

BETWIXT & BETWEEN

The great theological controversy of the 18th century...

Is Divine Grace Irresistible?

The five points of the Calvinist.

The five points of the Arminians.

Where is the truth in all this? Brother, it is betwixt and between. There are elements of truth and elements of error in both systems.

Rom. 10:21 carries a very strong implicit, indicating that Grace in general, under ordinary circumstances and conditions, not only is resistible, but that it also suffered both resistance and rejection by the people of Israel. By the term "Grace in general" we do not mean to deemphasize Grace in any measure, but we simply have in mind that which is spoken of in Tit. 2:11, the which if it were generally irresistible (that is to say, under all circumstances and conditions) would then bring all men to Salvation, which we certainly know is not the case.

On the other hand, we do not need to overlook or to disallow the Biblical record that we have been given in the four Gospels, dealing with the locating and calling of the twelve Apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, every one of which seemed to obey the command to "follow me" without the slightest hesitation. Nathaniels doubts were immediately dissolved as soon as he encountered the Lord Jesus in person. These things, (very implicit of Divine Sovereignty) can be used to assert that the Grace of God is irresistible, whenever it is according to his purpose for it so to be. The man "Saul of Tarsus" didn't seem to resist at all whenever the Lord Jesus located him on the Damascus Road (the Lord had a highly perfected GPS, long before man ever got his up and running).

We completely differ from the Calvinist position, that "Christ did not die for all", yet we know also by the use of sound reason and by the Scriptures, that the eternal Father would not have assigned to his Son the fathomlessly critical and strenuous task of laying in place the great eternal foundation, if there had not been an elect people reserved in his own foreknowledge and this sovereign reservation then sealed into the very foundation itself, and these to be given to the Lord Jesus for a bride.

If Acts 13:48's last clause had been written thus... as many as believed were ordained to eternal life, we could then report that the first point of the remonstrance, (Arminianism) which states that "election (and condemnation on the day of judgment) was conditioned by the rational faith or non-faith of man" would be totally true. We could come closer to agreement with this statement if the word "election" were replaced with the word *justification*.

As it concerns my own testimony, I myself resisted Divine Grace to a point that is frightening to contemplate, but later after that I had been "delivered unto Satan" that I might "learn not to blaspheme", I found that the Grace that before time had seemed to be resistible then seemed to become irresistible.

To conclude the matter, Arminianism is an overreaction to Calvinism, on much the same order as a strictly symbolizational sacrament is an overreaction to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. The concept of a strictly symbolizational sacrament renders it powerless, and in much the same manner, Divine Sovereignty can be nullified and laid waste in the minds of the people, by our failure to subordinate the doctrine of mans free-will under the explicit declaration of the Sovereign power and authority of our Lord Jesus Christ as declared in John 17:2 and other Scriptures.

R. Corn

P. S. This piece was originally written in 05 or 06 and rewritten with slight revision in 2010. We are looking at the prospect of a future piece to be written under the title; THE GREAT MISTAKE OF ARMINIANISM; FAILURE TO RECOGNIZE AND ACKNOWLEDGE THE ELEMENT OF INSEPARABILITY WHICH EXISTS IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIVINE FOREKNOWLEDGE AND DIVINE FORE-ORDINATION.