

PREDESTINATION DEBATE WITH AN ARMINIAN

Arminian Drew:

“It is my understanding that some claim that God chooses an ‘elect’ but that the way God chooses the members of the elect is in a manner such that He does not make this choice based on any characteristics of the person. If this is not what you believe, fine - this post may not be of interest to you. If you do believe that God's choice is neither arbitrary (essentially random) nor based on individual characteristics, then I submit the following for your consideration:

It does not appear that this a coherent position, because, unless God's choice is truly random, His choice must be based on some discriminating characteristic of the person He chooses (or does not choose).

There is a famous illustration of a hungry donkey presented with two buckets of oats. We imagine that the brain of the donkey is magically altered to render it incapable of identifying any distinguishing characteristics of the two buckets (although it does recognize the existence of 2 buckets). So, for example, the donkey can make no judgments like the following:

- Bucket A has more oats so I'll choose A.
- The oats in bucket B look fresher, so I'll choose B; etc.

If the donkey is not allowed (through this magical intervention) to make his choice based on characteristics that inhere in (belong to)

the buckets, then the only option left for him is to choose randomly. Otherwise, he will starve.

For the situation of election, even God has no choice but to use discriminating properties to differentiate us one from another. You may say that I am imposing a human restriction on God. I don't think that I am. I think I am simply acknowledging the fact that God has created a universe where objects are differentiated from one another based on their inherent characteristics. If we think carefully about what makes Fred "Fred" and Joe "Joe" to an observer, we seem unavoidably drawn to conclude that it is only inherent characteristics that allow a third party observer to distinguish them: Fred is taller. Joe is smarter, Fred has more money, etc.

I submit that in order for God to choose to elect Fred (and not Joe), He has no option but to base that choice on something about Fred (or about Joe). Once you take away distinguishing characteristics. Fred and Joe seem absolutely identical to an external person, even God. So unless God 'flips a coin', any selection He makes must be based on distinguishing characteristics.

The inequity that I see in predestination is the notion that some people are essentially "hard-wired" for eternal punishment (if one believes in an eternal hell, but that is another debate), with no degree of freedom to choose another path. Such persons can exercise no control over their ultimate fate. Therein lies the injustice.

Now the fact that we do not know who is destined for heaven and who is destined for hell does not solve the problem. It is still unjust for Fred to be born pre-destined to hell whether he or anyone else knows this fact. It is a simple direct contradiction to say salvation is open to all and also embrace the idea that some are pre-destined to hell.”

ICONBUSTERS:

The above analogy of the donkey and two buckets of oats is preposterous on three primary levels:

- (1) The Lord is not a donkey; He is wiser than a donkey. His election does not stem from animal instinct.
- (2) Men are not buckets of oats. Oats do not sin, nor have they guilt, unlike men. Nor are oats obligated to their Creator, unlike men.
- (3) The donkey did not create the buckets of oats; whereas the Lord created all men. Men are distinct because their Creator willed them to be so.

Furthermore, predestination is proven by the absurd analogy despite its illogical reasoning. The donkey is attracted to oats because the Lord decreed it. This decree was made before -- ‘pre’ -- the donkey or oats existed. It was the destiny of the donkey to eat oats. It was the destiny of the oats to be food for the donkey. Their destiny was of God who pre-destined them.

Rightly understanding the doctrine of Predestination is a pertinent and necessary one. Wrongly understanding this great truth

is tantamount to wrongly understanding salvation. Wrongly understanding salvation is to wrongly understand the Savior. Wrongly understanding the Savior results in worshipping a false Christ. Worshipping a false Christ results in rejection by the true Christ who will state, "I never knew you. Depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

The true Christ and true Christianity are offensive to the natural man. Had they not been, Christ, His Apostles and centuries of disciples would never have been persecuted, imprisoned, tortured and killed for their faith.

Theodicy is that branch of theology which attempts to vindicate God's justice. However, the Lord is the Law itself. Thus, He cannot be judged. For everything He says and does is Lawful.

The parable of the vineyard laborers illustrates this point. In giving the vineyard worker hired last the same wage as the one hired first, the natural mind recoils at the injustice and unfairness of the owner. After all, the worker first hired labored to a much greater degree than the one hired last. Why should the last be paid the same wage as the first? The answer? "Friend, I do thee no wrong.....Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil ---- (i.e., do you perceive evil on my part) ----- because I am good (i.e., gracious to the undeserving)?"

Salvation is the gift of God's love, mercy, and grace unto those who do not deserve it. All deserve everlasting punishment. However,

for reasons hidden in the Lord's unsearchable being, He has chosen to save some, giving them that which they did not deserve or earn -- Jesus Christ, and Him crucified -- while passing by others, choosing instead to give them exactly what they do deserve.....righteous judgment for their sins.

His choice is based on nothing inherently good or evil in man. Before they were born, having done neither good nor evil; in fact, before they were conceived; even before the Creation of the heavens and the earth, the Lord purposed Esau, the hated, should serve Jacob, the beloved.

O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

[A question is raised: "Does God have goal and purposes that in and of himself he is unable to bring to an end?"]

Arminian Drew:

"No. God can implement any purpose he wishes. The trouble lies in the naive belief (and I do not intend to be pejorative here) that this somehow requires that all the variables be under his control.

I think a big problem lies in our tendency to adopt the solution that is easiest to understand. As a result, we **assume** that God has to control all the variables to effect his purposes. But this seems to be an unjustified conclusion.

Let's suppose that I am playing chess against the world's greatest (I only know the rules of chess - I do not play the game at all). I am free to make any legal move I wish - my opponent, expert though he is, does not control my moves. Each time it is my turn, I have a large number of legal moves that I can make. And since I am a bad player, my opponent will probably have very little idea what move I will make - the worse that I am, the less predictable will be my moves.

Even though my opponent (the expert) does not control my moves, he is still almost certainly guaranteed to win. Why? Because his skill and knowledge so greatly exceeds mine that any move I make will not thwart his ultimate purpose - to place me in checkmate.

With God, the situation is even more extreme. He can give up control of a number of variables and still accomplish his goals - unless, of course, one maintains that God has a plan that prescribes every event in the universe, down to when some proton in intergalactic space is going to decay.

I see no reason to believe that God has such a fine-grained plan. I suspect that he does not really care whether I wear light blue or dark blue socks and has not pre-destined that choice. I certainly stand to be corrected, but I suspect that one will be hard-pressed to find scriptures that require the conclusion that God's "control" over his universe is so total.

I think the reality is that our lack of imagination prevents us from seeing how God can fulfill his purposes without pre-destining every event.”

ICONBUSTERS:

Consider Christ’s admonition that not one of the earth’s trillions of bird falls without the Lord’s decree. The very hairs on every human’s head are numbered. That infinite number is constantly changing.....on every human’s head. (Matt. 10:29-30). Even the outcome of a toss of the dice is of the Lord. (Proverbs 16:33). Consider, “A man’s heart deviseth his way: but the Lord directeth his steps.” (Prov. 16:9). All men’s plans and actions lead them to where the Lord decreed they would go.

Thus, what part of governing His creation does the Lord neglect? The answer: Not one part.

We can go further. If the Lord is actively involved with governing every jot and tittle of His creation so that His purposes for His creation come to pass, would He not be actively involved in His quintessential purpose of gathering a people in His name?

We are living in the time of God’s calling out a people in His name to join Him as a family unit forever. To accomplish this end He sent His Son to do that which Adam could not and would not do.....live a perfectly sinless life in obedience to the Father. His

sinless Son then gave Himself to be wrongly punished and executed in the stead of sinners, to the end that sinners might escape the just punishment due them.

Not only did the Lord devise and perfectly carry out this plan of salvation, but He did it using sinful men to accomplish His purpose. What wicked men devised in their hearts, the Lord used it to accomplish a good and holy outcome. (Acts 2:22-24).

Before Christ was captured, He prayed the Father on behalf of those sinners whom the Father gave Him. He prayed not for the whole world. He prayed only for the Elect, chosen by the Father, for whom Christ was to die a substitutionary death. (John 17).

The Father knew the identity of all those He chose before the foundation of the world because He created them. Christ's knowledge is co-equal with the Father. Thus, He knew for whom He was to die.

The Holy Spirit, whose knowledge is co-extensive with the Father and the Son, regenerates those for whom Christ died, whom the Father had chosen.

The Elect were predestinated to become members of the family of God through Christ. Their ultimate destinies are in the hands of God, who loses not one.

On the flip side, the Lord also knows those whom He did not choose to save.

It is these He chooses to judge. Their judgment will be meted out perfectly and justly, according to the grievous nature of their sins.

In the Elect, His merciful grace is manifested.

In the non-elect, His righteous justice will be manifested.

In the Elect, His righteous judgment was satisfied through Christ's crucifixion on their behalf.

In the non-elect, His righteous judgment will be satisfied by the individual himself.

It is both OT and NT theology which states the potter --- the Creator --- has the right to make clay vessels --- or humans ---- for different purposes.....some to honor and some to dishonor.

This is both the right of the potter and the Creator. And man has no cause to cry, "Foul."

Paul explains the deep truths of Predestination in Romans 9. Rightly understanding these passages was a turning point in my early walk with the Lord.

In creating these different vessels, the Lord commits no evil, for all He does is righteous, holy, and lawful.

In studying the passages in Scripture addressing the Last Judgment, you should note that one person condemned cries, "Foul." They all accept the truth that their life choices and actions were exactly as they had wished. They will even acknowledge the goodness of God in their life, and their willful rejection of Him as Lord and Savior.

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow [both Elect and non-elect], of things in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue [both Elect and non-elect] should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Arminian Drew:

"I am not convinced that the Matthew 10:29-30 text is really a strong endorsement of the idea that God prescribes all things that come to pass:

"Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground apart from the will of your Father. And even the very hairs of your head are all numbered"

What is this text actually saying? It is actually a little ambiguous in respect to the matter we are discussing. I claim that the following 2 interpretations of this text are both true to the text:

1. Each and every bird that falls to the ground does so in

accordance with the will of God that prescribed the details of that event. This is what I understand to be your interpretation.

2. Consider the set of birds that fall to the ground. No bird in this set falls so as to thwart the **general** will of the Father. Many a bird could fall, **without prescription by God**, and yet still not thwart this general will. All we can legitimately take away from this text is the notion that God will not allow a bird to fall if **that** falling bird will interfere with the fulfillment of his higher purposes.

Back to the chess analogy. Let's say that I am playing Kasparov (I think he is some chess master). Even in a situation where I am free to make whatever move I want, it could be said of me and Kasparov: "Not one of Drew's moves will take place outside the will of Kasparov." The reason why someone could say this is as follows: Kasparov's will is to **win the game**, not **control my moves**. Kasparov is so clever that he puts me in a situation where, even though I am free to make any legal move that I want to, I cannot thwart his will. Whatever move I make, he can deal with it and still accomplish his will.

Returning to the Matthew text, the only way I can think of the negate plausibility of this argument I have provided is to make a case that the 'will of the Father' referred to in this text can **only** be interpreted as his specific will in relation to the birds, not as his more general will. If it can be read as referring to the relation of the birds to

God's general will, then the text does not really require that God prescribe what happens to each and every bird.”

ICONBUSTERS:

Thank you for your response. In the context of Matt. 10, Jesus is speaking to His disciples, present and future. The subject is fear --- fear of those who would impose upon them the ultimate penalty: death. In the case of His disciples, the penalty would be unjust, for they would be persecuted, hunted down and even killed for proclaiming that which was holy and righteous. Jesus then calms their fears. If it is true that insignificant birds with very little monetary value cannot fall out of the sky to their death without the decree of God that it be so, then how much more will the Lord watch over His own, His Elect, who are so valuable that He sent His only begotten Son incarnate to die in their stead. No harm can come to one of His own unless He wills it be so. Furthermore, they are not to be fearful of death, for the enemy has no power over their souls.

The Lord then expands His reasoning. Not only is the Lord in control of the life and death of every creature, but He is also in control of every hair on every human's head.

Drew, Christ is not explaining in vague, general terms, the will of God. He is elaborating on the infinite care, concern, and control exercised by the Governor of all creation.....man being His most beloved creation, many of whom He willed to redeem through Christ.

Next, your chess analogy, as brilliant as it seems, lacks a biblical foundation. It is an argument from the flesh, and not the Spirit. To argue from the Scriptures is to argue after the Spirit.

Theologians recognize the distinction between the secret and revealed will of God; the will of decree is that which the Lord ordained would certainly come to pass, versus the will of command which is the duty of man.

It is the command of God that every man repent and believe the Gospel. This is the revealed will of God to man. However, in His secret will, His decretive will, He has appointed some men to salvation and others to condemnation.

Man's duty is to obey the revealed will of God. We are not to speculate on the secret will of the Lord.

Furthermore, in choosing some sinners as recipients of His mercy and saving grace, He does not 'look down the corridors of time' to see what men will do with the Gospel and Christ and then predestine them. Rather, He gives them this glorious destiny before -- PRE --- they have done either good or evil.....even before their birth.

The foreknowledge of God knows only that which He has decreed will certainly come to pass. The omniscience of God knows the infinite possibilities of all things and their permutations, had God willed each permutation to come to pass.

When Christ declares to the false Christians, *I never knew you*, He is not being literal. He obviously knew them as their Creator, having ordained their birth and circumstances on earth. But He did not know them as His Elect, His children, His bride. He had never appointed them as vessels of mercy, recipients of His saving grace.

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

Arminian Drew:

“I think that this response begs the question at issue. I have argued that the Matt 10:29 text in no way requires an interpretation that God has a will in respect to each and every bird. I have not denied that your view is a **possible** interpretation -- I have just pointed out another interpretation that is also true to the text. You need to show how this second interpretation is not plausible. I do not see that this has been done.

I am aware of the general context in which the reference to the birds is made - Jesus is indeed trying to calm his disciples' fears. But this fact does not really argue against the interpretation that I have put forward. Why? Because the re-assurance lies in the fact that the will of God will prevail - there is simply not enough reason to rule out the possibility that it is God's **general** will is that which will prevail. The 'general will' interpretation is still OK since being reassured of

this should be enough to comfort the disciples. This text does not require that God have a will in respect to each bird.

I will certainly concede that this text states that no event, no matter how tiny or insignificant, will interfere with God's will being achieved. However, it is a matter of logic that this does not require that every event be pre-determined by God. It is perfectly legit to see this text as allowing all sorts of free variables to be at play. Of course **certain** variables cannot go **certain** ways as this would indeed thwart the will of God. But this by no means requires all variables to be fully controlled.

Its like this: There are many ways that God can achieve his general will. So there are indeed many variables that are pre-determined. However, they certainly cannot **all** be fully free, for that would take away the certainty that his will will be achieved.

ICONBUSTERS wrote:

The Lord then expands His reasoning. Not only is the Lord in control of the life and death of every creature, but He is also in control of every hair on every human's head.

I see no issue of pre-destination here. All I see is a statement about God's omniscience, which I see as conceptually distinct from an issue of pre-destination.

ICONBUSTERS wrote:

Furthermore, in choosing some sinners as recipients of His mercy and saving grace, He does not 'look down the corridors of time' to see what men will do with the Gospel and Christ and then predestine them. Rather, He gives them this glorious destiny before --- PRE ---- they have done either good or evil.....even before their birth.

I am aware of this view. Let me ask you a direct question:

Do you agree with the following statement: All men are born with an irresistible inclination to sin - they have no choice in the matter in the sense that it is not possible for them to not sin. The wages of sin is eternal suffering in Hell. Some of these men (the non-elect) have no possibility to attain salvation. Consequently a non-elect person comes into the world pre-destined for hell with no possibility of escaping this fate.

If you agree with this statement, you seem to be effectively saying that it is just for God to create a feeling creature that is pre-programmed by some external force for eternal torment. I cannot accept this, since my whole notion of 'deserved punishment' for person 'X' necessarily entails the possibility that X can choose to avoid the transgression for which he is to be punished."

[ICONBUSTERS:](#)

Let's not switch the subject. I believe when examining the bottom line, you are attempting to argue for man's free will. Scripture proves the opposite.....man is naturally born of the flesh, flesh is

opposed to the Spirit, cannot discern or believe spiritual concepts, let alone pick up his cross and follow the true Christ.

You have offered no biblical proof whatsoever that there is one event taking place in Heaven, Hell or earth in which the Lord was not the prime mover or the direct cause of all the infinite secondary causes.

If man's days are numbered, i.e., predetermined --- from the second, minute, hour, day, week, month, year and century of his birth, to the second, minute, hour, day, week, month, and year of his death --- it is impossible the Lord is not in control and governing literally every event in a man's life. Certainly specific events --- be it disease of unknown cause, healthy or unhealthy lifestyle, car crash, drug use, random murder by being in the wrong place at the wrong time, suicide, genetic predisposition to fatal disease, etc., etc., etc., --- are events which must, of necessity, be in God's control for Him to number man's days. To that you will surely agree. But these drastic events are all the result of an infinite array of secondary causes. Change one minutia and a different outcome would take place.

By using the lesser example of the birds of the air who are governed by God, the Lord proves the greater, that Christians, who are of infinitely more value to the Lord, are under His total watch care and concern.

The Lord knoweth the days of the upright as well as the wicked.
(Psalm 37:18 ff).

He knows their days because He decreed them, and all that is contained therein.

Drew, your argument implies, as it does with all Arminians, the wish to live 'free' from the rule of Christ, the Governor of the Universe. However, that is impossible. The Christian prayer, 'Our Father who art in Heaven.....THY WILL be done on earth, as it is in Heaven,' implies ALL aspects of our lives, day in and day out.

Why does the Christian wish for the Lord to overrule his life? Because the Lord is wiser than the Christian and knows what is best for the Christian to achieve the ends for which the Christian was created.

Drew, I pray you freely and willingly submit to the sovereign rule of Christ in your daily life, leaving nothing out of His control. I pray the Lord's will for your life be done. Amen.

When you have done so, please report back regarding the new, improved and biblical view of your Lord and God, as well as your relationship with Him.

[Arminian Drew:](#)

“You say that I have not offered proof that God has not pre-determined all events and I agree. I think that this is an impossible request and that you are effectively in the same position. You **claim** that certain texts support this strong form of determinism but the case does not seem conclusive - as per the example of the birds. The text simply does not state that the fate of each bird is determined by God. It only allows one to conclude that the birds cannot fall ‘apart from the will of God.’ What this text is effectively saying is that ‘things are not **so** free that they will interfere with the will of God.’ In order for your interpretation to be the only valid one, you need to make the case that God has a specific will in respect to each bird. And I have not seen this yet.

The reality, in my view, is that the texts that Calvinists (and Arminians for that matter) use to ‘make their case’ are simply not as unambiguous as they believe. I think it is clear that basic process works as follows:

Calvinist (C) approaches Text (T) with an interpretive bias that leads him to resolve the inherent ambiguity in the text in the direction of a Calvinist reading. Arminian (A) approaches the same Text (T) with a different interpretive bias that leads him to resolve the inherent ambiguity in the text in the direction of an Arminian reading.

Perhaps you can show me one text that **unambiguously** speaks in support of any of the 5 points of TULIP.

In stating man's days are numbered, are you referring to Job 14:5?

"Man's days are determined;
you have decreed the number of his months
and have set limits he cannot exceed."

I will tentatively agree that this text states that the number of days we each live is pre-determined by God. As an aside, I am not sure why this text cannot be interpreted as follows: God determines the number of days of a man's life by making a 'run-time' decision (excuse the computer terminology), a decision is taken by God **as that man's life unfolds**, not necessarily in advance. However, on balance, I do think the wording from the NIV suggests the 'pre-determination' that you speak of. It would be interesting to study the original Hebrew.

In any event, your statement 'change one minutia and a different outcome would take place' has not been adequately defended. For example, if I choose to drink tea instead of coffee tonight, how do you **know** that this 'free' choice will not change the number of days that I will live. It is entirely possible that it will have no effect on that whatsoever. I think the most **easy** path is to conclude that if our days are pre-determined, all the details of our lives are also pre-determined. However, this is not the only solution. Like the chess analogy, God may be able to work things out so that Fred lives 35,117 days and yet not control everything that Fred does.

When I encounter a solid case for God pre-determining all events in the Universe, I will certainly stand corrected.”

ICONBUSTERS:

Once again, Drew uses a non-biblical analogy to ‘prove’ His point. Tonight he drinks tea rather than coffee. He forgets to ask the question, “Why do I drink in the first place; and why tea rather than coffee?” Had he been born in a different culture, under the auspices of the Chinese, for example, he might be drinking his own urine, rather than tea or coffee. (Ref: <http://skepdic.com/urine.html>). But, alas, it never occurred to him that his likes and dislikes are the result of an infinite array of second causes, including birthplace, parents, heredity and environmental factors, all of which were the result of the greater and first cause, the Lord. These peculiar likes and dislikes are what motivates him to make the choices he does.

The issue being addressed in this debate centers on that of Predestination of the Elect unto salvation, not predestinating the predisposition to drink coffee or tea. In the case of obeying the true God as Lord and Master, the Bible states unequivocally that *no man seeks the true God, not one*. The fault of disobeying and hating the true God is not the fault of God, but of man.

Perhaps not every reader of this thread is aware that orthodox Catholicism repudiates and curses the biblical doctrine of

Predestination. Thus, the Roman Catholic Church Magisterium teaches and preaches Arminianism.

This unbiblical view of God and man is typically the view held by most of so-called 'Evangelical Christianity.'

Thus, Evangelical Christianity and Roman Catholicism are, at their core, brothers and sisters, united by the same 'spirit,' and under the rule of the same 'father.'

By the authority of the Council of Trent, Section 16, *Fruit of Justification*, I quote:

Canon 1.

¶ 4. Whosoever shall affirm that when man's free will is moved and wrought upon by God, it does in no respect co-operate and consent to divine influence and calling so as to dispose and prepare him to obtain the grace of justification; or that he cannot refuse if he would, but is like a lifeless thing, altogether inert, and merely passive: LET HIM BE ACCURSED.

¶ 5. Whosoever shall affirm that the free will of man has been lost and extinct since the fall of Adam; or that it exists only in name, or rather as a name without substance; or that it is a fiction, introduced by Satan into the church: LET HIM BE ACCURSED.

¶ 17. Whosoever shall affirm that the grace of justification belongs only to those who are predestinated unto life; and that all others,

though they are called, are not called to receive grace, being by the ordinance of God predestinated to misery: LET HIM BE ACCURSED.

In par. 4, the Roman Catholic Church argues for the Arminian view of man's cooperation and agreement with the Spirit, while repudiating the biblical doctrine of Irresistible Grace.

In par. 5, the Roman Catholic Church argues against the biblical doctrine of the Total Depravity of man.

In par. 17, the Roman Catholic Church argues against the biblical doctrine of Predestination, as well as its sub-doctrines which include Unconditional Election by God's sovereign grace.

Arminian Drew:

“Since these doctrines [Irresistible Grace, Total Depravity, Unconditional Election] are claimed to be Biblical, perhaps someone can actually show that this is the case. I do not mean to be flip, and I realize that a lot of work may be involved, but I think an objective reading of numerous threads on this topic will show that the Calvinist case has not really been made in respect to such doctrines.

Perhaps there is a strong case for the Calvinist position, but it has not appeared in these forums. In defense of the Calvinists, I suspect that a real case would require complex and lengthy arguments that are simply too demanding to make 'on one's spare

time.' Same deal with an Arminian defense - the issues are complex and the reality (in my view) is that for either side to make a real case would be a momentous undertaking - after all, people have argued about this for centuries.

I want to be clear - I am very sympathetic to an Arminian position. However, I would never want to claim that the case can be made by 'listing some verses.' Things are not that simple, IMHO. We need to look at sweeping themes of the Scriptures - themes that are not encapsulated in individual verses.

We also need to look at the 'data of life.' This kind of statement is an anathema to those who think 'it's about the Bible and nothing but.'

Let's take 'total depravity.' I found the following from Wikipedia. Whether it is a fair statement of one aspect of this doctrine, I will leave to the opinion of those who hold it:

"The doctrine of total inability teaches that people are by nature not inclined to love God with their whole heart, mind, or strength, as he requires, but rather all are inclined **to serve their own interests over those of their neighbor** and to reject the rule of God."

I have bolded the part of interest to me. I think that it is a manifest fact of life that unredeemed people **do** engage in selfless acts (at times). Of course, one can always **say** that their underlying motivations are selfish. I do not know about your lives, but I can think

of plenty of examples of loving and selfless acts, performed by the unredeemed.

My point? The world of personal experience clearly shows that the unredeemed are not **totally** depraved - they do bad **and** good. I cannot ignore what my experience has shown me."

Drew wrote:

"Since these doctrines are claimed to be Biblical, perhaps someone can actually show that this is the case."

ICONBUSTERS:

The literature available to sincere truth-seekers which prove the doctrines of grace is staggering. By the Lord's sovereign decree, we live in the Age of the Information Superhighway. To remain ignorant of the fact that all your questions and arguments have been soundly answered in both ancient and modern times leaves me inclined to believe you are engaging in debate simply to hear the sound of your own voice as it echoes in the empty minds of those who share your lackluster love of eternal truth.

Recommended Reading:

Martin Luther, *Bondage of the Will*

John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* [especially sections on Predestination, Election, Reprobation and sovereignty of God]

Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, P & R Publishing, Phillipsburg, New Jersey, 1992, [especially *volume 1, 4th Topic* dealing with Predestination, Election, Certainty of Election, Reprobation]

Canons of the Synod of Dordt

http://www.reformed.org/documents/canons_of_dordt.html

Mr. Loraine Boettner, *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*

<http://www.bloomingtonrpchurch.org/refdocpre/>

http://www.the-highway.com/objections1_Boettner.html

Arthur Pink, *The Sovereignty of God*

<http://www.pbministries.org/books/pink/Sovereignty/sovereignty.htm>

Edwin Palmer, *The Five Points of Calvinism*

<http://www.monergismbooks.com/fivepoints9262.html>

Duane Edward Spencer, (ex-Methodist Arminian minister), *TULIP, The Five Points of Calvinism in Light of Scripture*, 2nd Edition, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, Michigan Copyright 1979, Third Printing 2003 ISBN 0 - 8010 - 6393 - 0

[FALSE CHRISTIANITY >> HOME](#)