees thought that they had kept all the commands of God, and yet they were not righteous before God, and Christ makes sure to point that out to them. The ones who were justified before God were those who believed the promise of the One to come. That is why "the just shall live by faith" is not only prominent in the NT, but also in OT as well.

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 11:24

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----Brother, God would never keep a man out of Heaven if he wanted to be there.  
-----

Yes, but according to your own belief, no man wants God, they only want sin, and until God changes their desires they are "all" opposed to him.

Therefore, that was a false statement.

All men desire sin and not God, or heaven, therefore, if God is granting repentance and a change of desire to some, and not all, it is unjust.

Secondly, I would like you to walk around and ask 10,000 people if they want to go to heaven, and see the response you get. You are likely to get an affirmative response from about 99.99% of them.

That statement is absolutely opposite of what you believe.  
-----

Quote:

-----You again are using emotional arguments that seem unfair when looked at through man's goodness, but strip away that goodness, and you will see rightly.  
-----

Um...no, I have not used any emotional arguments, only arguments of context, and logical conclusion.

Calvinism relieves the believer of accountability before God concerning lost men's souls. This is why I believe it is false, among other reasons.  
-----

Quote:

-----I do not wish to go round and round on this, because if you do not believe in original sin and its implications, we will continue to arrive at differing conclusions.  
-----

Neither do I, I hate the debate game of chasing wild goose tails, or feathers.

Yet I will say to you, I believe fully in original sin, and all of the implications it has that are outlined by scripture, in context, and clearly defined as the implications of original sin.

So, going to the place that talks about original sin most clearly, let's open Genesis, and see what it says:

#### **Genesis 2:17**

**17but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die."**

"You shall surely die"

#### **Genesis 3:16-19 16To the woman He said,**

Here we have all the physical effects of original sin for both man and woman.

"You shall surely die speaks of both a physical death, and of damnation to hell, it is not speaking of a spiritual death where the person now becomes an incapable of choice. If it did, God would not be concerned about the man eating from the tree of life as He was.

You will say to me, oh, but romans 1 shows what happened to man after the fall.

And I say to you, perhaps it does, but it does not say that it does, so if you believe that, then you are assuming that it does, and you have no backing scripturally to do so. While I may agree that it shows what happened, it is because Romans one shows the pattern of any man who refuses God, and the result of it.

But where we differ is on the meaning of Romans 1, you believe that Romans one shows how man is incapable of choosing God.

While believing that means that you have not read what it says verse by verse, and examined it fully, if you did, you would find that it very plainly shows the lengths that God has gone to to reveal himself to these people that choose to refuse Him.

Romans 1 even speaks of relational foreknowledge, with these people who refuse Him, if you didn't know that, it is because, as I said, you have not taken the time to read it and examine it.

I was shocked to find out that it is the main passage that calvinists use to prove their point, because it does more damage to their position than almost any other main passage that they use.

Explain to me, how God could know these people relationally, intimately, and then say to them "I never knew you".

You can't, because you do not understand Jewish culture, or the nature of God concerning relationship.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 11:45**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----God is pointing out the obvious, if Cain would, then God would. But Cain could not, therefore God did not.

Logical fallacy, if Cain could not, then God cannot say that he can, or God is a liar.

There is no way out of this, no other understanding. Bring this before a board of a thousand logicians, and not one will excuse the logical fallacy that this expresses.

Quote:

-----If anything, this shows the utter depth of Cain's depravity. To have God speak to you, and to simply ignore it? Hmm sound like Romans 1, where nature testifies of God's existence, and His creation of all things, yet men will not worship Him.

Um, let's start with this:

God himself comes to Cain, and tells him that "if he does well, he will be accepted by God".

1. God says "if".

A. That means that God is giving Cain a choice.

B. Cain must choose either to do well, or not to do well.

- C. If cain could not choose, then God lied to him by offering the choice.
- D. God tells cain that he can rule over the desire of sin.
- E. If cain could not rule over the desire of sin, God is lying by telling him he can.
- F. God gave him the choice to rule over sin.
- G. Cain's choice to do evil proves nothing, except that he did evil.

Quote:

-----I think you guys are trying to read into this passage something that is not there as a means to defend a supposed free-will.

I am sorry to say this, but what we are doing, is not reading into it, it is called "rightly dividing the word of truth". It means we are reading what is there, and examining it's meaning, first by what it says, second by what it implies, and thirdly by context.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/23 12:01**

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:

God is pointing out the obvious, if Cain would, then God would. But Cain could not, therefore God did not.

That is ridiculous, that would be like the LORD saying to Cain, "If you do well(but I know you can't), shalt thou not be accepted?(but I will not accept you because I hate you) and if thou doest not well(when you can't in the first place)... Cain, I am just teasing you, I made you sin because you have no free will any way. I order everything that happens, I wanted sin in this world to show my glory. I do all things for my good pleasure, therefore, I create people just to damn them to hell and that is My pleasure."

Quote:

-----I think you guys are trying to read into this passage something that is not there as a means to defend a supposed free-will.

So in your view this passage says something like this, " if you from your free will do good Cain, I will accept you. However if you from your own free will choose to do evil, sin lies at the door. But if you choose good from your own free will, you will be saved,so choose out of your free will to do good Cain."

That is the way one MUST read it.

Quote:

-----There is nothing here that hints at what you are trying to make it say, and again I ask you, was Christ tempting or lying to the man with the withered hand when He told him to stretch it forth? Or in any of the miracles that Christ performed in which He commands someone to do something they obviously could not do in their natural strength?

Since, Jesus told the withered hand to stretch it forth, then he could stretch it forth.

roaringlamb,

According to your theology, you have men in hell for no other reason but God's choice to put them there and not by their own choice of rejecting Him; while they had no other choice but to sin.

You have men being condemned for that which is unavoidable.

According to your theology, man would have this to say in the Lake of Fire:

"I am innocent for this is the purpose for which I was created(was created with no will of my own), therefore, I did God's will and am being condemned for it."

Also, According to your theology, man with no free will would have this to say in the Lake of Fire:

"I had no free will to either obey or to sin, all was preordained from the foundation of the world. I was created as a puppet

do to HIS bidding and I lived as I was willed to do by God. I am in hell for no other reason but His will."

This is a tyrannical devilish god as you describe.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 12:19**

Here's a question for both logic, and ben.

If there was a single verse that said that men were slaves to sin, and loved sin rather than God, how can you reason that man is free.

If man is enslaved, he is not free. That is a logical fallacy.

You cry, "unfair, unfair" But the bottom line is that if God does not change a man's heart, he will not desire the things of God. Men may wish to go to Heaven, but they, like Cain, will develop their own way of getting there rather than submit to Christ and His salvation.

Men are not walking around worried about their offence to God, but instead the vast majority are planning out how they can sin more, and they drink down their iniquity like water. It is this way until their heart is renewed, and then they hunger and thirst for righteousness.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 12:36**

roaringlamb, first you did not answer my questions, but nevertheless, I will answer yours.

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----If there was a single verse that said that men were slaves to sin, and loved sin rather than God, how can you reason that man is free.  
-----

I agree that men are slaves to sin, the scripture plainly teaches that.

What it does not teach is that they are so depraved that they are incapable of making a choice to go free when offered it.

That is a doctrine of calvin, and not the scripture.  
-----

We cannot base an entire theology off of one scripture, you should know that as well as any of us:

"Judas went out and hanged himself"

What we must do is examine the whole of scripture, and understand what it says.

You said, "man is a slave to sin."

I agree fully, now let's see what it says that Jesus came to do:

**Ephesians 4:8 Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.**

He took the captivity of sin captive, and gave gifts unto men, the primary gift being salvation.

**Isaiah 61:1 The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to "proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;"**



This is a prophecy about Jesus, undisputedly.

Who are the captives and the bound?

The answer is simple, anyone who is a slave to sin.

Christ's purpose was to set the captive free from the bondage of sin, and to give them liberty if they would take it.

You cannot deny this, and Ephesians 4:8 says He accomplished his mission of taking the captivity of sin captive.

**Therefore, salvation is for all men, because the bondage of sin has been taken captive so that they might have liberty.**

Christ took "CAPTIVITY" captive, He took the very thing, and made it captive to Him.

This is truth roaringlamb, do not let what you have learned stand in the way of truth. God is speaking these words to you right now, and your spirit bears witness they are true.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 13:21**

Quote:

-----This is truth roaringlamb, do not let what you have learned stand in the way of truth. God is speaking these words to you right now, and your spirit bears witness they are true.  
-----

God is speaking something, but it's not what you're making these verses say.

Christ did in fact set captives free brother as He died for the sins of His people(Matthew 1:21). Notice His people, not all people.

In a sense the work of salvation was accomplished in eternity, and is now being worked out in time, that is how Paul can write things like, "while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

When did this happen? On Calvary of course, He full purchased all those who will be saved. No man knows the number, and no man can say who will and who will not be saved. It is simply our duty to proclaim the Gospel of Christ, and then let God birth whom He will through the word preached by the Spirit.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 14:24**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----Christ did in fact set captives free brother as He died for the sins of His people(Matthew 1:21). Notice His people, not all people.  
-----

1. There is no place in scripture that says the atonement of the cross was only for the saved.

2. You avoided what I said once again, and did not answer what I posted. I bring things to your attention point by point, and you avoid them point by point.

The question is simple,

Did Christ take captivity captive?

Yes, the scripture states that clearly.

Now the question is, was it physical captivity, or spiritual captivity?

The answer once again is obvious, spiritual captivity.

If Christ led spiritual captivity captive, who was it for?

The answer is obvious in Isaiah, it was for the captives.

Who are the captives?

The answer is obvious, anyone in captivity.

But, you do not see because you are blinded by doctrinal statements.

And you do not answer my questions, because you do not know the answers.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 14:47**

Quote:

-----1. There is no place in scripture that says the atonement of the cross was only for the saved.

Mat 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is **shed for many** for the remission of sins.

Mar 14:24 And he said unto them, **This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.**

These line up pretty well with this-

Isa 53:11 He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify **many; for he shall bear their iniquities.**

We know that if not all men are saved, then not all men's iniquities have been borne by Christ. If they were, they would be forgiven, and would be saved. Salvation has very little to do with man at all, and all to do with His grace and mercy. That God would save a single soul is amazing, and even if I was not that souls that was saved, God would be completely without blame because man is sinful, and without God's remarkable grace in giving His Son there would be no hope for any.

I cannot understand why you accuse God of unfairness when he does not save all men rather than praising Him for saving any people at all.

Quote:

-----The answer is obvious, anyone in captivity.

And only those who have their "eyes" opened will see that they need to be set free, and even this work is done by God alone.

All we are really debating here is man's state before God prior to salvation.

You take the Pelagian argument that has been time and again shown to be heresy throughout the church's history. I take the Biblical and historical position that man is completely unable to respond to God apart from God first working. Even the very desire to seek God is caused by God Himself.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/23 14:58**

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:  
Here's a question for both logic, and ben.

If there was a single verse that said that men were slaves to sin, and loved sin rather than God, how can you reason that man is free.

If man is enslaved, he is not free. That is a logical fallacy.

You cry, "unfair, unfair"

I never cry, "unfair, unfair", I cry, "tyranny!, tyranny!"

Quote:

-----But the bottom line is that if God does not change a man's heart, he will not desire the things of God.  
-----

That is because, according to your theology, God will not change a man's heart.

Quote:

-----Men may wish to go to Heaven, but they, like Cain, will develop their own way of getting there rather than submit to Christ and His salvation.  
-----

According to your theology, God has already pre-ordained who will be damned and who will go to heaven, and God's wills for men to sin rather than submit to Christ and His salvation, because HE will not give them what they need to submit to.

Quote:

-----Men are not walking around worried about their offence to God, but instead the vast majority are planning out how they can sin more, and they drink down their iniquity like water.  
-----

According to your theology, that is because they were created for that very purpose. God created them to be that way because HE wanted vessels of wrath.

Your God sends people to hell for no reason other than doing what HE wanted them to do.

Quote:

-----It is this way until their heart is renewed, and then they hunger and thirst for righteousness.  
-----

According to your theology, they are despairing of their heart ever being renewed because God ordained them to wrath.

Again, "unfair, unfair" but "tyranny!, tyranny!"

**Hard to answer - posted by Psalm73 (), on: 2007/10/23 15:18**

I'll use good scripture to show you who is damned to hell, (wo to you scribes and pharises, hypocrites) and the common death of all men, is well death. Jesus Christ has compassion on sinners, yet he is the one with power.

The foolish bodies say in their hearts: Tush, there is no God.

Psalm 53 (faithofgod.net reformation O.T)

Corrupt are they, and become abominable in their wickednesses, there is not one that doth good.

53:2

God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that would understand, or seek after God.

53:3

But they are all gone out of the way, they are all become unprofitable: there is none that doth good, no not one.

Romans 3, these also have no fear of God before their eyes

**Re: Hard to answer - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 15:32**

Brothers ben and logic here is another question for you guys.

Who decides if a man goes to Heaven or Hell?

You will say, "man decides by his choice."

(Please note the following is completely hypothetical, and is not a description of my theology) :-D

But let's say that if possible a man decides that he will go to Heaven, and he does everything he thinks he needs to do to get there. When he dies, God says, "you may not enter".

Ultimately, who had the choice?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/10/23 16:29**

Rom 8:29 For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

Quote:

""

As I also asked, does God lie to Cain when He personally exhorts him and warns him of the choice before him?

In Christ  
Jeff""

You cannot have the real thing until He comes and is birthed in you. Able had a preview but not the composition of the whole accomplished and finished.

Ephesians 1:3-4 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing s in heavenly places in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

Where? "in Christ"

Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Able was not crucified with Christ. But He will have The Words of God put in His heart, when the earthly Kingdom of God comes in the millennial reign of Christ and His own, the Body of Christ the Church.

Hebrews 10:15-17 Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.

Then will Able be fulfilled, and God's promises to Israel, they will have their land and the promise of their earthly Kingdom with Christ on the throne of David.

Able could not have something, New Birth, "Born again of Spirit and water," (Born Again) that had not come yet. But He will have what is promised to God's chosen.

Only in the dispensation of the fullness of time can Christ be revealed in you.

Colossians 1:25-27 Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory:

Eph 1:10 That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; in him:

Israel will be on earth in the Kingdom that was promised to them, an earthly kingdom.

Where are we, the son's of God seated already?

Eph 3:2 If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward:

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 16:30**

I said:

Quote:

-----1. There is no place in scripture that says the atonement of the cross was only for the saved.

-----

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----Mat 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Mar 14:24 And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.

These line up pretty well with this-

Isa 53:11 He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

-----

None of these verses say that the atonement is only for the saved. They are only used that way once the misimplications of romans 1 and 9 have come into play.

These verses use the "lack of information" argument, you say that because they do not say "all" then you have an argument.

But I can sit here and pull out a list of near to 15 or 20 verses that clearly state the atonement was for all men.

Have you ever read the passage that Paul writes where he says this:

**Romans 5:15**

**15But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one (many be dead), much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded (unto many).**

If we use your logic of many, then from what Paul writes here, we can understand that not all were dead in sin.

I think again we have a logical error, and that you have read into a passage based of of a doctrinal statement on Roman s 1 and 9.

-----

Now, on your most recent post you asked this:

Quote:

-----Who decides if a man goes to Heaven or Hell?

You will say, "man decides by his choice."

(Please note the following is completely hypothetical, and is not a description of my theology)

But let's say that if possible a man decides that he will go to Heaven, and he does everything he thinks he needs to do to get there. When he dies, God says, "you may not enter".

Ultimately, who had the choice?

-----

In that particular hypothetical situation, God would have had the choice.

However, if you mean to say that that is any kind of actual scenario described in scripture, it is not.

And if you mean to reference it with revelations "I never knew you" speech, then you will have a sad time indeed attempting to prove that. There are two arguments against that. And I do not believe there is any evidence against them.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/23 16:43**

Quote:

-----

roaringlamb wrote:

Brothers ben and logic here is another question for you guys.

Who decides if a man goes to Heaven or Hell?

You will say, "man decides by his choice."

(Please note the following is completely hypothetical, and is not a description of my theology) :-D

But let's say that if possible a man decides that he will go to Heaven, and he does everything he thinks he needs to do to get there. When he dies, God says, "you may not enter".

Ultimately, who had the choice?

-----

God would be a liar if the man does what is needed, and God still says, "you may not enter".

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 16:54**

So now let us say a devout Muslim man, or an avowed atheist perish, and come before God. Neither will be saved because they rejected Christ (I think we both agree on this point). But what if their continued rejection (which appears as their free choice) is in reality because God has not given them the grace to believe, or has not drawn them to His Son. In Christ's days there were many who heard His words, saw His miracles, and yet did not believe. To the Pharisees He said, "you do not believe, BECAUSE you are not my sheep." (John 10), but went on to say, "my sheep hear my voice." If someone does not hear, it is because they are not one of the sheep.

Consider Christ's words to His disciples here-

Mat 13:13 Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

Mat 13:14 And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive:

Mat 13:15 For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.

Mat 13:16 But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear.

Is Jesus playing favorites here, or is He really solely concerned for those that were given Him by the Father? John also points out that Jesus did not commit Himself to all men, because He knew what was in them.

And we know that when Peter confessed Christ to be the Son of God, Jesus told him that flesh and blood had not revealed that to him, but the Father in Heaven.

What you attribute to man's will, is nothing more than God passing over people, or withholding grace from them.

No man anywhere, or at anytime can come to Christ unless God initiates a desire within him. To state otherwise is to deny the Bible, and to make Christ Himself out to be a liar.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/23 17:44**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----Consider Christ's words to His disciples here-

Mat 13:13 Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

Mat 13:14 And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive:

Mat 13:15 For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.

Mat 13:16 But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear.

Is Jesus playing favorites here, or is He really solely concerned for those that were given Him by the Father? John also points out that Jesus did not commit Himself to all men, because He knew what was in them.

And we know that when Peter confessed Christ to be the Son of God, Jesus told him that flesh and blood had not revealed that to him, but the Father in Heaven.

What you attribute to man's will, is nothing more than God passing over people, or withholding grace from them.

No man anywhere, or at anytime can come to Christ unless God initiates a desire within him. To state otherwise is to deny the Bible, and to make Christ Himself out to be a liar.

First, I would like to balance what you said by adding other scripture:

**Luke 13:34 O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!**

Now, I would like to point out that Jesus is speaking of the whole city here, which contained the same people that the verses you quoted mentioned, and Jesus declares that,

"He wants to gather them together to Himself, but they refused"

They did not refuse Him because God did not draw them, it says plainly there that God sent unto them prophets, and others, and that they stoned them and killed them.

Again, if you understood Romans 1, then you would understand what Jesus said to them in the verses you quoted, but what you have said is again unbalanced by other scripture, therefore it is false.

Another point I might add, John 10 is so easy to understand if you balance it by other scripture.

No other place in scripture says that Christ died only for His sheep, while it may say that He did die for His Sheep, it does not say that He only died for His sheep.

While it does say that He died for all men.

When Christ says you are not my sheep, what does that mean?

Well, if we read the verse where Christ explains it, we will know.

**John 10:27 27" My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me;**

There is the definition of "His sheep" by Jesus.

Jesus is revealing the order of salvation,

They hear Him, then He knows them, then they follow Him.

Seems very similar to,

The gospel preached, regeneration to those that believe, then the believer is a follower of Christ.

Coincidence? I don't think so, I think it is quite plain.

He is in essence saying, you do not believe me because you do not hear what I have to say. Those that hear me, believe me, I enter into relationship with them, and they follow me.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 19:30**

Quote:

-----The gospel preached, regeneration to those that believe, then the believer is a follower of Christ.

Yes, but regeneration causes them to believe, and persevere.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/23 19:40**

"What you attribute to man's will, is nothing more than God passing over people, or withholding grace from them."

Brother, just taking this statement, deep in your heart, what do you think about it? I am not asking what your theologians say, but what do you think? Knowing the terror, the eternal punishment, the continuing torment of hell for all eternity that awaits the lost, what pleasure or love could you have towards a god like that, if it were true? Be honest and answer from your heart, not a robotic repetition.

What would you think of a man who entered a burning house, carried out one child in one arm, but purposely left the other without so much as an attempt to call him out? Now these are only temporal flames, not eternal. How can you love a god who purposely for good pleasure would withhold nothing more than a call to save someone from eternal damnation? I say that is naturally impossible.

If you really believe that, as stated in 5 point theology, there is something at work that would allow you not to cry out as another brother said "Tyranny". We would not expect that from the worse of a man, let alone God who desires our love and worship. I know, you will say I am using human logic and feelings, and I have quoted no scripture. So many have already been quoted. I am just asking, do you really love a god who would do that? Can you really trust him? Does it not cause uncertainty about his character? Now this whole topic is one that has troubled me for years. I am being honest. Thoughts like this have plagued me over and over. Hearing this doctrine years ago, and tormented at times over it until I was shown the truth through prayer and God's mercy. It is still a hot spot at times, and sometimes it haunts me like a bad dream. Just what comfort can a god like this bring anyone? To what end does it bring to constantly buttress this type of God? Why don't Calvinist preachers start off with this, instead of it being an "enlightened" doctrine for the advanced? Probably because if it was preached up front, there would be no converts! I do not know why I even read these posts on this topic, I would be better off leaving this one alone.

But what if God is really like the god of Calvinism? I wonder how many souls have anguished over the centuries? No one can say that there are some difficult passages, but all in all, the scriptures do not side with a god like Calvin's. Whatever mysteries election may hold that we do not know or understand, you cannot ignore the free will of man, the pleading to choose life, the desire of God that all men be saved. But I know I am beating a dead horse repeating scriptures that have already been stated over and over. It (Calvinism) contradicts conscience, logic, and most importantly revealed scripture. The best case that can be made by this type of thinking is always presupposition and conjecture, never direct scriptures taken.



en in full context. Yet multitudes are in scripture stating directly Gods desire for all to be saved, pleading with the lost, turning from sin, etc. You do not have to force meaning or wrench context for that argument. You must change meanings of words, ignore opposing scriptures, and do severe injustice to the texts to adhere to 5 point calvanism. This is not against any person, but it is against the doctrine. This doctrine is damaging to many people, when it rears its head I have a problem keeping silent. But I still love the brothers! (And sisters) weather calvinists or not!  
God bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/23 20:12**

I am new to posting on here, I just read the community rules. I may have sounded a little harsh in my two posts here, if so I ask forgiveness. I think I already made clear why I this topic pushes a button for me, but I will try to watch more carefully how I express myself in the future. God bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/23 20:37**

Quote:

-----  
roaringlamb wrote:

So now let us say a devout Muslim man, or an avowed atheist perish, and come before God. Neither will be saved because they rejected Christ(I think we both agree on this point). But what if their continued rejection(which appears as their free choice) is in reality because God has not given them the grace to believe, or has not drawn them to His Son.

-----  
Then that god is not all loving nor is he infinitely gracious.

Quote:

----- In Christ's days there were many who heard His words, saw His miracles, and yet did not believe. To the Pharisees He said, "you do not believe, BECAUSE you are not my sheep."(John 10), but went on to say, "my sheep hear my voice." If someone does not hear, it is because they are not one of the sheep.

-----  
They are not His sheep because they hate Him, that is why they do not believe.

Quote:

-----What you attribute to man's will, is nothing more than God passing over people, or withholding grace from them.

-----  
What you attribute to God is a god that no one would come to because he is not great, awesome and holy.  
If you told sinners about this god, they would hate him not because of his righteousness, but because he is a devil.

What you attribute to God is a god that is not all loving and very finite in grace.

What you attribute to God is a god that surely does not condemn for sin, as this verse that you love so well and take out of context proves:

**Rom 9:11** the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil

**Rom 9:13** Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated

Quote:

-----No man anywhere, or at anytime can come to Christ unless God initiates a desire within him. To state otherwise is to deny the Bible, and to make Christ Himself out to be a liar.

-----  
To state otherwise is to know what one is talking about.

Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/23 20:49

Hi Bob,

I don't think you were harsh. I was about to post a thank you for your heart's cry and how well you articulated not just concern, but torment.

In the UK, we don't have much of this brand of Calvinism.

When I read a phrase like 'election of grace', something inside me knows it is something about the person choosing to receive grace from God, rather than God's supercilious choosing of a person against their cognition... somehow forcing them into a relationship with Him which did not require their consent. By any standard, that would not be love.

A point I heard made by a preacher, once, was to do with the Lamb's book of life. The way he explained what he'd noticed in scripture, is that all names start out already there - because Jesus died for all - the Lamb was slain from before the foundation of the world - but, as people are born, and have the opportunity to choose Christ and eternal life, so their names either stay in the book, or are blotted out.

Made sense to me.

In Tyndale's 1534 New Testament, there are two or three places where he refers to the fellowship saints have with one another.

Tyndale was great on the love of God, and how it is by love the laws written on our hearts are interpreted. I believe this ties in with an understanding there is a third love commandment - 'Love one another'. So then, the whole population of earth was predestined to salvation, but not many receive it. Being in the minority, unity becomes a vital attribute of the church, because as He was rejected, so will we be. Nevertheless, as believers find one another and strengthen one another, such as the body of Christ is on earth, it can be effective.

I know I've roamed around a bit here, and not addressed scriptures but I have an overwhelming sense that after Peter had told the Lord to depart because he was a sinful man, and then watched in horror while He was mocked and crucified, he also had an overwhelming sense of his own unworthiness of such a Man. When the Holy Ghost came, there was a sense amongst those early believers, of how much they did not deserve such a salvation. All those animal sacrifices for over a thousand years had made them understand something about the intransigence of sin, and they knew that it was God's grace alone which had opened up a way by which they could enter into fellowship with Him.

I moot that 'such as should be saved' is a best-attempt at trying to express the wonder the apostles felt as they preached Christ crucified, and watched faith rise in some hearts who had never heard this before and who had never known personally the beauty of Jesus the Man, as they had, and by the Holy Spirit they were born again also.

Another thought (sorry I'm going on longer than I had planned) is that there is similarity in the way God set Isaiah up when he was in the Holy of Holies, by asking the question in his hearing 'Who will go for us?' (Do we really think God didn't know what was going on in Isaiah's heart? And He wanted to hear Isaiah say the equivalent of 'I will' because that's what makes a relationship.) and when He knew Adam had gone along with Eve's bright idea but still He came out calling 'Where are you?' Then 'Have you ....? (again, as if He didn't know!\\) That was God helping Adam out. Instead of Adam having to put his whole confession into his own abject words, he just had to say 'yes'.... because of God's generous mercy towards men. Peace on earth... goodwill. Amen.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/23 20:52**

Welcome brother, and no I do not think you have been harsh at all.

Brother no matter what someone believes about salvation, each group must face the fact that men will be lost. This is never something to be taken lightly, but it is a fact because men love darkness rather than light. Until the desire of the heart is changed, they will continue that way.

So you believe that men are lost because they "choose" to be, but God has done all He could to save them(if this is not your view, please forgive me. It seems to be the logical opposite). Thus you have a God who is weak and cannot change men's hearts apart from co-operation from man.

I believe that man is incapable of salvation apart from God's grace giving men faith to believe. Thus the problem is with man and not with God.

We need to move away from the idea that man is neutral towards God and can be swayed either for God, or against God. The natural mind is against God, and the heart is set upon only pleasing self. This does not sound like a heart that is able to swing one way or the other.

Either way, may God bless you,, and keep you.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/10/24 2:47**

Quote:

"I believe that man is incapable of salvation apart from God's grace giving men faith to believe. Thus the problem is with man and not with God."

Great statement:

That is what Grace is all about. Not necessarily for salvation, although it has a deep working in it. Grace is so God can deal with man before he believes and also after he believes and is born again. Then Grace allows God to work with man even when he messes up.

Predestination is to that effect in Grace, not the predestination of some to be saved and some not. Predestination is by Grace to the effect that God in salvation can deal with Man because he now has Jesus Christ in him, which God sees and that is how he will deal with us in Grace, because not He deals in us and to us by the Son, through the Holy Spirit.

Ephesians 1:3-6 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.

Predestination always has to do with God dealing with us in Christ, not in our salvation as choosing some to death or some to life. Still God is dealing with man in the dispensation of Grace, meaning He can seek us, because we won't seek Him. Then when we believe what He says about His only Begotten Son, He can then birth Him in the believer.

Did Adam choose Satan or believe him?

He did not choose him but he did believe him and that is why the whole human race is in Satan until Christ came and defeated him at the Cross and provided the way we can believe The Father about the Son.

Ephesians 1:7-12 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will: That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.

Predestinated and Dealt with in Christ, not in salvations choice by man, but God providing the faith that we might believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

Galatians 2:16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

And by Christ in you the Hope of Glory, His faith brings forth the life of Christ in us.

Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/24 12:22**

roaringlab wrote:

Quote:

-----Yes, but regeneration causes them to believe, and persevere.  
-----

This is a doctrinal statement from a sect of the faith, it is not found in scripture.

When a man believes, he is then saved. For it is and the point of belief that righteousness is imputed to a man, and that is what regeneration is.

If a man was regenerated prior to believing, that would mean that he was saved before he believed. Which is undeniably contradictory to scripture.  
-----

Quote:

-----I believe that man is incapable of salvation apart from God's grace giving men faith to believe. Thus the problem is with man and not with God.

We need to move away from the idea that man is neutral towards God and can be swayed either for God, or against God. The natural mind is against God, and the heart is set upon only pleasing self. This does not sound like a heart that is able to swing one way or the other.  
-----

Brother, I have already shown through both the old and new testaments how Christ took the captivity of sin captive, giving men the opportunity to believe on Him of their own will.

That issue in and of itself is an example of the length that God has gone to save men, and yet men in their freedom, not many men have chosen to humble themselves and serve God.

I don't know how many times it has to be stated that man is not neutral towards God, he is opposed to God because he does not want his wickedness exposed by God.

That is why Jesus said:

**John 3:19 19And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.**

He further said that men will not come to the light because their deeds were evil.

He does not say that men cannot come to the light because their deeds are evil, he says they will not. Two very, very different things.

-----

Quote:

-----Thus you have a God who is weak and cannot change men's hearts apart from co-operation from man.

-----

This is an age old argument from a calvinist, and I would think that if they examined the scriptures, they would see how fallable it is, let's balance this argument with scripture shall we.

### Romans 10:13-15

**13For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.**

**14How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?**

**15And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!**

HOW SHALL THEY HEAR WITHOUT A PREACHER?

Surely Paul who wrote Romans 1 and 9 knew that God would "save His chosen" no matter what the believers did.

Or was he just teaching false doctrine?

How shall who hear? The chosen of God?

Is Paul saying that the only way the chosen will be saved is by other chosen preaching to them?

You cannot redeem this passage to your doctrinal statements. You have an inflated view of the sovereignty of God in salvation, and so you are blind to what the scripture says.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/24 13:47**

Quote:

-----If a man was regenerated prior to believing, that would mean that he was saved before he believed. Which is undeniably contradictory to scripture.

-----

John 3:3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

"See" is the Greek eido which means to understand, to see etc. If a man is not "born from above" as it is literally in the Greek, he cannot understand or discern spiritual things. This lines up perfectly with Paul's words here-  
1Co 2:14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

This is also why Paul could say this-

1Co 1:18 For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.

There are many other verses that show that faith is a gift from God, and proceeds from a new heart. How can a heart th

at is contrary and hating of God suddenly change itself to now love God, and seek His ways. How can a man know he is a sinner apart from revelation from the Holy Spirit? If a man understands that Christ has died for his sins, this is because he is born again, it is not the cause.

Quote:  
-----He does not say that men cannot come to the light because their deeds are evil, he says they will not. Two very, very different things.  
-----

They cannot come because they are blinded by satan, and do not want to come. The natural man would rather spit upon Christ than submit to Him. If anything this only proves that the heart must be changed, the desires must be changed, and only God can do that. Faith is the fruit of a regenerate heart, and this causes men to no longer hide from the light, but to walk in it. This causes a man to no longer curse God, and hate Him, but rather love Him, and obey Him.

If you think you changed your own heart, you are practicing idolatry by taking responsibility for what only God can do. No man can convict himself of sin, or convince himself of his need to be saved, that work is God's alone.

Quote:  
-----Romans 10:13-15  
-----

How about we look at what Paul says before your selected verses-

Romans 10:11 For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.

Romans 10:12 **For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.**

Now Paul comes to your verse-

Rom 10:13 For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

The point here is that God no longer favors Jew above Gentile, but that whoever believes may be saved.

I don't see what the argument is, I full agree that whoever believes will be saved. But only God can cause people to believe by renewing their hearts, and giving them the gift of faith.

Quote:  
-----Is Paul saying that the only way the chosen will be saved is by other chosen preaching to them?  
-----

Look at verses 16 and 17-

Rom 10:16 But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?

Rom 10:17 So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

Why did they not all believe? Because they did not hear the "word" which here is rhema. God uses the Gospel to speak faith into a person (inward calling and outward calling as you and I spoke of quite awhile back), that is why it is imperative that the Gospel be preached to all people everywhere. God will call His own to Christ through this, and since we do not know who is elect and who is not, we preach to all and let God give life as He sees fit.

Quote:  
-----You cannot redeem this passage to your doctrinal statements. You have an inflated view of the sovereignty of God in salvation, and so you are blind to what the scripture says.  
-----

Brother either He is or He is not. If one created thing was out of His control, He would cease to be Sovereign and omnipotent.

otent. If He did not know everything at all times He would cease to be omniscient, and if He was not everywhere at the same time, He would cease to be omnipresent.

That would mean He would not be the God presented in Scripture, which would mean I would be following an idol that suited my own intellect and idea of fairness. A god who was much like me, only bigger, kind of like a super hero.

I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep me until that day.

**Re: - posted by Psalm73 (), on: 2007/10/24 16:40**

I would answer that to be safe, you must turn from idols. I mean the glaring statue that poses as Christ or as Paul. Calling upon strange gods, then going about making vows, because you think you're saved. Jesus Christ has to save you through the fire of adversity, and it would be something we all would be afraid of. But fear thou not. Mark 10 (W.Tyndale N.T) 14 When Jesus saw that, he was displeased, and said to them: Suffer the children to come unto me and forbid them not. For unto such belongeth the kingdom of God.  
15 Verily I say to you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a child, he shall not enter therein (<http://www.faithofgod.net>) Where the Tyndale N.T is

These have not obeyed the gospel, in that they still go blindly, following some blasphemies. Using men's commandments, and doctrines, which having a similitude of godly living, deny the power thereof, such abhor.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/24 17:11**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----John 3:3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

"See" is the Greek eido which means to understand, to see etc. If a man is not "born from above" as it is literally in the Greek, he cannot understand or discern spiritual things.  
-----

Actually, according to strong's, that is not the definition of the word see, it means to "see". Wow, it doesn't have a hidden meaning.

"a-don"

- 1) to see
  - a) to perceive with the eyes
  - b) to perceive by any of the senses
  - c) to perceive, notice, discern, discover
- d) to see
  - 1) i.e. to turn the eyes, the mind, the attention to anything
  - 2) to pay attention, observe
  - 3) to see about something
    - a) i.e. to ascertain what must be done about it
  - 4) to inspect, examine
  - 5) to look at, behold
  - e) to experience any state or condition
  - f) to see i.e. have an interview with, to visit
- 2) to know
  - a) to know of anything
  - b) to know, i.e. get knowledge of, understand, perceive
    - 1) of any fact
    - 2) the force and meaning of something which has definite meaning
    - 3) to know how, to be skilled in

**c) to have regard for one, cherish, pay attention to (1Th. 5:12)**

So we can see this argument already beginning to fade, let's examine the rest of these scriptures, in context, rather than just pulled out of a book.

Quote:  
-----1Co 2:14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.  
-----

ok roaringlamb, I am not going to quote the whole chapter of 1 corinthians 2, because it is quite long, but you are going to have to stop pulling things out of context to make points.

Paul says absolutely nothing about the issue of salvation, or the sovereignty of God anywhere in the chapter, neither does the chapter's context reveal that to be what Paul was talking about.

What Paul is talking about is depending on the wisdom of God rather than the wisdom of man. And he goes on to say that a natural man cannot discern the deep wisdom of God, that it is foolishness to him because it is a spiritual thing.

So anyone who read this would immediately understand that Paul is saying that a natural man cannot understand the deep things of God because they are spiritual.

Nowhere does Paul say that a natural man cannot understand the gospel, that is not found in this passage, nor is it found in any passage.

You have once again ignored the context, and used a doctrinal statement to interpret the passage, rather than use the passage to interpret itself.

Quote:  
-----1Co 1:18 For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.  
-----

You are reading into this verse far too much, it does not say what you imply unless you cross reference it with the other verses that you just took out of context.

I am going to use a very simple verse to show you a simple meaning that should be plain without me even doing this.

**John 3:16 "For God so (A)loved the world, that He (B)gave His (C)only begotten Son, that whoever (D)believes in Him shall not perish, but have eternal life.**

Now let's take this step by step,

- 1.Those that believe in Him are not perishing.
- 2.Those that do not believe in Him are perishing.

Ok, now let's take what Paul said and compare it to this simple truth found throughout the rest of scripture.

**1Co 1:18 For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish (DO NOT BELIEVE IT) foolishness; but unto us which are saved (BELIEVE IT) it is the power of God.**

Now, that is what that verse means, not the twisted definition that is drawn from the bad context of the other two verses that you misinterpreted.



Quote:  
-----They cannot come because they are blinded by satan, and do not want to come. The natural man would rather spit upon Christ than submit to Him. If anything this only proves that the heart must be changed, the desires must be changed, and only God can do that. Faith is the fruit of a regenerate heart, and this causes men to no longer hide from the light, but to walk in it. This causes a man to no longer curse God, and hate Him, but rather love Him, and obey Him.

If you think you changed your own heart, you are practicing idolatry by taking responsibility for what only God can do. No man can convict himself of sin, or convince himself of his need to be saved, that work is God's alone.  
-----

This again is a doctrinal statement, and it is based mostly off of the few verses that you misinterpreted, and also a misinterpretation of Romans 1.

The scriptures do not say that natural man cannot come, it says he will not, and the difference is apparent.

I have shown the bad contextual interpretation that brings about this conclusion, and without the prior, this point falls apart as well.

Now let me state so that the record is clear, I did not change my own heart, God did. I did not save myself, God did. But he saved me because I believed, I did not believe because he saved me, that is contrary to the order that scripture teaches in salvation.

And I challenge you to show an example through scripture, where a man was saved before he believed.  
-----

Quote:  
-----How about we look at what Paul says before your selected verses-  
Romans 10:11 For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.  
Romans 10:12 For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.

Now Paul comes to your verse-  
Rom 10:13 For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

The point here is that God no longer favors Jew above Gentile, but that whoever believes may be saved.

I don't see what the argument is, I full agree that whoever believes will be saved. But only God can cause people to believe by renewing their hearts, and giving them the gift of faith.  
-----

While I agree with the first two statements that you made there, and part of the third, where you say, "whoever believes shall be saved," which proves only further the point that belief comes before salvation, I do not agree with your last statement there.

That pattern of salvation is not a biblical one, you cannot show that pattern outlined in scripture at all. Like I have said before, it is a doctrine that is taught, and all of its conclusions revolve around itself, and not what scripture shows.

I refer you to my earlier challenge of showing this outlined in scripture, and let me further add to the challenge that it must be in context, not a verse from here, a verse from there, I want to see a real passage that teaches that concept all by itself.  
-----

Quote:  
-----Why did they not all believe? Because they did not hear the "word" which here is rhema. God uses the Gospel to speak faith into a person (inward calling and outward calling as you and I spoke of quite awhile back), that is why it is imperative that the Gospel be preached to all people everywhere. God will call His own to Christ through this, and since we do not know who is elect and who is not, we preach to all and let God give life as He sees fit.  
-----

Does God do this as well, preach to everyone because He doesn't know who the elect are?

I refer you again to where God tells cain that he "can" be accepted.

Either God does what you do, or you are wrong. It cannot be both ways, God told cain he had the ability to be accepted, and it was either true or a lie. You can ignore it, but God does not lie. So you have a problem.

-----

Quote:  
-----Brother either He is or He is not. If one created thing was out of His control, He would cease to be Sovereign and omnipotent. If He did not know everything at all times He would cease to be omniscient, and if He was not everywhere at the same time, He would cease to be omnipresent.

That would mean He would not be the God presented in Scripture, which would mean I would be following an idol that suited my own intellect and idea of fairness. A god who was much like me, only bigger, kind of like a super hero.

I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep me until that day.

-----

God's sovereignty is in no way threatened by man's ability to choose, God said, "choose" or "repent", and that is His sovereign declaration concerning salvation for all mankind.

God's will was from the beginning to have all men completely surrendered to Him, if you deny this, then you say that it was as God's will that man sin.

In the same way, you say that satan is under God's will, so satan was actually doing God's will in tempting man, yet the scripture tells us that God tempts no man, according to James.

-----

One other thing, inward and outward calling the way you use them is not found in the scripture, Jay never could show me that concept in scripture. When God speaks to a man, He does not speak to his brain, or his skin, He speaks to the spirit of a man, every time.

I challenge you with that to demonstrate one passage of scripture where God says something to a man, any man saved or non, and prove that it is either an inward, or an outward calling, and not both at the same time.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/24 18:25**

"Brother no matter what someone believes about salvation, each group must face the fact that men will be lost. This is never something to be taken lightly, but it is a fact because men love darkness rather than light. Until the desire of the heart is changed, they will continue that way.

So you believe that men are lost because they "choose" to be, but God has done all He could to save them(if this is not your view, please forgive me. It seems to be the logical opposite). Thus you have a God who is weak and cannot change men's hearts apart from co-operation from man."

Brother, just to clarify, I realize many, if not the majority will be lost. That was not my point. My point was the Calvinist view that God double predestinates, thereby appointing most men to hell without a thing they can do, another word created for the slaughter. Now this is the belief in a nutshell. One can dance all around it, changing context in mid stream, and going in different directions, but that is the end result of this theology plain and simple. How could anyone really love or trust a god like that? One who commands us to love, who says he hates a false balance, gives warning to those who call good evil and evil good, etc? What in the entire universe could be worse than to create a soul, billions of them for that matter, and condemn them to hell for being sinners, creating them that way, and punishing them eternally for what they cannot help or stop doing, with no remedy or even lifting a hand to help them? (or passing them by as said before?) This defies logic! (sorry Bro logic, I mean all human logic!) How could you even defend this god, let alone love him? When I hear these things, how it brings back memories of the struggle I previously mentioned which I loath. The basis of judgement is men refused to come to the light. The offer is there, to reject, then judgement is understandable. To reject the supreme sacrifice of the eternal living God, that demands eternal punishment. But to condemn a man, or multitudes for no other

er reason than good pleasure, now that is evil beyond description. And again, I contend that no thinking person who believes this to be true can really love a god like that. We are not wired for such internal contradiction. It does not follow reason or scripture, but I see I am repeating myself.

One thing I do not understand, some calvinists will claim God is good to them (the damned) on earth, rain on the just and unjust, and say that is God's goodness to them. Someone else said that is like giving a man a steak dinner before you kill him. Good things, even if a perfect life was given to a man for say 70 years, compared to eternity in hell fire does not constitute God being good to anyone. That is cruelty, not goodness. It would be more "good" to torture him on earth so that he has no conception of what "good" is. Then he would have no point of reference to compare the torture, and the torture would be at least something he is accustomed to.

(It would be better to have never tasted a steak, then to have one, and then have one held a foot away and smell it and never be able to bite into one again - and let's make this even more applicable, to have that happen for all eternity.) God doing all He can to save someone equated to God being weak: That is so far from reality. With that line of thinking, we could conclude God is weak because Satan rebelled, God is weak because man rebels, Jesus said for us to pray "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven", thereby proving God's perfect will is NOT being done on earth - (it must mean He is a weak God??) - (God wills that none should perish, but that ALL should repent and be saved - they are not, so He again must be weak) One could go on and on with this line of thinking. This has nothing to do with a weak God, but the result of wanting a creature who would FREELY love Him without coercion, the result being that not all in His creation, for a limited time, would allow things to not be "On earth as it is in Heaven". You see, my definition of God is much more supreme and sovereign than Calvin's, mine says God can maintain His sovereignty, and also allow free will to operate together. I cannot explain how that is, but it is true. Maybe the JW's have that answer to, or maybe Calvin? Why is it so hard for Calvinists to get this? The arguments never seem to directly address to what is being discussed.

Do you know why JW's become JW's? Well, at least a majority because the JW have an answer for everything. A neat tidy religion that answers all the mysteries perfectly. There is mystery to election, I cannot argue that. I have my beliefs but I may not have it down pat. There is also mystery to once saved always saved, vs you can lose it. Both sides can quote scriptures up and down, just like this debate. (I do believe you can lose it by the way, if you walk away from Christ, not abiding in Him by your own free will - yes. And yes, I believe we have one, but in the end, if you didn't have salvation to begin with, or lost it, the end result is the same)

My point is these things cannot always be tied up into a neat little package. Anyone who denies free choice or election (properly defined) is off base. Both are true, but one cannot cancel the other. Truth lies between the extremes. When a man, Calvin, could not reconcile with his limited brain the whole council of God, he went to far, along with his many followers in coming up with the neat package I mentioned. But in saying that, it is not even a neat package, it is full of contradictions. Please help me understand my Calvinist friends, how do you swallow this and stay sane? I ask this humbly, I can't understand it at all. Please answer the question, HOW can you love the god you defend if this is his ways and methods?

I am not sure what to think about all this discussion, it can be very frustrating. I wonder if it accomplishes anything? At minimum it shows we care about truth and the things of God. All we need to do now is have our Calvinist brothers see the light!

God bless, Bob

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/24 18:49

Quote:  
-----So we can see this argument already beginning to fade, let's examine the rest of these scriptures, in context, rather than just pulled out of a book.  
-----

Not at all brother, because man must still believe to be saved. Since man does not have free will to determine himself to be saved, it must come from somewhere else i.e. the new birth.

Scripture does not talk of man being born by his own decision, but rather God's choice of whom He will.

What you seem to ignore or do not wish to explain is how is it that a man believes? Who causes him to believe in what he previously thought was foolishness?

Look at Jesus' words here to the Jews-

John 8:42 Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.

John 8:43 Why do ye not understand my speech? even because **ye cannot hear my word.**

Is this because they were deaf? or is Jesus speaking of a different "hearing" that a natural man does not have, and must be given?

Quote:  
-----ok roaringlamb, I am not going to quote the whole chapter of 1 corinthians 2, because it is quite long, but you are going to have to stop pulling things out of context to make points.  
-----

Brother the "wisdom" Paul is speaking of is Christ's crucifixion, and the Gospel. Therefore it firmly shows that Paul is speaking of the natural man not being able to understand the Gospel.

Is the Gospel spiritual, and must it be applied by the Spirit? If so, how can a natural unspiritual man receive it. How can a man even comprehend "conviction of sin" without a new heart when his natural heart loved his sin and left on its own would continue in that state?

Quote:  
-----Now, that is what that verse means, not the twisted definition that is drawn from the bad context of the other two verses that you misinterpreted.  
-----

So you would say that a man apart from the Spirit may at any time "choose" Christ, and enlighten himself? While Christ said that the Spirit convicts of sin.

Quote:  
-----Now let me state so that the record is clear, I did not change my own heart, God did. I did not save myself, God did. But he saved me because I believed, I did not believe because he saved me, that is contrary to the order that scripture teaches in salvation.

And I challenge you to show an example through scripture, where a man was saved before he believed.  
-----

God did not save you "because" you believed, you "believed" because God gave you faith, and your heart was regenerated to believe.

I do not know the time period in which they happen, but in many times it is simultaneously, the new birth provides faith, and the two are intertwined with each other, but the birth precedes life.

Quote:  
-----That pattern of salvation is not a biblical one, you cannot show that pattern outlined in scripture at all. Like I have said before, it is a doctrine that is taught, and all of its conclusions revolve around itself, and not what scripture shows.

I refer you to my earlier challenge of showing this outlined in scripture, and let me further add to the challenge that it must be in context, not a verse from here, a verse from there, I want to see a real passage that teaches that concept all by itself.  
-----

Eph 2:1 And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;  
Eph 2:2 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:  
Eph 2:3 Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.  
Eph 2:4 But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,  
Eph 2:5 Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)

2Ti 2:24 And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient,  
2Ti 2:25 In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; **if God peradventure will give them repentance to th**

**e acknowledging of the truth;**

**2Ti 2:26 And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.**

Act 16:14 And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us : **whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.**

Quote:

-----Either God does what you do, or you are wrong. It cannot be both ways, God told Cain he had the ability to be accepted, and it was either true or a lie. You can ignore it, but God does not lie. So you have a problem.  
-----

Brother again Cain could have been accepted by God, if he would have accepted God's way of sacrifice, that is the point there. The very point that he would not only shows that natural men cannot change themselves, and rather rebel. But God still gives them mercy. To put it in a simple way, for the unbeliever, Earth is the closest they will ever get to Heaven, while for the child of God, Earth is the closest they will get to hell.

God could have destroyed Cain and been just, as He could with all of society. However God gave him life, and mercy.

Quote:

-----God's will was from the beginning to have all men completely surrendered to Him, if you deny this, then you say that it was God's will that man sin.

In the same way, you say that Satan is under God's will, so Satan was actually doing God's will in tempting man, yet the scripture tells us that God tempts no man, according to James.  
-----

God ordained that sin entered the human race, and He allowed the human race to continue to this day. God has ordained demons to hell, and angels to Heaven. All things are under His control and guidance.

Satan is under God's rule, and cannot do anything but what is allowed by God. Even in the book of Job, we see God allowing Satan to test Job.

It was God's will for Job to be tested, was it not?

God from all eternity did by the most wise and counsel of His own will, freely, and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass. Yet in all of this, He remains holy, and in no way violates a man's will. We see God do this with Assyria in raising them up to chasten Israel. Though the Assyrians were being a tool in God's hand, they wanted to destroy Israel and so delighted in this.

God created Satan, and allowed him to bring sin into the world. If God did not want sin to exist, it would not, but this does not mean He has stepped back and left us all to our own ways. He reigns and as the Psalms say- "our God is in the heavens and He has done whatever He has pleased"(Psalm 115:3)

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/24 19:07**

So here's a question for all involved in this discussion.

If a man is presented with the Gospel, and is not saved, why is this?

Why is it that some believe and some do not, when all of us start off dead in sin? Who gives the life, who causes us to believe and not others?

Why is this?

Why do some have faith, while others do not in light of the fact that faith is a gift from God?

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/24 21:03**

John 3 is not "regeneration"; John 3 is saying one must be "born from above" or "born again", "born of the Spirit".

If one is "born of the Spirit", that one has Eternal life already(John 17:3), that means "saved".

If one does not have eternal life, that one is not able to enter into the kingdom of God(John 3:5).

"Entering into the kingdom of God(John 3:5)" is the same as "seeing the kingdom of God(John 3:3)"

**Titus 3:5** not by works in righteousness which we had done, but according to His mercy, He saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit

In other words, becoming new again from the washing away of sin with the Holy Spirit's renovation, that is how we are saved.

**1 Peter 1:23** Being born again(begotten again), not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abides for ever.

In other words: We have eternal life(born again) by incorruptible Seed(God as our Father).

The word "seed" is Greek "spora": a sowing, that is by implication, a descent from parents.

If one is "born again", one simultaneously has God as his own Father, and therefore, already saved.

One must not say the "regeneration" or the "new birth" comes before salvation, they are one and the same.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/24 21:04**

"So here's a question for all involved in this discussion.

If a man is presented with the Gospel, and is not saved, why is this?"

John 5:39-40 "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye WILL NOT come to me, that ye may have eternal life.

Note: you WILL NOT come that you MAY HAVE eternal life. That is a choice, it says or implies nothing of a secret doctrine. Was Jesus upfront and honest in His appeal, or not? Was He lying, or offering something that could not be obtained by who he was speaking to, or not? The direct context is, the choice to receive a free gift was offered, and rejected.

9:41 Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye would have no sin; but now ye say, we see; therefore your sin remaineth. Pride kept this sinner out of the kingdom, as all others who reject the terms of the Gospel. The gift offered, the gift rejected. (Romans 9:30-33 - , read it all, but vs 32 - Wherefore, because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law, for they stumbled at that stumbling stone" (Jesus -the cross)

12:47 And if ANY man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the WORLD, but to save the WORLD.

Note: ANY man, not some. World means world, not the world of the elect)

He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same will judge him on the last day.

Note. He that REJECTS ME. Again, no secret society, no secret doctrine. HE that rejects - it is called accountability - rejection of truth. Pride of man. (Romans 10:3 For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not SUBMITTED THEMSELVES unto the righteousness of God" Accountable, or not? Elected not to submit by decree? 11:23 - And they also, if they abide not in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again.

15:22 If I had not come, and spoken unto them, they would have no sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin.

Why do some men accept, and others reject the Gospel? This is a very small sample of scripture to answer your question brother. How many more do you need? Please, lay down all the books pray, and ask God to show you the truth about this. We may never in this life have all the answers, but this path of the secret and enlightened doctrine is just incredible!

How can you ignore so many scriptures that contradict this theory?

God bless, Bob

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/24 21:25

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:

So here's a question for all involved in this discussion.

If a man is presented with the Gospel, and is not saved, why is this?

-----  
You reject the answer, or, you reject the truth to that question.

Quote:

-----Why is it that some believe and some do not, when all of us start off dead in sin? Who gives the life, who causes us to believe and not others?  
-----

Your theology, is seriously flawed, because you put a different meaning to what Paul meant by "dead in your trespasses and sins".

Using your theology, we could just as well say that those who are spiritually dead cannot make moral judgments, choose to do any good, or acknowledge any truth, since physically dead people can't do those things either.

Like all analogies, there are similarities that can be seen between physical and spiritual death, but, like all analogies, there are limits.

You are taking the term spiritually dead to far in what it is supposed to mean.

"dead in your trespasses and sins"( Col 2:13) means that unregenerate man has no relationship with Christ because of his sin. It does not mean that man is incapable of making a choice to repent, just as it evidently does not imply the unregenerate's inability to make any other choice, including moral choices.

Unregenerate people have the capacity to choose between doing what is right and or wrong, and receiving Christ is a moral decision. People make choices all the time to obey or disobey from their own consciences. The unregenerate are not so evil that they are incapable of choosing to obey.

So what is the difference between any other moral choice that an unregenerate person makes and the moral choice to repent and follow Jesus?

It is evident that people who are "dead in their trespasses and sins" are capable of submitting to God.

Quote:

-----Why do some have faith, while others do not in light of the fact that faith is a gift from God?  
-----

Where does it say that faith is a gift, do not use Eph 2:8.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/24 22:16

Quote:

-----If one is "born of the Spirit", that one has Eternal life already(John 17:3), that means "saved".  
-----

Interesting that you would use this verse, because look what Jesus says before this-

John 17:2 As thou hast given him(Christ) power over all flesh, that he(Christ) should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

So let's see what is being said here-

Christ says that He gives eternal life to those whom the Father has given Him, and that eternal life is the knowledge of God and of His Son Jesus Christ.

What do you make of Christ's words to Peter-

Matthew 16:16 And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Matthew 16:17 And Jesus answered and said unto him, **Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.**

No one has answered what Christ meant when He said that no man could come to Him unless they were drawn by the Father.

As far as being dead in sin, I have never said that this means men cannot do moral, or good deeds so please do not add to my words. I have said that because of this deadness, they must be given life to be spiritual and man cannot do this. God and God alone must give life just as He did the day each of us was born into this world.

How much control did you have over choosing your parents, or when you were born? That's about as much control as you had over your re-birth as well. The wind blows where it will brothers.

Quote:

-----One must not say the "regeneration" or the "new birth" comes before salvation, they are one and the same.  
-----

I don't think I've ever said anything to the contrary. But they are from God and God alone. The fruit of these is faith in Christ, because now I understand my sin, and need for Christ, and take Him as Lord and Saviour.

Apart from God working in man first though, no man would choose this, or see his sin as it is the work of the Holy Spirit to convict of sin.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/24 22:23**

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:

I don't think I've ever said anything to the contrary.

Yah, but you do take the term dead in sin out of it's true meaning.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/24 22:33**

Brother bob,

I don't know why you did not include this verse first though-

John 5:21 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; **even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.**

The Son gives life to whom He will, it's His choice and not determined upon merit or works of ours.

Quote:

-----Please, lay down all the books pray, and ask God to show you the truth about this  
-----

And cannot I say the same to you brother?

It is because men forsook "the books" as you say that we are in this mess in the first place. Paul had to deal with "free-will worship", as did Augustine, as did the Reformers, as did the Church in the 1800's.

The semi-Pelagian ghost seems to be throttling the Church, and many of the complaints voiced by people here and in the professing church at large are a direct result of this flawed view of man, and a idolatrous view of God.

I have prayed, and prayed some more, have lost friends, have been labeled "out of my mind", but it is all worth it because I know Him, and that is what I rejoice in.



I would not have even posted on this thread except for the demeaning tone in which ben spoke of those who hold to Calvinist doctrine.

By the way, I have yet to read a book by Calvin, looking forward to getting the Institutes though.

**Re: All Men Everywhere - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/24 22:42**

Quote:

-----If God is completely sovereign in salvation, and if His word does not return to Him void,  
-----

I don't know why I didn't see this earlier, providence I suppose.

Ben, you misquote that verse about God's word not returning to Him void. Here is what it says-  
Isaiah 55:11 So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: **it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.**

Notice it will accomplish what God pleases. Thus the word preached either softens or hardens the hearts of those that hear it.

The word works God's will. To the elect it produces faith, to the non-elect it condemns and leaves God with an even longer rap sheet against them as they store up wrath against the day of wrath.

Seeing also as we are all made from the same lump of clay, the difference is not in the clay, but in the Potter and what He makes of the clay.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/25 10:10**

I don't know why you did not include this verse first though-

John 5:21 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.

The Son gives life to whom He will, it's His choice and not determined upon merit or works of ours.

Brother Roaringlamb, I am at work on break so I only have a min, "He gives life to whom He will" Why is that an issue? God sets the terms, no problem with that scripture for me at all. To who does God give anything? To him who is of a humble heart, to the poor in spirit, to those who sense the working of the Holy Spirit and respond (Yes I believe that the Spirit must draw a man, but the bible says When He is lifted up, He will draw ALL MEN unto Himself.) Those who respond, to those He gives life. The offer given, man to respond. No works involved, just plain receiving or rejecting. "I set before you life and death -therefore CHOOSE life!) Brother, a child can understand that! "Suffer not the children to come unto me" Come as a child - could a child ever conceive of a god who is so confusing as Calvin's? We can pick a scripture here and there and make it say anything! Look at the big picture, the whole bible, the workings of God. You have not answered any specific questions in my posts that I have asked so far, well not most of them anyway. You did not address what I asked in the last post that I am responding to, but only asked another question to which I have answered. At first, I thought this was a waste of time, getting on here and getting myself frustrated, but the more I do it, the more it does two things: It is helping me see more and more how wrong Calvin was, and that discussing this is helping me see the flaws in this thinking more and more clearly by the responses I read, It also shows me that others besides myself have a concern over this issue. I can't seem to find many that I know personally that even care to discuss it on both sides. I thought I might be weird or something that I can't let this issue go when it comes up. I do care, I want the truth. Others are much more articulate than I, so I enjoy the discussion. It could be that all this helps some to come to seeing the whole truth. And that is my prayer, that we all come to the knowledge of the truth in love, and can keep from getting too upset with each other. But, compromise?/No way. My issue is with doctrine, not people. I hope we all can keep it that way. God bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/25 10:35**

Roaringlamb, I too had this question "why do some reject salvation"

This may contribute.....Man is three parts Spirit,soul and body.

When you become born again it is your spirit that is born again.Your mind doesnt know you are born again. And your body surely doesnt know either.

This is why the word commands us to walk in the spirit.

The next time you witness to someone , make eye contact with them. As soon as you tell them about Jesus you will see a 'light' come to their eyes. I believe you have touched their spirit man. Now you will most likely see their eyes gloss over. They can push their spirit man down.

I did this experiment and was absolutely amazed that this was happening.

.....David

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/25 12:16**

I also asked a previous question which was never addressed, how can someone love the God of calvin, do you? If I ask why, and you say for what he did for you, in a "way" I can see that. But there is still that bigger picture that must lurk behind the calvanist mind. Put it this way, If a stadium was full of people, and a gunman systematically shot each person in the head. One by one, I know this is a stretch, but just hypothetically. Then he got to you, ("passed you by") - so in the end, a multitude is sent to their death, but you are left standing, left alive. Now in a strange sense, you would be thankful that you are alive, but could you ever love the gunmen who showed you "mercy"? Would you not always wonder what the future holds for you if you faced that individual again? Maybe next time you would be the target? I say you cannot love someone who would do this, no matter what "good" may have been shown towards you. The best you could ever do is a mechanical, fearful, reluctant, and whatever other negative you can name relationship. That is the god that calvin describes. Now it seems only scriptures for scriptures are answered, selectively addressed, or questions to questions. Can a calvinist please address this issue without the polished answers and from the heart. (A new heart, the one given by God to the redeemed - the one that is not desperately wicked, because the Spirit of God dwells in it!)  
God bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/25 12:31**

Brother psalm1,

I don't know if I agree with this, because the spirit is dead within man is it not? The new birth is from death to life, as the spirit is made alive.

Adam and Eve had spiritual life, but upon sinning there was death that has passed upon all men.

Isn't spiritual death the reason people perish?

Once the spirit is made alive, they are saved as they are now children of God.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/25 12:40**

Quote:

-----I also asked a previous question which was never addressed, how can someone love the God of calvin, do you?  
-----

Quite simply, I love Him because He first loved me. If He had not loved me before, there was not anything to love once I was alive that is for sure.

Brother in your illustration, you cannot make God the gunman, nor can you say that He was killing people.

It would be more Scriptural to say that the whole stadium was full of dead people, and Someone came and gave life to some. Those who received life would love the one who gave them life, and no one could blame the one who gave life only to a few, but rather be in amazement at the fact that He gave life to any.

Again, man is not naturally inclined to desire God, that is why Paul writes, "there is none righteous.. none seek after God".

God seeks after men, He initiates, He gives life both natural and spiritual.

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/25 13:34**

Roaringlamb, no we have a spirit wheather we are born again or not.  
the people not written in the lambs book of life live on do they not?  
therefore the triune man is spirit soul and body,  
the lost mans spirit is there.....just needs rebirth.....  
do you agree?

....David

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/25 14:02**

Well in one sense I can see how a man has a "spirit". For example when we say someone is "spirited" or excited.

The death that came upon all men is not just physical, but also spiritual is it not? So when a man is dead in sin, he is spiritually dead. Thus he cannot have a relationship with the true and living God who is spirit. Something must be birthed within man, and that is impossible for men to do.

The new birth allows us to have relationship with God as our Father through His Son Jesus Christ. Even in this, it is Christ's work that paves the way for us to enter into God's presence.

I believe the soul can create many "spiritual" feelings, and duties to make it seem spiritual, but apart from the true birth of the Spirit in a man he is still dead no matter what he does. This plays itself out in a multitude of ways from those who worship false deities, to those who worship themselves. But when the spirit gives birth, it is no longer I that live, but Christ that lives in me.

Maybe I'm not understanding your view, but it seems to me that natural men must be made spiritual, and that only happens by the new birth which man cannot control or manipulate in any way, shape, or form.

By the way, blessings to you in Christ Jesus :-D

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/25 14:14**

roaringlamb, when a lost person dies what part of him stands before the great white throne judgement.  
It is his spirit.  
Whether lost or saved we all have an alive spirit.

....David

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/25 14:45**

Quote:

-----  
roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----I also asked a previous question which was never addressed, how can someone love the God of calvin, do you?

-----  
Brother in your illustration, you cannot make God the gunman, nor can you say that He was killing people.

It would be more Scriptural to say that the whole stadium was full of dead people, and Someone came and gave life to some. Those who received life would love the one who gave them life, and no one could blame the one who gave life only to a few, but rather be in amazement at the fact that He gave life to any.

-----  
First of all, that "Someone who came and gave life to some" also first made them to be dead to start with by giving them the wage of sin that someone else committed (Adam).

Therefore, you still have that "Someone came and gave life to some" killed them first then gave them back the life.

Quote:

-----God seeks after men, He initiates, He gives life both natural and spiritual.

-----  
He also must cause them to die by condemn it with Adam's sin when it has not yet sinned, and putting a nature on us for it to do naturally what HE hates, and To put the indictment or a responsibility of sin that has not yet been committed and put a penalty or a price on the innocent.

Innocent being in the sense that children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him who hates some and loves some for no apparent reason.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/25 15:10**

Quote:

-----Therefore, you still have that "Someone came and gave life to some" killed them first then gave them back the life.

Man killed himself by sinning. In a sense it was suicide, because he thinks knows better and does not need God, or that he can operate apart from Him.

You still want to defend the goodness of man, and deny that sin has been passed down from Adam and Eve into all of mankind not only by imitation, but by imputation as well.

Quote:

-----He also must cause them to die by condemn it with Adam's sin when it has not yet sinned, and putting a nature on us for it to do naturally what HE hates, and To put the indictment or a responsibility of sin that has not yet been committed and put a penalty or a price on the innocent.

Who is innocent brother? Show me one person aside from Christ Himself who was innocent before God and had not sinned in thought, word, or deed. Someone who always without failure loved God with all his heart, mind, soul, and strength. Someone who always without fail loved his neighbor as himself.

Now you see the universal guilt of all men, none is righteous no not one, they have ALL gone astray.

God did not create man evil, but when Adam sinned, innocence was lost. Brother the implications of Adam's sin affect everything around us. Romans says that even nature groans under the curse and waits for the sons of God to be glorified. Death, sin, suffering are part of the curse, but this was not God's intention in the beginning.

You accuse God of tyranny for punishing sinners because you do not look at thing from God's point of view. Did He not also create angels? Some of whom fell and will be damned, while the others are referred to as "elect angels".

Man is not better than the angels, yet in mercy God rather than destroying all of mankind has saved some who were not worth saving at all, and yet in spite of this you say, "tyranny, tyranny" and you charge God with being unfair.

I bless Him for being unfair, and giving salvation to man which is perhaps the most unfair thing in the history of the world.

I wonder what you would say to a verse like this-

Proverbs 16:4 The LORD hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.

And what of this one-

Proverbs 21:1 The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: **he turneth it whithersoever he will.**

Or even this-

Proverbs 16:33 The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the LORD.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/25 17:53**

"Well in one sense I can see how a man has a "spirit". For example when we say someone is "spirited" or excited."

The death that came upon all men is not just physical, but also spiritual is it not? So when a man is dead in sin, he is spiritually dead. Thus he cannot have a relationship with the true and living God who is spirit. Something must be birthed within man, and that is impossible for men to do."

Brother, James 2:26 - "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead" First take context which is always crucial-I am lifting nothing from its true meaning. James is talking about works being a proof of faith. Without such, there is no true faith. True bible faith must have works. Now I am not saying you work to be saved, or any non sense like that. Just take scripture as it stands. Then James makes the analogy, just like faith is dead without works, man is DEAD without his spirit being alive. The spirit is the essence of life. Any man alive has a living spirit. The death the bible speaks about is communal, alive to God. In tune and in true worship to Him. Dead meaning broken, severed relationship Spirit to spirit. We are dead in that sense, not dead as in drop dead or non living (the spirit). This is a crucial error and leads to many other errors that keep coming up.

Why is it that some things when it comes to proving a point, like all does not mean all, and some all means some, and world does not mean world, etc, then interpreting by those standards are acceptable. Then when scripture does not fit the doctrine, all the wording is held to the letter? You can't have it both ways brother! Context is everything! And the WHOLE bible is the context - the whole of revealed scripture, not bits and pieces! Some things are hard, but why do some have to force meanings where they do not apply?

God bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/25 18:35**

Quote:

-----Any man alive has a living spirit  
-----

So then why does a man need to be re-born of the spirit?

Could it not mean "breath" in the James passage as the word "pneuma" is used differently in Scripture?

It cannot mean that man has God's spirit within him, then none would need to be re-born of the Spirit of God and this would contradict other passages throughout the Bible.

So in looking at all Scripture, and understanding man is spiritually dead and must be born again, the James passage cannot mean that all men have the Spirit of God in them, nor does it mean that all men have the ability apart from God to seek Him.

Quote:

-----Why is it that some things when it comes to proving a point, like all does not mean all, and some all means some, and world does not mean world, etc, then interpreting by those standards are acceptable. Then when scripture does not fit the doctrine, all the wording is held to the letter? You can't have it both ways brother! Context is everything! And the WHOLE bible is the context - the whole of revealed scripture, not bits and pieces! Some things are hard, but why do some have to force meanings where they do not apply?  
-----

The majority of the time, as we use common sense and the totality of Scripture, we see clearly that "all" does not mean "all" all the time.

So in looking at the WHOLE Bible as you have said, God has a special love for His people that He does not share with the

he whole world.

We must realize that the reason men are lost is because they will not come, because God has not opened their heart to receive the revelation of their sin. In all of this, God is not to be blamed as He made man perfect in the beginning, but the only man who had free-will chose sin, and the rest of the story is God's working to bring the Deliverer into the world to save those chosen in Him before the foundation of the world.

Now what happens is that people automatically put themselves in God's place and start to limit who will be saved, and who will not. I do not do this, but rather leave that in God's hands.

To say that not all men will be saved is clearly Scriptural, and the reason is that not all men receive the faith to believe. The Pharisees are a prime example of this, as are any other of Christ's persecutors in the Gospels.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/25 21:10**

Quote:  
-----by roaringlamb:  
Man killed himself by sinning. In a sense it was suicide, because he thinks he knows better and does not need God, or that he can operate apart from Him.  
-----  
One man "killed himself", with your theology, God made it a law that He would kill the rest of humanity because of Adam's sin.  
According to your theology, I didn't kill myself with sin, God did with another man's sin before I was even born.

Quote:  
-----You still want to defend the goodness of man, and deny that sin has been passed down from Adam and Eve into all of mankind not only by imitation, but by imputation as well  
-----  
That is my point, According to your theology, it was God that made it so one man's sin was passed to all mankind through out history.

Quote:  
-----  
Quote:  
-----He also must cause them to die by condemn it with Adam's sin when it has not yet sinned, and putting a nature on us for it to do naturally what HE hates, and To put the indictment or a responsibility of sin that has not yet been committed and put a penalty or a price on the innocent.  
-----  
Who is innocent brother?  
-----  
Guilt comes only with a crime, what crime has a newborn done? Better yet, what crime has a fetus done?

Quote:  
-----God did not create man evil, but when Adam sinned, innocence was lost  
-----  
How and why? How did another man's sin make another man guilty, that is against true justice & reality.

Quote:  
-----You accuse God of tyranny for punishing sinners because you do not look at things from God's point of view  
-----  
It is not God's point of view, it is your despicable interpretation of the bible.

Quote:  
-----yet in spite of this you say, "tyranny, tyranny" and you charge God with being unfair  
-----  
Quit saying that I am charging God with being unfair.  
I am charging what you describe God as being unjust; tyranny has nothing to do with fairness.

**Proverbs 16:4** The LORD hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.  
God does not create the wicked as you are assuming this means,

**Proverbs 21:1** The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will. Solomon is the king. God may turn Christians hearts as HE wills through the Christians love for Him.

**Proverbs 16:33** The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the LORD.  
I love this verse, it means that there is no such thing as luck.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/26 15:21**

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----Not at all brother, because man must still believe to be saved. Since man does not have free will to determine himself to be saved, it must come from somewhere else i.e. the new birth.

Scripture does not talk of man being born by his own decision, but rather God's choice of whom He will.

What you seem to ignore or do not wish to explain is how is it that a man believes? Who causes him to believe in what he previously thought was foolishness?  
-----

Actually, the argument does begin to fall apart when the context shows that the interpretation is wrong. So while the entire argument may not be thrown out outright, the passage used to create the point has been proven to mean otherwise. Therefore, that argument, with that passage, has fallen apart. For you to maintain that argument, you must have other scriptural evidence to back it up. Which I believe you have provided, and I will address it now.

Actually, scripture speaks of both man's decision to believe, (by which proveably scripturally a man is saved) and of God's choice.

It is not one or the other, God's choice is that He will make those people the elect who choose Him. He is not hindered by time, nor does He have a lack of perfect foreknowledge, so He is able, as Paul says here:

**Romans 4:17** (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, (and calleth those things which be not as though they were.)

To "call the things which are not as though they were" This is why God can say, I chose you.

Another reason God can say that He chose us is that He draws us, the Bible says nowhere that everyone God draws is chosen, but it does teach that everyone who is chosen has been drawn.

I thought I had already addressed how a man believes, I will outline it again:

A. Christ took the bondage of sin captive for all men, He has given them the ability to believe. (This does not mean that they are neutral to God, or that all men will be saved, as many are hard hearted, and love the wickedness they had previously committed more than the truth.)

B. Because of Christ's death, where He was raised up, and fulfilled prophecy, all men are drawn by God, both before the crucifixion because God "passed over the sins previously committed", and after, because Christ had now been crucified. (We know that all men are drawn because Christ said that He would draw all men if He was lifted up, which He was at the cross.)

C. The gospel is preached, and the truth is made known, and to those who "HEAR" the truth, (which is a choice, to listen, or to ignore) then can believe the truth because they have now heard the truth. (As we know, faith comes by "HEARING", and "HEARING" by "THE WORD" of God. Therefore the gospel, which is the word of God, gives faith to those who "HEAR" it.)

This is the pattern shown by scripture, plain and simple. To read into it any more than what is there, means you are creating something that is not shown, that is the first step to a false teaching.

The Bible does not say, "How shall they hear unless God renews their heart?"

It does say, "How shall they hear without a preacher"

So we can see plainly that the ability to believe does not come from a renewing, but from hearing the truth, because, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free".

In what you believe, the truth holds no power to set a man free, only God's renewing. That, denies scripture that I have just shown you, the "TRUTH SHALL SET YOU FREE". It is the truth that frees a man, and gives him the ability to believe, not a renewing.

Now if you want to say, well the truth is the renewing, then you have an even greater problem, because the gospel is the truth, and that makes it the way of salvation, and if you are not preaching, then people will die without hearing the truth. God will then require their blood at your hands, as He did with Ezekiel.

You see, you cannot accept what I say, because you have already chosen in your heart to define everything said by a five point list. This is what Jehovah's Witnesses do, they say "The scripture is the ultimate authority" even as you do. But when you give them scripture, they run home to the watchtower and find "the true" interpretation from them, even as you define all scripture by five points, and not by itself. You do not judge what I say based merely off of scripture, therefore, whatever you say, is tainted by the interpretation of one rule, five points, and not held accountable solely by scripture.

I have yet to meet a calvinist, who can prove the five points of calvinism from scripture without reading into passages and taking things out of context. I have read Edwards, I have read Spurgeon, and even they, read into passages meanings that were not there. While they had hundreds, maybe thousands of pages of wonderful and enlightening sermons, and teachings, in this one area, they erred.

-----

Quote:

-----Look at Jesus' words here to the Jews-

John 8:42 Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.

John 8:43 Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.

Is this because they were deaf? or is Jesus speaking of a different "hearing" that a natural man does not have, and must be given?

-----

Well, to answer this, we might look at the strong's, so that we do not read into the passage what it does not say.

**ou - cannot**

**1) no, not; in direct questions expecting an affirmative answer**

This is the only meaning of the word cannot, it says that it is used in a direct question, that expects an "AFFIRMATIVE ANSWER". So let's see what the question was that they could want for an affirmative answer.

**John 8:43 Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.**

The question, "Why do ye not understand my speech?"

Now notice something, they did not answer Him, they were too proud to admit that they could not understand Him.

And His response in keeping with the greek, let's go back to that word "cannot" which means the question asked was expected to be answered by Jesus, but they did not, which is why He continued with that word.

Which basically means, you did not answer my question, I was expecting an answer, and you do not "HEAR" my "WORD" "THE TRUTH"

So again, we have an example of exactly what I stated about what the means of belief is, hearing, and hearing the truth.



Another interesting thing about that word cannot, is it indicates that Jesus took smooth breaths, after saying, "You did not answer my question". that means He waited for there answer a second time after the question, and then said, "You do not "HEAR" "MY WORD".

So in answer to your question, no, it speaks nothing of a spiritual understanding, or even that they cannot, or will not hear, it only says that they did not answer, and that they did not hear.

-----

Quote:

-----Brother the "wisdom" Paul is speaking of is Christ's crucifixion, and the Gospel. Therefore it firmly shows that Paul is speaking of the natural man not being able to understand the Gospel.

Is the Gospel spiritual, and must it be applied by the Spirit? If so, how can a natural unspiritual man receive it. How can a man even comprehend "conviction of sin" without a new heart when his natural heart loved his sin and left on its own would continue in that state?

-----

Let us go to scripture now, and see what is being addressed in this passage:

Now, to start with, agreed upon by all, is what chapter one of 1 corinthians is addressing, and that is the division in the corinthian church over the issue of whose ministry they were from, and they were being prideful, and dividing themselves because of it.

If we pay close attention we will notice, that Paul does not leave that subject, we can tell this, by the fact that Paul starts off chapter 2 by saying "AND", that means, let me add to what I just said. So we can see that both chapter one, and chapter two share the same topic, and the same context.

So now we understand something, to understand what chapter 2 is talking about, we must read chapter 1 to find the point of what Paul is saying, if you read chapter 1, right after Paul says "some say there of this guy, others of this guy..."

Paul brings it to a head, and says what is the point that He is making, the reason the divisions should end, and the understanding, or interpretation guide of what He will say in chapter 2. Let's see what it is:

### **I Corinthians 1:17-21**

**17(For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.)**

**18For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.**

**19For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.**

**20Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?**

**21For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.**

Verse 17 is the pinnacle verse of chapter one, where Paul confronts their sin, and tells them, "You were appointed to preach the gospel like I was!" and Paul furthermore addresses their sin, (which was pride, and seeking after man's wisdom) by saying, "And you were not appointed to preach the gospel with great wisdom or great revelation! Because if you do, the cross, and it's preaching, which is the "TRUTH" "CAN BE MADE TO HAVE NO EFFECT AT ALL".

(which in itself presents a problem for a calvinist, because they do not believe that preaching holds any effect, or power, to save the lost, only God effects salvation. So a calvinist must now come to grips with one of two things, reading further

into this passage, and coming up with an idea of what the gospel affects, or accepting what it says and realizing that the "TRUTH" is what effects salvation, not a renewing.)

Back to the point, Paul then decides to address fully the issue of man's wisdom versus God's wisdom in the issue of salvation. So if we move to chapter 2, we still find Paul addressing this issue, and I am going to address the whole chapter now, because you have taken this out of context for a second time.

#### **I Corinthians 2:1-5**

#### **I Corinthians 2:1-5**

**1And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God.**

**2For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.**

**3And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.**

**4And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power:**

**5That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.**

The first five verses, Paul is addressing the corinthians at their point of salvation, he tells them how he came to them, the things that he spoke to them, and how he avoided a grand spiritual display of wisdom, because as he said in chapter 1, "I was sent to preach the gospel WITHOUT great wisdom.

And Paul gives the reason in verse 5, "THAT YOUR FAITH WOULD NOT BE IN WISDOM, BUT IN THE POWER OF GOD."

#### **I Corinthians 2:6-9**

**6Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought:**

**7(But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory:)**

**8Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.**

**9But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.**

**10But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.**

Then Paul goes on to say, yet even so, even though as I stated earlier in chapter 1 that the gospel is foolishness, even though it is foolishness, it contains the deep wisdom of God hidden inside it. He says, "this wisdom is so hidden, that even the principalities, and powers of the air could not discern it."

He then goes on to say, But God has revealed this deep mystery, and hidden wisdom to us who are saved.

Do not make a mistake here and read into this passage what is not there, Paul is not saying that God revealed this to us at the point of salvation. Only someone who has never seen a man saved could conceive that to be the meaning of that scripture. For when a man is saved, if you were to ask him the question, tell me what the deep and hidden wisdom and mystery of the gospel is, any man's response would be "WHAT? I don't understand." So it is foolish to think that is Paul's point, and he even explains this as we move on, let's check it out:

**I Corinthians 2:11-13**

**11For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.**

**12Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.**

**13Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.**

So then in verses 11 through 13, Paul is explaining why the deep mysteries and wisdom of God are not effective in preaching the gospel, and He says as I just explained, that a natural man does not understand them.

Which is why we preach the cross, and Christ crucified, (like Paul said in verses 1-5) because that is powerful to save, while the deep mysteries produce nothing for the unsaved.

**I Corinthians 2:14-16**

**14But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.**

**15But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.**

**16For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? but we have the mind of Christ.**

Paul then clarifies everything in chapter two, and all the way back to verse 17 of chapter 1 with verse 14 by saying in a concise statement what he has just explained in detail.

Paul's last statements in verses 15-16 are a further explanation of why a spiritual man understands the deep things, and the answer is that the mind of Christ is in them.

So we have now seen, and shown how this passage says nothing about a natural man not being able to understand the gospel, but on the contrary, shows this:

- A. A natural man can understand the gospel.
- B. The gospel is the power of God to save the natural man.
- C. The deep mysteries and wisdom of the cross are not understood by the natural man.
- D. We are to avoid these deep mysteries of God when preaching, because they can render the "TRUTH" the "GOSPEL" of "NONE EFFECT".
- E. Paul's whole point in all of this, preach the gospel to the lost, that is what we are called to, because it is effective in saving them.

Quote:  
-----So you would say that a man apart from the Spirit may at any time "choose" Christ, and enlighten himself? While Christ said that the Spirit convicts of sin.  
-----

No, I would say that apart from a man hearing the gospel preached to him by a man of God, or by Christ appearing to him and preaching it, that he has not "HEARD" the "TRUTH" and cannot be saved.  
-----

Quote:  
-----God did not save you "because" you believed, you "believed" because God gave you faith, and your heart was regenerated to believe.

I do not know the time period in which they happen, but in many times it is simultaneously, the new birth provides faith, and the two are intertwined with each other, but the birth precedes life.  
-----

Again, a five point interpretation, the pattern not being outlined in scripture, but derived from a doctrine that is separate from scripture. If we simply balance it in scripture by the examples given, it is obvious that that is not a true statement, it is an illogical one.

#### **Acts 16:29-31**

**29Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas,**

**30And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?**

**31And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.**

This story causes a major logical bind for five point theology.

The reason why is that a man who has been renewed enough to say the phrase, "What must I do to be saved?", already has the understanding that he must believe to be saved, at least according to five point theology. And since a Calvinist believes the man is saved at the point of renewal, why would he ask how to be saved?

Certainly Paul and Silas would have told him that he was already saved, or would they? I don't think they were Calvinist's yet. That didn't happen until the reformation I think.

But it creates circular reasoning, and illogical understandings. The man was not saved yet, and he was not believing yet, or they would not tell him to believe as they did.

You cannot be saved and unsaved at the same moment of time.  
-----

Quote:  
-----Eph 2:1 And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;  
Eph 2:2 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:  
Eph 2:3 Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.  
Eph 2:4 But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,  
Eph 2:5 Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)  
-----

Um... this says nothing of the pattern of salvation, it only quotes the mantra of five point, and that is that we were dead in trespasses of sin, (Which is then misinterpreted to mean we were incapable of hearing or believing the gospel, which I have already shown is a fallacy, and that Paul teaches exactly the opposite of it.) and then that God saved us from that state of incapability.

Oh no, it is not so my brother, and I say again, the only way that you come to the conclusion that that passage is a detailing of the way salvation works is because you are interpreting it from a five point standpoint. It does not detail salvation's pattern, it only says that God saved us when we were sinners, and who may I ask was not a sinner when they were saved? Nobody, and that is the point of that passage. Not to forget that God saved us.

Quote:

-----2Ti 2:24 And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient,  
2Ti 2:25 In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;  
2Ti 2:26 And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.  
-----

So then you believe that men repent before they acknowledge the truth?

Quote:  
-----Act 16:14 And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.  
-----

Again, you have a problem here, read the first part of this verse, and find the problem, it says, "WHO WORSHIPPED GOD", here is the issue pointed out, a woman who was a devout worshipper of God, so much so that the scripture points it out, is hardly a woman whose mind is rolled up and held captive by the evil one.

Yes God opened her heart, but she was already serving God, and had not yet heard the news of the gospel. It is a problem, because when Christ died, everyone who had priorly been servants of God were not suddenly subdued again by Satan, but rather God sent people unto them to show them the truth, and with those people, obviously God would be able to open their hearts because they were already His servants to begin with.  
-----

Quote:  
-----Brother again Cain could have been accepted by God, if he would have accepted God's way of sacrifice, that is the point there. The very point that he would not only shows that natural men cannot change themselves, and rather rebel. But God still gives them mercy. To put it in a simple way, for the unbeliever, Earth is the closest they will ever get to Heaven, while for the child of God, Earth is the closest they will get to hell.

God could have destroyed Cain and been just, as He could with all of society. However God gave him life, and mercy.  
-----

It is time to face the music with Cain, so I have a question that will end the debate about him. Yes or no will suffice.

Was Cain one of God's chosen or not?  
-----

Quote:  
-----God ordained that sin entered the human race, and He allowed the human race to continue to this day. God has ordained demons to hell, and angels to Heaven. All things are under His control and guidance.

Satan is under God's rule, and cannot do anything but what is allowed by God. Even in the book of Job, we see God allowing Satan to test Job.

It was God's will for Job to be tested, was it not?

God from all eternity did by the most wise and counsel of His own will, freely, and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass. Yet in all of this, He remains holy, and in no way violates a man's will. We see God do this with Assyria in raising them up to chasten Israel. Though the Assyrians were being a tool in God's hand, they wanted to destroy Israel and so delighted in this.

God created Satan, and allowed him to bring sin into the world. If God did not want sin to exist, it would not, but this does not mean He has stepped back and left us all to our own ways. He reigns and as the Psalms say- "our God is in the Heavens and He has done whatever He has pleased"(Psalm 115:3)  
-----

If Satan is completely under God's rule, and complete control, then by logical default God is commanding Satan when where and how to sin, and also when where and how to deceive and tempt every man on earth.

By your interpretation, "Satan had to ask God about testing Job", then by that definition, he does the same thing with every individual, and God thus, tempts man, and ordains the captivity of the captive to Satan.

If you are ok saying that, (which you just have) then it is obvious where the problem lies, and it is with a wicked God who lies and says he can do no evil, yet commands hoards of demons, and satan to do His evil desires upon mankind.

-----

If I can say anything, I say this, stop interpreting things by the five point guideline, they are not held in the rules of hermeneutics, and are therefore not needed to understand the scripture. The scripture speaks for itself when it is read in context.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/26 20:48**

I have been reading this thread with great interest. Now I am quite firm with the argument from both sides. Of course I oppose calvinism as I have mentioned since posting on here. This rebuttle by brother Ben is excellent, along with others. I must ask my calvinist friends, when will you lay this non sense down, or at least consider you may be wrong, and ask God with all sincerity to open your hearts to the truth? How many times must all your arguments be demolished, yet you cling to error and add to the written word of God? There is a warning in Revelation about that, it is a serious matter! Could it be that if you discarded this error, you could may not still have the friends you have, the church you have attended for years, to admit you were wrong, or one of many other reasons some cling to their religion and refuse to acknowledge the truth? Brothers who hold this false doctrine, let it go once and for all! If you could only see this from another perspective, if you were not entangled in this web of error and deceit - someone from the outside can see when others are trapped and they can't see it - that's how this looks from the outside. Calvinist arguments are like a dog chasing its tail, it just keeps going round and round, going nowhere. How depressing is not only the doctrine, but those trapped on this merry go round theology. I do not say any of this to try to offend, I am just out of words to describe how frustrated this is to see and read.

God bless, Bob

**Re: - posted by intrcssr83 (), on: 2007/10/26 23:02**

Quote:

-----by refrigbob on 2007/10/27 11:48:21

I have been reading this thread with great interest. Now I am quite firm with the argument from both sides. Of course I oppose calvinism as I have mentioned since posting on here. This rebuttle by brother Ben is excellent, along with others. I must ask my calvinist friends, when will you lay this non sense down, or at least consider you may be wrong, and ask God with all sincerity to open your hearts to the truth?

-----

Bob, have you considered the possibility that of the calvinists throughout the body of Christ, there are those who have indeed come to such convictions by doing just that? By getting on their knees in prayer, seeking God for wisdom and insight, wrestling until they had assurance of truth, even if that truth would be something they initially would find unsettling, even dispicable by human standards, yet after surrendering themselves completely found it to be, as Jonathan Edwards described it, exceedingly pleasant, bright and sweet."; hence leading them to greater depth in worship, prayer and personal discipleship?

You might want to check out this article from Christianity today:

(<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2006/september/42.32.html>) Young, Restless and Reformed

Quote:

-----by refrigbob on 2007/10/27 11:48:21

How many times must all your arguments be demolished, yet you cling to error and add to the written word of God? There is a warning in Revelation about that, it is a serious matter! Could it be that if you discarded this error, you could may not still have the friends you have, the church you have attended for years, to admit you were wrong, or one of many other reasons some cling to their religion and refuse to acknowledge the truth? Brothers who hold this false doctrine, let it go once and for all! If you could only see this from another perspective, if you were not entangled in this web of error and deceit - someone from the outside can see when others are trapped and they can't see it - that's how this looks from the outside. Calvinist arguments are like a dog chasing its tail, it just keeps going round and round, going nowhere. How depressing is not only the doctrine, but those trapped on this merry go round theology. I do not say any of this to try to offend, I am just out of words to describe how frustrated this is to see and read.

-----

A lot of us have not only looked at the other side of the argument, but have experienced it and been able to live through it. I have seen many brethren being give over to depression and a spirit of fear because they were told that their personal standing before God was dependent upon their own personal "holiness" rather than the sovereign grace of God. I've seen in the personal lives of potential ministers, missionaries and evangelists ruined because their mentors in the faith repeatedly threatened them with the possibility of "disqualification" on the grounds of a sloppy exegesis of 1 Corinthians 9.

Easy-believism, prosperity preaching, seeker-friendliness; when was the last time you saw any of today's well-known reformed ministers (Piper, MacArthur, Packer, Sproul) endorse these things?

Don't take this as a personal attack, but learn to check your eyes for logs, brother. Those that have held to your view(s) are by no means innocent when it comes to the wickedness that has left the church paralysed.

**Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/27 5:33**

intrcssr83

Quote:  
-----I have seen many brethren being give over to depression and a spirit of fear because they were told that their personal standing before God was dependent upon their own personal "holiness" rather than the sovereign grace of God.  
-----

Brother, of course this is also a false appraisal of the truth. But where Calvinism falls short of the Calvinism cannot be its antithesis. The whole simple scriptural truth is the antithesis to all error.

The thing any of us most objects to about false doctrine, is that it necessarily departs at some point, from being able to be supported in scripture, especially where the Holy Spirit's work is involved, as He addresses the obtuseness of individual's comprehension until it is straightened into God's definitions.

Every misapprehension is just that because of a lie or a deception or an assumption or simply carnal thinking, added to truth. Only truth can be mixed with faith, to the ultimate altering of the believer's being - way beyond natural comprehension and into spiritual comprehension.

I had no idea what 'the truth' might be before I started listening for God's word to me in the preaching I sat under. He was faithful to speak, and His word to me created faith in me. I cannot speak for anyone else who heard the same sermons.

It is the hearing of His word which can be done, without spiritual sight. Even in the womb, the ear is one of the first organs to be completed. Sight develops in its own time, but does not function to bring understanding until after birth, when light can flood in. This is why Jesus said to Nicodemus that unless he was born again, he would not be able to 'see' the kingdom.

Incidentally, the structure of the heart and the circulation also change significantly at birth, and the old heart which was in the womb can no longer function as it did. The *spirit* (oxygen) by which the child lives after birth is also its own personal supply (through breathing), no longer second hand through the mother's circulation.

In my view, this makes natural birth a perfect working model of new birth (not the other way round). God patterned the physical on the spiritual. We see this in the tabernacle/temple mentioned in Hebrews... the temple of the Holy Spirit... the temple made without hands. The visible pictures are all made according to a heavenly template.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/27 10:55**

Quote:  
-----intrcssr83 wrote:  
I have seen many brethren being given over to depression and a spirit of fear because they were told that their personal standing before God was dependent upon their own personal "holiness" rather than the sovereign grace of God.  
-----

I have known many brethren being given over to bitterness and anger towards God because they were told the Calvinistic theology.

They began to realize that this God is a monster creating men only to condemn most of his creation without any choice of

their own. along with the rest of the cries of tyranny that I've declared about that god, of which these bretheren were about to forfeit, if they could, their faith because of the atrocities of this god that were calimed by other calvinists.

I said "if they could" about forfeitting their faith, because they were told that they were forever in his clutches even if they dis-ownd him, you know, OSAS.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/27 14:19**

Quote:  
-----B. Because of Christ's death, where He was raised up, and fulfilled prophecy, all men are drawn by God, both before the crucifixion because God "passed over the sins previously committed", and after, because Christ had now been crucified. (We know that all men are drawn because Christ said that He would draw all men if He was lifted up, which He was at the cross.)  
-----

Christ draws all kinds of men to Himself, not all men. If this was true, then all men would be saved. Rather, because men are unable to respond in their natural abilities, they reject Christ and are enemies of God this you cannot deny.

Now the question becomes, how does a man go from hating and being an enemy of God? How does a man change his nature on his own?

Quote:  
-----C. The gospel is preached, and the truth is made known, and to those who "HEAR" the truth, (which is a choice, to listen, or to ignore) then can believe the truth because they have now heard the truth. (As we know, faith comes by "HEARING", and "HEARING" by "THE WORD" of God. Therefore the gospel, which is the word of God, gives faith to those who "HEAR" it.)  
-----

Brother many "hear" the Gospel, with their natural ears, but are not convinced of their need of Christ. It has nothing to do with "choice". Their ears are dull of hearing, and until God grants them spiritual ears to hear, they will not.

What amazes me is that you do not factor into this equation that even as saved men, we must have revelation from God to know Him. How then can you say that a man who has no inclination to God whatsoever can of his own desire understand and spiritual truths, and make himself spiritual.

If indeed man can make himself spiritual any time he chooses, then Christ is a fool. For He really did not need to die, and send His spirit to convict the world of sin. He really did not even need to die, because after all man can fulfill the law of God, I mean why else would God command us to do something?

This view is foolish and though you may give lip service to needing Christ, in your heart you must not believe this. Because you boast of your ability to keep the law and its commands. So you have in essence made yourself your own savior because you did something to make God accept you, and you are better than other people who don't get it, or who don't have the spiritual understanding you have.

Quote:  
-----In what you believe, the truth holds no power to set a man free, only God's renewing. That, denies scripture that I have just shown you, the "TRUTH SHALL SET YOU FREE". It is the truth that frees a man, and gives him the ability to believe, not a renewing.  
-----

I would have to say you are incorrect, and rather your view does not believe that God can set men free, and keep them, and make them persevere. Because you believe it is all man and man's will.

Under your view, though a man professes faith, at any moment if he does not keep the law, he could be lost.

No, my view has Christ fully paying for, and the Spirit fully changing men into the image of Christ, and men may have full assurance that they are Christ's and He is theirs.



Quote:  
-----I have yet to meet a calvinist, who can prove the five points of calvinism from scripture without reading into passages and taking things out of context. I have read Edwards, I have read Spurgeon, and even they, read into passages meanings that were not there. While they had hundreds, maybe thousands of pages of wonderful and enlightening sermons, and teachings, in this one area, they erred.  
-----

Brother if any read into texts, I would have to say it would be those who champion your cause. For you take a text where God says, "if you will", and then automatically assume ability to do.

It's as if God could say to a man, "if you will raise the dead, I will accept you." To this you would reply, then we must be able to raise the dead. Or if God said, "if you walk on water, I will save you", and you say, "then I must be able to walk on water!"

You read into texts that man has free will to choose God, and then read out election, foreknowledge to form a god to fit your own ideas about God.

What you have done to 1 Corinthians 2 is not what is being said.

The deep wisdom Paul speaks of in the Gospel, and Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom. There is not some "deeper" wisdom that Paul was speaking about.

Even if this were true brother, how does a man go from natural to spiritual? Does he do it on his own?

Allow me to apply your reasoning to a portion of Scripture from within this section we are discussing.

1 Corinthians 2:8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

Now if I followed your way of thinking, I could look at this verse and say, "aha free will! For if they would have understood, then they would not have crucified Christ. Oh but sadly because they did not exercise their free will and choose Christ, He had to be crucified."

After all, this is what you have done with passages like the one where Christ says, "how often I would, but you would not."

yet we know that Christ is the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the Earth, and that God works things "according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" We know that those who believe were chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, that all who are called were predestined and are justified, and will be glorified. (Romans 8:29,30).

We also know that the Cross was God's plan(temporally)back in Genesis 3, and that the crucifixion was prophesied in many passages such as Isaiah 53, Psalm 22.

We know that it was God's predetermined plan(Acts 2:23;4:28) so that if one was to say that if only the princes of the world used their free will then Jesus would not have been crucified is a foolish argument. God has already set who will be saved, and their sins were placed upon Christ. Now the Spirit applies that work to them.

You jump to the conclusion that this means so and so will not be saved, and that is unfair. But how do you know? are you God?

Would you dare to say who will be saved, and who will not be saved? I hope you would not be so brash, and before you say I limit who will be saved, realize that we both do. you due to man's so called free will, and me because of God's free will to do with His creation as He will(which by the way is all throughout the Bible).

So, I am sorry to say brother you have yet to answer, how a man gives birth to himself, and makes himself alive spiritually. And if all men have this ability, then the Scriptures lie when they say that many are called, but few chosen.

**Re: - posted by refrigbob (), on: 2007/10/27 17:51**

"Easy-believism, prosperity preaching, seeker-friendliness; when was the last time you saw any of today's well-known reformed ministers (Piper, MacArthur, Packer, Sproul) endorse these things?"

Brother, First, I do not endorse easy believism, prosperity preachers, seeker friendly churches, etc. Second, whatever or who ever the preachers are that you mentioned, I follow none of them. And third in regard to this, If we are to going to talk about character of preachers, lets not forget about calvins character, and many of the false teachings that Luther espoused and his attitude towards the Jews. It looks like we all may have some logs to extract. There may be many non calvinist preachers off the wall, but please don't stereotype them all. I don't know the numbers, but I would guess that non calvinist preachers outnumber calvinists a thousand to one. So yes, in proportion you most likely will find more non calvinist preachers into and preaching off the wall nonsense in that number. I will agree with you on that. I am embarrassed by many of them.

I do want to comment on something Spurgeon wrote about 1 Tim 2:3-4

"For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth"

(Good and acceptable - here we have the Lords assesment of His good pleasure regarding salvation for mankind-we don't have to guess, wonder, or make conjectures about it -it is plainly stated, but this is my comment not Spurgeon)

Spurgeon commented: "Here is how our older Calvinist friends deal with the text. "all men" say they -"that is some men"; as if the Holy Ghost could not have said "some men" if He had meant some men. "All men" say they - "that is some of all sorts of men" if He had meant that. The Holy Ghost by the Apostle has written "all men", and unquestionably he means "all men"

Spurgeon added " I was reading just now the exposition of a very stable doctor who explains the text so as to explain it a way: he applies grammatical gun powder to it, and explodes it by way of expounding it. I thought when I read his exposition that it would have been a very capital comment upon the text as if it had read, "who will not have all men to be saved, nor come to the knowlege of the truth"

" I do not know how that squares with this" adding "I would sooner a hundred times over appear to be inconsistent with myself than be inconsistent with the word of God"

At least Spurgeon was honest !

And what about 1 Tim 4:10 "The Saviour of all men, especially those who believe"

1 Tim 2:6 "Who gave Himself a ransom for all"

Heb 2:9 "that He by the grace of God may taste death for every man"

Acts 17:26-31, and so many many more.....This leaves one of two choices. Either universalism is true, or POTENTIAL salvation is true for all men. There are no other choices. Potential is the only biblical alternative. Christ died for ALL. To as many as recieved Him, to them He gave authority to become the sons of God. This should settle the issue.

I'll say it once more, whatever mystery election, foreknowledge, choosing, predestination... may hold....and no doubt I do not know how it all comes together for certain, but I do know it is not properly explained by a man named calvin or his contemporaries with 5 point theology.

God bless, Bob

**Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/27 19:01**

Quote:  
-----Again, you have a problem here, read the first part of this verse, and find the problem, it says, "WHO WORSHIPPED GOD", here is the issue pointed out, a woman who was a devout worshipper of God, so much so that the scripture points it out, is hardly a woman whose mind is rolled up and held captive by the evil one.

Yes God opened her heart, but she was already serving God, and had not yet heard the news of the gospel.

-----  
Just like Cornelius?

Ben, I believe there are several additions men make to scripture, around Cain and Abel. One is to assume Abel had an altar. Another is to assume Abel's sacrifice was a sin-offering, when it is much more likely to have been a thank offering.

About Cain, I believe one of the reasons his offering was not accepted, was because God had cursed the ground for Adam's sake (Adam himself was not cursed.) and therefore its produce was not what He wanted to be offered. Perhaps Cain was being defiant even to go there.

Much later, Moses predicts that disobedience will result in curses being outworked against Israel. Finally, Malachi is still using the word 'curse', and also about the people.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/27 20:17**

Quote:  
-----About Cain, I believe one of the reasons his offering was not accepted, was because God had cursed the ground for Adam's sake (Adam himself was not cursed.) and therefore its produce was not what He wanted to be offered. Perhaps Cain was being defiant even to go there.  
-----

Sister Dorcas, thank you for your insight into this. Yes it seems that Cain was offering an offering of that which was deemed cursed. Abel's offering was not and thus was accepted by God.

There are many parallels to be seen here, but most alarming to me is that part of me that wishes to take any part of my flesh and present it before God, and say, "this is why you must accept me, because I have done...."

Christ Himself was made a curse that we believe in Him are justified by having His robes of righteousness placed over our filthy rags. Isn't it beautiful and wondrous!!!!

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/27 22:14**

Quote:  
-----roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----About Cain, I believe one of the reasons his offering was not accepted, was because God had cursed the ground for Adam's sake (Adam himself was not cursed.) and therefore its produce was not what He wanted to be offered. Perhaps Cain was being defiant even to go there.  
-----

Sister Dorcas, thank you for your insight into this. Yes it seems that Cain was offering an offering of that which was deemed cursed. Abel's offering was not and thus was accepted by God.  
-----

**Hebrews 11:4** By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent (or more of a) sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaks.  
It wasn't necessarily the offering itself, but the intent of the offering.

Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/28 18:27

Hi Patrick,

Thank you for the acknowledgement. I was beginning to wonder if anyone was reading my posts, let alone understanding them... ;-) - but I know I'm not very good at pleasantries and can honestly say that's as far as my 'wonder'ing went :-).

I think perhaps Logic has touched on a valid observation to add to mine about Cain... the intent of his heart.

I am reminded of when Satan turned up on the presence of God in Job 1:6, when his presence was obvious to God - perhaps because of his attitude. (Perhaps I've been wrong to think all angels look alike, as they have names and individual roles. Perhaps also, Lucifer looked very different after he'd become the prince of the power of the air.)

Quote:  
-----Christ Himself was made a curse that we believe in Him are justified by having His robes of righteousness placed over our filthy rags.  
s.

Brother, I believe Christ does far more than this for us. I am glad, though, that you wrote this, because I want gently to challenge (through scripture), this not uncommon view.

First yes, Christ was made a curse for us. I don't want to discuss that large topic. (The curse came through the law, and disobedience to it attracted curses (beginning in Deuteronomy).

But, the idea that Christ's righteousness is 'placed over our filthy rags', is not in scripture (I believe).

Zechariah 3

3 Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel.

4 And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, **Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.**

5 And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments. And the angel of the LORD stood by.

I feel we should remember that Jesus had His seamless undergarment taken from Him before He was nailed to the cross. Although the New Testament doesn't make this absolutely obvious, He was, therefore, naked (a truth which comforted Corrie Ten Boom and others while in concentration camp).

Personally, I believe this is important, as nakedness is mentioned in different contexts in scripture. One of them is idolatry. Another is materialism. (Same thing.) In Revelation 3, a spiritual nakedness is implicit in the letter to the Laodiceans:

18 I counsel thee to **buy of me** gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see.

It is quite clear, here, that the white raiment is instead of the nakedness.

Exodus 32

25 And when Moses saw that the people *were* naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto *their* shame among their enemies:)

26 Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who *is* on the LORD'S side? *let him come* unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him.

(I feel I should say here, that I've no idea if anything I'm writing cuts across Calvinism. If it does, I'm not writing it *because* it does.)

So, with nothing to bring to commend themselves to God, they had to come, with their sin absolutely open to Him:

#### Hebrews 4

13 Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things *are* naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession.

At this point of choice, also, notice how Moses' relatives lined up with him. I had to smile when I re-read Aaron's account of what had happened. It bears a significant amount of tweaking from the truth, culminating with the impression he tries to give that the golden calf formed itself into that shape all by itself as it came out of the fire.

There are many sinners who might fear Christ had never felt shame, humiliation, embarrassment (and many other crippling emotions), had He not been made to suffer the indignities he experienced before and during His crucifixion. It is also very important (I believe) that the Pharisees tried so hard to find false witnesses against Him. How many? lies did He listen to that night? How many times is a reputation of a person undermined because someone lies about them, or, enhances their own reputation, by lying about themselves? For Jesus to have gone through all this was essential to His claim of 'Saviour of the world' being believable.

While He Himself was above all of them - He despised the shame Heb 12:2 - nevertheless Psalm 22 opens our understanding to His prayers during His time on the cross. (These also refer to devils and the artefacts of idolatry, such as 'bulls of Bashan'.)

Regarding the robe of righteousness, Jesus (Matt 22) told about a man who came to a wedding in his own clothes. This simply was not 'done', as a 'wedding garment' would be supplied for each guest. This was another reason the king wanted people to furnish his feast. It didn't matter that they had been living on the street, because he was going to take off their rags and put them in 'rich robes' (NKJV Zech 3).

We learn, also, that sins could not be forgiven under the law (Heb 10:4). (They were merely covered by the blood.) Now, our sins are cleansed by His blood, (1 John 1:7) as they are brought into the light of God's knowledge. This is the exact opposite of covering.

#### Heb 10

21 And *having* an high priest over the house of God;

22 Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed\* with pure water.

\*This is in line with what the High Priest had to do naturally under the Old Covenant, to wash and dress appropriately to appear in the presence of God. (The picture is in Exodus 30:18 - 21.)

As I said above, I am not consciously offering a counter-Calvinistic argument. For all I know, Calvin would agree with me! This is what the Bible says and it is difficult to draw any other conclusion, than that our old rags (law-keeping\works) are taken off and our sins are washed away prior to our nakedness being clothed in any robe of righteousness.

To go further, 1 Cor 1:30 says that by God, Christ is made to us... 'righteousness' - among other attributes - so this kind of righteousness is not external at all. It is because He is within, being our Righteousness, that we are ever deemed clean *enough* to wear white robes.

Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/28 18:32

Hi Ben,

I wanted to draw to your attention this, that John 8:32 does not use the word '... SETS ...'. If you bear this in mind as you meditate upon scripture generally, it will grow to have rather a different sense to it, than 'sets'.

John 8

31 Then Jesus said to those Jews who believed Him, "If you abide in My word, you are My disciples indeed.

32 "And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall **make** you free."

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/28 22:21

Quote:

-----dorcas wrote:

Hi Ben,

I wanted to draw to your attention this, that John 8:32 does not use the word '... SETS ...'. If you bear this in mind as you meditate upon scripture generally, it will grow to have rather a different sense to it, than 'sets'.

John 8:31 Then Jesus said to those Jews who believed Him, "If you abide in My word, you are My disciples indeed.

32 "And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall **make** you free."

-----  
I am not seeing the difference between "sets" & Making"/

Please explain the difference.

You could translate the Greek to say:

**John 8:32** and you shall be knowing the truth, and the truth shall be freeing you.

"shall be freeing" is:

Verb, future active, indicative, 3rd person, singular.

So what is the difference between:

"shall be making you free"

&

shall be setting you free"

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2007/10/29 2:21

I have not kept up with this thread...but another section of Scripture came to mind concerning this thread...I don't want to side track the current discussion...this is just an offering...

Luke 6:46 "But why do you call Me 'Lord, Lord,' and not do the things which I say? 47 Whoever comes to Me, and hears My sayings and does them, I will show you whom he is like: 48 He is like a man building a house, who dug deep and laid the foundation on the rock. And when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently against that house, and could not shake it, for it was founded on the rock. 49 But he who heard and did nothing is like a man who built a house on the earth without a foundation, against which the stream beat vehemently; and immediately it fell. And the ruin of that house was great."

Everyone builds a house. Those who hear and do nothing are foolish. Those who Jesus speaks of hear...47 Whoever comes to Me, and hears My sayings and does them,..these have chosen to listen.

Cain built his house on sand, Abel built his house on the rock.

In Christ

Jeff

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/29 12:58

roaringlamb, you consistently draw my words out of context from a point I make, while I have made it easy to see where a point begins and ends, still only small portions are addressed, and the pieces you lack answers to are passed by. You continue to make many statements about the things I say, dismissing them outright. While I have gone painstakingly through the process of exegesis of different passages, you are content to just say "you are wrong" while providing no evidence against what I say.

Nevertheless, while you do not answer my questions, I will answer yours. As I have shown myself diligent to do throughout this conversation.

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----Christ draws all kinds of men to Himself, not all men. If this was true, then all men would be saved. Rather, because men are unable to respond in their natural abilities, they reject Christ and are enemies of God this you cannot deny.  
-----

This is an inaccurate argument against the point made, while it is a typical response that I expected, it holds no scriptural or linguistic truth. Allow me to offer evidence to the truth.

pa's

**1) individually**  
**a) each, every, any, all, the whole, everyone, all things, everything**

**2) collectively**  
**a) some of all types**

Now, the first point to note is that the verse says "ALL", it does not say "ALL KINDS", while you may use your argument of, well there are some places that all does not mean all, then I would like to take you to a passage written by Paul where all now does not necessarily mean all by your own definition.

**Romans 3:23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;**

Based off of your own argument, we can come to the conclusion from this verse, that Paul did not mean "ALL" have sinned, he only meant "ALL KINDS" have sinned, and thus, there are some who are perfect of us, from birth till now.

Ok, so you see how that argument is a flawed one, and cannot be applied so easily, each time the word all is used, it must be interpreted by context, not a flawed argument.

Now, point two on this is that the most common definition of that word, as we see from strong's is "ALL" and means "ALL".

However, I will now point out again, as I did in my last post that you did not fully address, there is no place in scripture, old testament or new that states that every man that is drawn by Christ is saved.

That is an assumption based off of a bad contextual representation.

Quote:  
-----Brother many "hear" the Gospel, with their natural ears, but are not convinced of their need of Christ. It has nothing to do with "choice". Their ears are dull of hearing, and until God grants them spiritual ears to hear, they will not.  
-----

Show me the scripture behind this argument, or do not use it, I have already shown conclusively, contextually, and other wise that man's believing the gospel is contingent upon him hearing it.

Quote:  
-----What amazes me is that you do not factor into this equation that even as saved men, we must have revelation from God to know Him. How then can you say that a man who has no inclination to God whatsoever can of his own desire understand spiritual truths, and make himself spiritual.  
-----

What is revelation, except truth?

As I have stated already, God shows the "TRUTH" through preaching, and those who "HEAR", choose to either believe it or not.

What you do not seem to understand is that God is giving revelation through the message of the gospel to those who are unsaved.

Now you of all people, who believes so much in the sovereignty of God, should know that if He wants to show the truth to a man, He can.

What is it to you if He shows the truth to every living creature on the earth? He already commanded us to do so.

Quote:  
-----If indeed man can make himself spiritual any time he chooses, then Christ is a fool. For He really did not need to die, and send His spirit to convict the world of sin. He really did not even need to die, because after all man can fulfill the law of God, I mean why else would God command us to do something?  
-----

A man does not "MAKE" himself spiritual, how simply must I state things so that all who read them would understand.

I have said nothing of a man saving himself.

I have said nothing of a man making himself spiritual.

I have said nothing of a man regenerating himself.

You have misunderstood me. What I have said is that God's "TRUTH" or the "GOSPEL" gives authority to a man to make a decision to repent, or to continue in sin.

As Dorcas said, the "TRUTH" shall "MAKE" you free.

By the way, I have proven this to be true through scripture, you have not even made an attempt to disprove it with scripture. All you have done is state your doctrinal stance.

So I conclude, either you have no answer, or you refuse to answer.

Quote:  
-----This view is foolish and though you may give lip service to needing Christ, in your heart you must not believe this. Because you boast of your ability to keep the law and its commands. So you have in essence made yourself your own savior because you did something to make God accept you, and you are better than other people who don't get it, or who don't have the spiritual understanding you have.  
-----

You put words in my mouth, I boast of nothing, except that maybe I'm good at video games. I boast of no ability to keep the law, nor of the commandments.



First of all, the law was not given to the gentiles, of which we are.

The conscience, and the revelation of God according to Romans 1 was given to us.

We as gentiles are not held accountable to the law of the Jews, but to the law of our conscience.

I have fallen more than short of my conscience, so much so that I was dangling over the pit of hell. I was saved by grace, by hearing God's truth, and hearing about God's wrath, I heard it, and knew it was true, and I repented and gave my life to Christ, I put my faith in Him, and have chosen every day to believe in Him.

I am not my own saviour, and neither is any other man, I have not made myself to be such, but I have made God, and His truth to be the instrument of conversion by which God then saves those who repent and believe.

It has nothing to do with anyone being better or worse than anyone, it has to do with a man choosing to believe the truth when God reveals it to him.

-----

Quote:  
-----I would have to say you are incorrect, and rather your view does not believe that God can set men free, and keep them, and make them persevere. Because you believe it is all man and man's will.

Under your view, though a man professes faith, at any moment if he does not keep the law, he could be lost.

No, my view has Christ fully paying for, and the Spirit fully changing men into the image of Christ, and men may have full assurance that they are Christ's and He is theirs.

-----

Again I respond by saying, God sets men free with the truth. God initiates it, man responds or does not. God is ultimately responsible for giving the man the option of being saved, and saving the man once the man has believed.

I fully believe that God causes those that are saved to persevere in their faith. But I also believe that a man can make a conscious decision from a place of free will, (even as Adam) to stop believing the truth, or he can be deceived by the evil one to believe in a lie and not the truth. (Galatians)

However, what I do not believe is that a man's salvation is dependant (as you so readily said I did) upon his sin, or his works.

Upon your third point, I fully agree.

-----

Quote:  
-----Brother if any read into texts, I would have to say it would be those who champion your cause. For you take a text where God says, "if you will", and then automatically assume ability to do.

It's as if God could say to a man, "if you will raise the dead, I will accept you." To this you would reply, then we must be able to raise the dead. Or if God said, "if you walk on water, I will save you", and you say, "then I must be able to walk on water!"

-----

I do not defend others positions that I do not know, nor do I condone the out of context method used by many today. I can only defend my own position which lies right in the middle of the two positions. Calvinists over emphasize God in salvation, and Arminians over emphasize man in salvation. Both have flaws in theology, both do not know fully which is the truth, (although both will claim they do) so they both read in and out texts they do not understand.

No, I assume that if a God can directly command a person to repent, then He directly has given them the ability to do what He has commanded them.

I assume that if they cannot, then God is a cruel God who's desire is not for righteousness in His own creatures.

I assume that if His desire is not for righteousness from all His creations, then He has evil desires.

I assume that if He has any evil desires at all, then He is not perfect, and He is not God.

I assume that if He is not God, then He is not to be worshipped.

All other evidences given, are not assumed, they are based upon logic and reason. You have yet to give the reason why God did not explain to Cain that he was not a chosen one, instead of telling Him something that is untrue.

Your God is not a God who directly states the truth, rather He is a God that can only be understood by understanding first your doctrine. That is a limitation that is not found in scripture.

To your last statement about raising the dead, or walking on water. Absolutely, I agree, for a God who can make an impossible demand of a creature, not give them the ability to carry it out, and threatens eternal punishment for such a thing is no God at all, He is a cruel task master.

Quote:  
-----You read into texts that man has free will to choose God, and then read out election, foreknowledge to form a god to fit your own ideas about God.  
-----

I have not read out election, I have read out the Calvinist interpretation of election.

I fully believe in election, but it is based off of a foreknowledge by God of those who would be saved, and not an eternal choice from ages past.

I believe fully that we are the chosen of God, but we are chosen by Him because we believed.

I believe fully that we are drawn by God, but so are all men.  
(Again, no place in scripture says that all who are drawn, are saved.)

Quote:  
-----What you have done to 1 Corinthians 2 is not what is being said.

The deep wisdom Paul speaks of in the Gospel, and Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom. There is not some "deeper" wisdom that Paul was speaking about.

-----  
Um... have you ever read what theologians have to say about the cross? I fully believe that the magnitude, and revelation of God's wisdom in the cross of Christ will be continually revealed to a greater level throughout all of eternity.

We will be awed by the revelation of wisdom that we see in the cross.

I believe that the people of Corinth were trying to persuade men to be Christians by espousing pieces of wisdom that they had come to understand, thinking that men would be saved by seeing their wisdom. Which is why Paul confronts that so strongly for all of chapter 1 & 2 of Corinthians.

If you do not recognize that there is a deeper wisdom in the cross, than just the forgiveness of sins and salvation, then I move to say that you have never meditated on the cross in prayer, and you have not studied all the implications that it creates. From the blood of Christ, to the cross itself, every piece of the crucifixion holds symbolic, and literal wisdom, it even has allegorical prophetic fulfillment out of Isaiah.

I do not think that I need to go into the issue of the cross having a greater, or deeper wisdom, because it unquestionably does. Paul made this point by saying that when he came to the Corinthians in their unsaved state that he "determined to know

now nothing except Christ crucified." His point was, did you notice that when I preached the gospel to you, I was not making a big show of my wisdom about God and His salvation?

Quote:

-----Even if this were true brother, how does a man go from natural to spiritual? Does he do it on his own?  
-----

A man believes on his own, if God believed for him, then faith is a non-existing thing. To say God gives a man faith to believe is reasonable, if one recognizes that to every man is given a measure of faith as Jesus told His disciples. So all men already have a measure of faith.

You cannot say, oh but he could have given some no faith, and that is their measure.

This would be on all counts a logical impossibility.

First, you cannot give someone nothing.

Second, you cannot measure nothing.

Third, Christ says "EVERY MAN" has been given "A MEASURE" of faith. The words "A MEASURE" refers to an amount, or a measureable amount of something.

Fourth, the conclusion is undisputable, every man has been given a measure of faith, the gospel is to be preached to every man, every man is commanded to repent, every man must choose to repent and believe, or not.

Quote:

-----I'll let me to apply your reasoning to a portion of Scripture from within this section we are discussing.

1 Corinthians 2:8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

Now if I followed your way of thinking, I could look at this verse and say, "aha free will! For if they would have understood, then they would not have crucified Christ. Oh but sadly because they did not exercise their free will and choose Christ, He had to be crucified."

After all, this is what you have done with passages like the one where Christ says, "how often I would, but you would not."

yet we know that Christ is the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the Earth, and that God works things "according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" We know that those who believe were chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, that all who are called were predestined and are justified, and will be glorified. (Romans 8:29,30).

We also know that the Cross was God's plan(temporally)back in Genesis 3, and that the crucifixion was prophesied in many passages such as Isaiah 53, Psalm 22.

We know that it was God's predetermined plan(Acts 2:23;4:28) so that if one was to say that if only the princes of the world used their free will then Jesus would not have been crucified is a foolish argument. God has already set who will be saved, and their sins were placed upon Christ. Now the Spirit applies that work to them.

-----

I hate to bring this up, I thought it was obvious, "THE PRINCES" are demons, not people, according to scripture angels walk a fine line of one sin and you are cast down and lose your free will.

If you don't agree that they are demons, then tell me which of the Sanhedran court were princes? Or which roman governor was a prince.

No, the scripture shows they were demons, and that they did not know that they were fulfilling God's plan, they could not act upon knowledge they did not have.

Unlike the case of a man who hears "THE TRUTH" or knowledge of the gospel, and is then able to act upon it.

Quote:

-----You jump to the conclusion that this means so and so will not be saved, and that is unfair. But how do you know? are you God?

Would you dare to say who will be saved, and who will not be saved? I hope you would not be so brash, and before you say I limit who will be saved, realize that we both do. you due to man's so called free will, and me because of God's free will to do with His creation as He will(which by the way is all throughout the Bible).

So, I am sorry to say brother you have yet to answer, how a man gives birth to himself, and makes himself alive spiritually. And if all men have this ability, then the Scriptures lie when they say that many are called, but few chosen.

-----  
I am not God, nor claim to be, I do not know who's heart is truly right with God, but I do know the fruit of a believer, which is how we are told we can judge whether a man is a believer or not.

If you believe that I limit salvation by saying that all men can be saved if they repent and believe, I agree, no man that does not repent and believe will be saved.

However, the limitations you place, go beyond that of the scripture, to the point of eliminating the need to repent and believe the gospel to be saved. They can be saved before they repent and believe, so it is a definition outside of scripture.

On your last point, I believe I have done a simple easy enough to understand definition of this in this post. If you do not understand it, then I can explain it further.

-----  
Lastly, I don't expect you to quote every passage of scripture that I do, or to necessarily quote every word I say, as I know that I type a lot. But I would appreciate it if when you address a point, if you would quote the whole point, so that the context of what I have said will remain consistent. Otherwise it makes it appear as though I have stated something completely by itself without explanation.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/29 13:55**

Brother ben, please forgive me for only taking portions, and addressing them. I hope that this does not take away from truth within either of our replies to one another.

Quote:

-----I am not my own saviour, and neither is any other man, I have not made myself to be such, but I have made God, and His truth to be the instrument of conversion by which God then saves those who repent and believe.

-----  
The following quote from your last reply sums up what I believe. God uses the Gospel preached to regenerate the heart. The new heart understands its sin against the love, and holiness of God. The new heart sees the justice of God in making Christ sin for us, but also the grace in allowing us through Him to be the righteousness of God in Christ.

But I also see that God's truth by His Spirit causes repentance and faith in the person who God regenerates. Thus it is not God who repents for that person, but that person repents for himself. perhaps this has been an area of confusion as I did not make that point clear before.

At the moment, I do not have the wherewithal to answer all of your points, and I also see that neither of us will "prevail" upon the other(which was not my point). Just please do not lump all Calvinists as "fools", or "lesser brothers".

Now I would like to put forth an illustration for you and logic(if he chooses)to look at and give feedback.

Let us suppose a man has fallen into debt. He cannot repay this debt as he has nothing to pay with, he is utterly poor.

A bill collector comes calling, and says to the man, "you must pay the debt or you shall be punished."

To which the man replies, "Sir, I have nothing to pay with, please let me go free."

Now, is the bill collector unjust for demanding that which is impossible for the man to pay?

Or is the bill collector just for seeking the justice of what was demanded by the law, and the man a law breaker for not doing what was required by the law?

Now I think we agree that every man is guilty before God through the Law, and thus God is not unjust to demand what men cannot do, for man could do it before the fall. The effects of the fall, and the imputing of sin are clear.

Just so we understand that sin is not just counted against us because of imitation, but because of imputation, I ask you to look at the following truth which is observed in our daily lives.

Infants are subject to the effects of sin. They feel pain, they suffer illness, and they also die. Yet what sin has an infant committed? If they are unable to commit sin, yet suffer sin's effects, are they not guilty as well? If they are guilty, not because they have committed sin, then why? Does this not show that Adam's sin has been imputed to the world?

Your feedback is appreciated, and I wish to thank you, and may God continue to bless you through Christ Jesus our Lord.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/29 15:07**

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:

Now I would like to put forth an illustration for you and logic(if he chooses)to look at and give feedback.

Let us suppose a man has fallen into debt. He cannot repay this debt as he has nothing to pay with, he is utterly poor.

A bill collector comes calling, and says to the man, "you must pay the debt or you shall be punished."

To which the man replies, "Sir, I have nothing to pay with, please let me go free."

Now, is the bill collector unjust for demanding that which is impossible for the man to pay?

-----  
No.

Quote:

-----Or is the bill collector just for seeking the justice of what was demanded by the law, and the man a law breaker for not doing what was required by the law?  
-----

**Mat 18:27** Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and released him, and forgave him the debt.

Notice that the Lord of that servant was moved with compassion.

God is **infinite** in compassion and grace and mercy.

You make God to be not all loving, finite in grace and mercy by having God desire not all men to be saved.

Quote:

-----Now I think we agree that every man is guilty before God through the Law, and thus God is not unjust to demand what men cannot do, for man could do it before the fall. The effects of the fall, and the imputing of sin are clear.  
-----

Man can fulfill the righteousness of the law by walking after the Spirit.

The the imputing of sin is not clear, it is ridiculous.

Quote:

-----Just so we understand that sin is not just counted against us because of imitation, but because of imputation, I ask you to look at the following truth which is observed in our daily lives.  
-----

Proove it.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/29 15:21

Quote:  
-----Proove it.  
-----

Well, to use a scientific way of proving a hypothesis true, a law must be easily observable before a hypothesis is labeled a law.

So, if infants are guilty and suffer the effects of sin, while not sinners by way of their own committing sin, we must ask, does this show that they are guilty by imputation?

Or, the hypothesis is that the effects of sin have been imputed to all that are living.

Now we test this by seeing if the effects of this guilt(death, illness, pain, suffering) are suffered by all apart from their committing sin.

The test shows that without a doubt, all persons suffer from the effects of sin, not just by imitating it, but also because it is imputed to them, and so is the guilt that accompanies it.

We see this over and over, and over again. Therefore it is save to make a law, or principle that men of all ages apart from imitating Adam's sin, have sin and its effects(guilt etc. ) imputed to them.

I believe the evidence has proven my point. Of course, if infants did not die, or suffer, or get sick, then we could say I was wrong, but...

Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/29 15:40

I do forgive you, and I want to say that you have been better than most people that I have discussed, as most of them can't even remember what we are talking about. : )

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:  
-----The following quote from your last reply sums up what I believe. God uses the Gospel preached to regenerate the heart. The new heart understands its sin against the love, and holiness of God. The new heart sees the justice of God in making Christ sin for us, but also the grace in allowing us through Him to be the righteousness of God in Christ.

But I also see that God's truth by His Spirit causes repentance and faith in the person who God regenerates. Thus it is not God who repents for that person, but that person repents for himself. perhaps this has been an area of confusion as I did not make that point clear before.  
-----

May I point out that the only difference here is that I believe regeneration takes place after a man believes, otherwise salvation would not be by faith alone through grace.

Rather it would be by God alone to the working of faith, which would contradict Paul's whole excerpt on grace.

I believe that we have had a bit of confusion, but I don't think we can conclude that we believe identically.

Quote:  
-----At the moment, I do not have the wherewithal to answer all of your points, and I also see that neither of us will "prevail" upon the other(which was not my point). Just please do not lump all Calvinists as "fools", or "lesser brothers".  
-----

I do hope that at some point, you will find the time to answer them, as I believe it is important for us to know the truth in a

It matters that God will give, and has given to us.

I also must say that I do not think of you, or any calvinist as a "lesser brother", but rather it only saddens me, because I see the great ability, and potential of each man to go and preach the gospel. Yet I see very few in both circles, (calvinist & arminian) that will go and preach like they have been commanded.

The biggest heartcry I see is that I am concerned for calvinists and arminians alike, is that when they stand before God on judgment day, He is going to look into all of our eyes, and start naming souls by name and requiring their blood at our hands, and we will have no excuse for our lack of action.

Paul was afraid of this, to the point that even after he said he was done with the Jews and would go to the gentiles from that point on, he tarried still another two years with the Jews preaching the gospel to them.

I see what calvinists believe as a reason to excuse themselves from that issue. Now I realize that no calvinist would say that they are excused from preaching, but deep down, they know from their doctrine that "God will save the lost He wants anyway" so it is not a serious thing to them.

I have been to presbyterian churches before, and I applaud their diligence in knowing the word of God, and I applaud their reverence for God.

But on this one issue of the lost, I am deeply concerned, if you want to believe in five point theology, that is fine by me, but be a Charles Spurgeon, be a George Whitfield, be a Jonathan Edwards, preaching such things as "Sinners in the hands of an Angry God".

I believe they would accuse both the calvinist, and arminian churches of being sluggards concerning the cause of Christ, and the preaching of the gospel.

Quote:  
-----Now I would like to put forth an illustration for you and logic(if he chooses)to look at and give feedback.

Let us suppose a man has fallen into debt. He cannot repay this debt as he has nothing to pay with, he is utterly poor.

A bill collector comes calling, and says to the man, "you must pay the debt or you shall be punished."

To which the man replies, "Sir, I have nothing to pay with, please let me go free."

Now, is the bill collector unjust for demanding that which is impossible for the man to pay?

Or is the bill collector just for seeking the justice of what was demanded by the law, and the man a law breaker for not doing what was required by the law?

-----

The bill collector is absolutely just in requiring the man to pay the debt...

...unless the bill collector pays the debts of his other debtors and let's them go free.

For if the bill collector frees one who deserves to pay, and does not free the other, he becomes an arbitrary bill collector.

We know from studying the scripture that God is arbitrary about nothing, and that everything He does is with just purpose and righteousness.

Quote:  
-----Now I think we agree that every man is guilty before God through the Law, and thus God is not unjust to demand what men cannot do, for man could do it before the fall. The effects of the fall, and the imputing of sin are clear.

Just so we understand that sin is not just counted against us because of imitation, but because of imputation, I ask you to look at the following truth which is observed in our daily lives.

Infants are subject to the effects of sin. They feel pain, they suffer illness, and they also die. Yet what sin has an infant committed? If they are unable to

o commit sin, yet suffer sin's effects, are they not guilty as well? If they are guilty, not because they have committed sin, then why? Does this not show that Adam's sin has been imputed to the world?  
-----

While sin is imputed, and the effects of it, Christ's death on the cross broke the power of sin so that we as sinners might come to know God

We must sometimes remember to look at certain things like the issue of babies, and the Hebrew law.

If you know anything about the Jews, you must know that children according to the law of Moses were not accountable to the law until the age of 12 or 13, I don't know which. When the disciples tried to hold back these children, (who had sin imputed to them, but were not accountable yet,) Jesus response to the disciples was that "the kingdom of heaven belonged to such as these".

Christ made a clear point of saying that to children belonged the kingdom of heaven. Now Christ understood the scriptures and far more, so if He had wanted to say differently at that point He could have. But what He did say was "let them come to me".

I believe that the scripture clearly teaches that children are not accountable to imputed sin, until they have reached an age of understanding it.

If you look at the issue of abortion, you cannot call judging souls of infants that are unborn to hell just. That is not love, for they did not even have life yet, yet they had a soul.

I do not believe a just God could sentence all of the unborn children to burn in hell forever like that, there is no love in that.

I believe that until a child has a revelation of sin, he is not accountable to it. Meaning, there is an age with every child where they can hear their conscience, and at that point they are accountable to it. An infant cannot hear their conscience, neither can a 1 year old. Therefore they cannot be judged by the standard that Paul lays out in Romans 1 of how people are judged who have not heard the gospel.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/29 15:54**

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----Proove it.  
-----

Well, to use a scientific way of proving a hypothesis true, a law must be easily observable before a hypothesis is labeled a law.

So, if infants are guilty and suffer the effects of sin, while not sinners by way of their own committing sin, we must ask, does this show that they are guilty by imputation?

Or, the hypothesis is that the effects of sin have been imputed to all that are living.

Now we test this by seeing if the effects of this guilt(death, illness, pain, suffering) are suffered by all apart from their committing sin.

The test shows that without a doubt, all persons suffer from the effects of sin, not just by imitating it, but also because it is imputed to them, and so is the guilt that accompanies it.

We see this over and over, and over again. Therefore it is save to make a law, or principle that men of all ages apart from imitating Adam's sin, have sin and its effects(guilt etc. ) imputed to them.

I believe the evidence has proven my point. Of course, if infants did not die, or suffer, or get sick, then we could say I was wrong, but...

-----  
The effect of sin is spiritual death. you are thinking that death, illness, pain, suffering etc are effects what they are only circumstances of Adam's sin.

Furthermore, there is no guilt imputed unless the act is done personally.



**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/29 16:31**

Quote:  
-----I see what calvinists believe as a reason to excuse themselves from that issue. Now I realize that no calvinist would say that they are excused from preaching, but deep down, they know from their doctrine that "God will save the lost He wants anyway" so it is not a serious thing to them.  
-----

I would agree, and also caution you not to lump Calvinists in with hyper-Calvinists who believe what you are saying. If you have not already, I might recommend to you a wonderful little book called "Spurgeon Versus Hyper-Calvinism" by Iain Murray. It tackles what you are addressing here very well.

Quote:  
-----I do not believe a just God could sentence all of the unborn children to burn in hell forever like that, there is no love in that.  
-----

Neither do I brother. But rather because of His merciful character, I believe He regenerates them when they die in infancy, or even those who are mentally disabled and cannot "decide".

I am glad that you are my brother, and that we can each spur one another on to know Him more and more.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/29 16:55**

roaringlamb,

Out of curiosity, what do you think about what I said about the issue of faith, and a measure to all men?

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/29 18:32**

Quote:  
-----Out of curiosity, what do you think about what I said about the issue of faith, and a measure to all men?  
-----

Let me re-read what you wrote before making a response. If however you are basing that on what Paul says in Romans (Romans 12:3), it would apply to the believers Paul was writing to, and I believe the context of that section clearly shows that.

**Re: All Men Everywhere, on: 2007/10/29 23:13**

Just for the record, I'd like to quote Young's Literal Translation from Romans 8, to show something about the tenses, and therefore the meaning Paul intended.

26 And, in like manner also, the Spirit doth help our weaknesses; for, what we may pray for, as it behoveth *us*, we have not known, but the Spirit himself doth make intercession for us with groanings unutterable,  
27 and He who is searching the hearts hath known what *is* the mind of the Spirit, because according to God he doth intercede for saints.  
28 And we have known that to those loving God all things do work together for good, to those who are called according to purpose;  
29 because whom He did foreknow, He also did fore-appoint, conformed to the image of His Son, that he might be first-born among many brethren;  
30 and whom He did fore-appoint, these also He did call; and whom He did call, these also He declared righteous; and whom He declared righteous, these also He did glorify.

A few thoughts on the above:

v 27 'He who is searching the hearts' is the Lord Himself

v 28 Paul is testifying from his past, as a means of encouraging the body in Rome.

It is not a prediction, but rather a hope based on live experience.

v 29 We are glorified already.... that is to say, we are identified in Christ's resurrection and the sanctification of the Spirit which is eternally true *now*. (2 Cor 3, Heb 10, 1 Thess 5:23 Now may the God of peace Himself sanctify you completely; and may your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.)

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/30 10:33**

Hey roaringlamb, I thought that the verse about faith I was referring to was in one of the gospels, but as it turns out it was from Romans 12:3.

I am not totally convinced that the context actually does make it say that it is talking about believers, but it is ambiguous enough that I will say that it may not be a point worth discussing.