

FREEZE DRIED CALVINISM/DIVERSIONARY ARMINIANISM
and the original sin catalyst

Little do our Holiness folks realize that they have been programmed by the Arminian emphasis upon the divine counsel, even much the same as the Presbyterians and others, have been programmed by the Calvinist emphasis, and the Lutherans by the Lutheran emphasis. Hence the necessity of this piece of writing.

We will here give in quote a typical definition of predestination (which subject, by the way, is a definite building block in the theological construction of the Paulinian presentation of the divine wisdom, and is also (together with "election") the central element in the Calvinist-Arminian controversy. Quote; "The belief that before times dawn, God decided whom he would save (or not), unaffected by any subsequent human action or decision". We somewhat wonder if the grammatical architect of this definition was theologically Arminian seeing as the last line of the quoted definition seems to portray the predestinator as cold, unmerciful, and inconsiderate. Whether this be so or not, we say that such (freeze-dried) definition, without a deeper exposition of the matter is to a great degree responsible for the (rebellious) diversionary form of thought which embodies the greater part if not all of the different factions of the Holiness movement, as well as other movements. This being the case we will use the last line of this definition as a launching pad for such an exposition, exposing as it were the scheme which lies behind diversionary Arminianism, which *scheme* of course is to totally deemphasize the rock bottom concepts of sovereign election and predestination.

The architect of this definition (whether they be Calvinist or Arminian) very conveniently overlooks that which we will call the original sin catalyst, which thing makes the above quoted definition somewhat absurd. If you believe the doctrine of original sin as we do, you then believe that everyone of us (in father Adam and mother Eve) made our own fatal "action or decision" in the garden, which fatal "decision" still stands today and also for eternity unless God in his sovereign grace and mercy has elected to work within us (see Phil.2:13) a new and correctional decision, by which we may escape the judgment to come. This is relevant to "the election of grace". In order to drive home our point, it must also be stated that this original sin "action and decision" was subsequent to the pre-creational decrees of God the eternal Father.

It can be objected however, that the design of such an inherent sin transmission would have been an unrighteous thing on the part of the eternal Sovereign. To this we say; if the overall design had not included a perfect (foreordained) plan of Salvation, all sufficient for the entire race (the first parents included) then such a charge might possess some degree of merit. Give Rom.8:20 a thorough indepth study to dispel all doubts concerning this particular paragraph of this article. We say also that this perfect foreordained plan of Salvation came replete with priceless eternal rewards, for those who qualify. Qualification can involve the acknowledgment of such things as we are here asserting, especially when they are so conveniently laid in our lap, and cost us nothing except the mortification of our spiritual arrogance.

Calvinism (it seems) is interpreted by some (we ourselves have not studied this theology enough to know) as totally disregarding the human will. This Rom.9:16 nor any other scripture does not do. Rom.9:16 (and other Scriptures) do however, make us to know that the human will is not going to *effect* our Salvation, (please note that we did not here use the word *affect*). Diversionary Arminianism strives (so it seems) to make the decrees of the Almighty subject to the human will and its faltering decisions.

Whether this definition, mentioned in the first paragraph, is Calvinist theology, or an Arminianistic assessment of Calvinist theology, is hard for us to ascertain. Either way (we say) that this definition is basically sound but misses one very important factor. Repetitively we say, that according to the doctrine of original sin (as we understand it) mankind collectively made his/her "decision" in the garden (for this reason only, could we be born with the sin nature working in us) which decision stands (individually) for all of time and also eternity unless God the eternal Sovereign has elected to abolish it by working within us a new and correctional decision, and by this same sovereign mercy (acting upon mans will) deliver "us from the wrath to come". This appertaineth to "the election of grace".

We say that every person is born with this original sin principle working in them, the motions of which are non-imputative until such time as God should bring the individual into a relationship of accountability to himself, through the Spirits call and the accompanying "knowledge of sin". We say also, that this said fatal (original sin) decision is always cancelled by an early death with those that are not accountable. The fact that little infants sometimes die in the womb, or soon after birth, should be proof to any reasonable mind that the original sin curse is that which brings the decree of "mortality" upon mankind rather than any post-conception sin which they may commit. Therefore the Apostle Paul, in Rom.5:12 last clause, must have been intending to create this context.

The doctrine of original sin stands on the incontrovertible assertion, that any human being who has ever existed (the Lord Jesus Christ excepted) would, as a matter of principle, have done exactly the same thing that Adam and Eve done, if they had been in their place (in the garden) under the same circumstances and conditions which they were (that is to say, without any experiential knowledge of death or suffering). Adam and Eve were created in human perfection, and if they were so effectively seduced in the original sin temptation, it then becomes an absolute inevitability of principle, not only that we would have fallen just as they did, but also that we did fall into sin, through them and in them.

The full unfettered acknowledgment of sovereign election and predestination is undoubtedly one of the most stringent acknowledgmental tests contained in the Scriptures (for the creation of a fuller potential eternal reward). We say also that the spiritual senses must be vigorously exercised in spiritual discernment in order that one might hold such state of acknowledgment if ever it is attained. We say that for those who have reached such a state of acknowledgment, a perpetual Bible study, at least on the sidelines of the general Bible study will (most likely) be required to keep such individuals from slipping.

Erroneous doctrines, (which some seem to associate with sovereign election and predestination) are generally (it seems) not hard to hold by those who have embraced them. Those who get hooked most usually never get lose, unless they are sovereignly persuaded of their error by the Lord Jesus. This is not the case with the true Bible doctrines of sovereign election and predestination, we know some who have stood on the threshold of this priceless acknowledgment, but because they failed to pursue they soon fell backward.

FREEZE DRIED CALVINISM/DIVERSIONARY ARMINIANISM, cont...

We have from time to time down through the years heard it said (by various saints) that this Salvation "is not just for certain ones". To this we do fully agree, its not just for certain ones, it is for everyone. We will however, here state the obvious; everlasting life will only be obtained by "certain ones", see Rom. 11:7.

These "certain ones" are the elect of God for he foreknew them. Relevant also is the fact that he purposefully caused their existence as also he did the existence of those who will ultimately fail to make their own election sure. These things are vividly illustrated in the fact that Rebecca the mother of Jacob and Esau was barren before that she was miraculously caused to conceive those two individuals, in whom the principle of sovereign election and predestination is so clearly and sovereignly set before us.

We will here break down the matter of sovereign election and predestination in a manner which should make it comprehensible to any mature Christian and especially our brethren of the five-fold ministerial orders. We will do this through the presentation of two theological assertions, the first of which is flatly incontestable. The second should also be incontestable, however we have been informed that there are some who attempt to do so.

Assertion #1. The eternal three-fold Godhead has sovereignly caused (through creation and the procreational chain reaction) the existence of every human being, as well as of all other things, both material and immaterial.

Assertion #2. God the eternal Father, foresaw from eternity past the souls destiny of every human being whose existence he (through creation and the procreational process) would sovereignly cause.

The equasion... We will now reiterate (with revision) from a former article. Any thing which God the eternal Father foresaw, is inevitably foreordained by this this one factor alone, he foresaw it. That which he foresaw (electing not to prevent or to circumvent) is also foreordained by sovereign election (the clearest example of this is the eternal soul loss of all those who are not "ordained to eternal life"). That which he did elect to prevent or to circumvent, was never foreseen (as an event) for it could never occur. An eternal soul-loss by the elect is the clearest example of this.

THE ELECTION OF GRACE... Fully implicit in this powerful Paulinian phraseology is the undeniable theological import that without such sovereign election (and in spite of the great work and perfectly sufficient sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ for this very purpose) there would yet have been none saved out of the whole human creation. Such a failed effort is utterly unthinkable and utterly impossible with an All-Powerful Deity whose ascendant characteristic is righteousness. Love is the divine essence and to call it a characteristic would be a deemphasis. Many books could be written based upon the vast implicit contained in this afore-mentioned four word term. Formal Calvinism could be correctly restructured and diversionary Arminianism (as far as it concerns the perceived need thereof) could be forgotten.

R. Corn 09

Additional commentary... While we ourselves are theologically predestinarian, we are not theologically Calvinist (we recently told two Calvinists that we are not a Calvinist). While we are as predestinarian as any Calvinist, we are far from the theological formation which walks out of the Calvinist mold. This is where many are likely to stumble, for they acknowledge no variance between the expressed Paulinian thought concerning sovereign election and predestination and the Calvinist perversion of these Biblical truths, example; the supposed impossibility of falling from grace.

How does the great predestinator feel whenever he considers that his people whom he has sovereignly predestinated are ashamed to identify with those who are even willing to be set aside because they teach this great Scriptural truth.

This matter is made much more weighty by the fact that we ourselves are learning these things through the contemplation of our own personal experiences with the Lord as we examine them in the light of his word.

We now say thus; If (and as) the "spirit of antichrist" gains greater degrees of control, within this organization, it may well be expected that our elected guardians will use their ecclesiastical authority yet more toward preventing the people from receiving the benefit of the whole counsel of God, of which sovereign election and predestination are such a significant component.

Any spirit which hinders the word of the Lord (and the sound doctrine which derives thereof) from having "free course" and being glorified, is "that spirit of antichrist".

If 1st Peter 1:2 were to be "wrested" into a structure which would be supportive of the popular Arminian conceptions, the key word "unto" as it is used in the third clause, would need to be replaced with the phrase "because of". This (loaded) word "unto" is used by Paul in a very similar context in Eph.2:10.

Our people are so accustomed to interpreting the Scripture as meaning what it seems to them that it should mean, for example, it does not seem right that God the eternal Sovereign would have fore-ordained individuals in their eternal destiny, therefore Acts13:48, Jude verse four, and other such Scriptures must not be taken as meaning what it would seem that they do. This also is the error of the Arminian diversion.