

February 29, 1980

To: A New England I.F.C.A. Pastor

Dear N.E.P.

Realizing your strong opposition to what I have previously written, or the theological position itself--whoever represents it, I hope that the enclosed rebuttal to your 12 point discourse promoting the free will/universal redemption interpretation of scripture, will nonetheless be accepted in good spirit, and objectively studied.

While it is admittedly disappointing not to have more contemporary support--especially among brethren whom I know--I want to say that I deeply believe in the Calvinistic interpretations of the doctrines of grace, which I have come to know in the past several years.

May it be accepted, that I have not attached myself to this theology for any reason less than believing it to be the testimony and teaching of scripture. It is, of course, not easy to keep going, when so little acceptance or agreement is found among the brethren whom I have either talked, or corresponded with.

While there are few indeed, I do know some who are either leaning in the direction of the historic Calvinist system, or at least are objectively open, interested, and at times reading the word, and various writings on the subject.

The only real comrade that I can acknowledge is Pastor R. S. as you are aware. I thank the Lord for him, as he is a much needed encouragement, and very capable co-laborer in the cause of defending and teaching the principles of the Calvinist system--which increasingly to us, are the true interpretation of scripture.

And while certainly some of the questions and issues of today were not a problem in the early church, I believe, and am sure that R. does, that such was the theology that they held--from which the church has so long and thoroughly defected into the pervasive humanistic, subjective philosophy that we have now.

R. has recently stated in "The Teacher", that he feels it advisable to cease further publication on the subject of

limited atonement, to avoid conflict with brethren who strongly disagree with it.

I sympathize with his reason, and have had similar feelings myself, but I believe with such assurance and dedication to the Lord and His word on this subject, that I could not withdraw from defending and proclaiming these truths any more than Gill, or Spurgeon, or Calvin and Luther, or so many more of like convictions, could restrict their labors in that cause.

Nor, can I think of better company to be identified with, than such notable men of the word, as these have been.

What today may be regarded--by otherwise sound fundamentalists--as even strange fire, was to them and any real Calvinist, live coals from off the altar; or a rediscovery (by the intervening grace of God) of the unmodified scriptural principles of salvation doctrine.

Conversely, as far as Pastor R. S. and I are able to determine, all of the leadership of the New England Regional I.F.C.A., and probably the National, are in practically total disagreement with the 5-point Calvinist system, as a whole. This would apply particularly to limited atonement, but with significant difference in the interpretations of election, and grace.

As I have indicated in the enclosed paper, I have been in the process for some time now of preparing a refutation thesis (non-academic) against Dr. John R. Rice's book, "Predestined for Hell? No!", which deals in somewhat more depth and detail with various contentions and arguments of the free will/universal atonement persuasion; of which he has been probably the most dogmatic advocate--and correspondingly militant denouncer of Calvinism, in our time.

Though I have communicated only with you, on the Regional I.F.C.A. executive level, I assume that you substantially represent the thinking of Pastors: (other N.E./I.F.C.A. pastors), etc.? One reason for asking, being that I have seen something rather baffling, or at least surprising about this.

In view of the excellent work you all have done in studying and teaching the supremacy and sovereignty of God in His person, and works--why wouldn't such emphasis logically lead to the Calvinistic system of salvation principles; which exalts God more in such ways, than the other position ever could; except one or both systems be woefully misconstrued?

It was the concentrated attention on "who God is", etc., that caused me to believe that the Regional was moving inexorably toward a resurgency of true Calvinism. To my dis-

appointment, what seemed practically imminent, has not yet materialized. I can only ask: was there a conscious decision against it, or did not such thinking ever develop? You may recall that I mentioned something of this before, in connection with your mutual work against neo-evangelicalism --and that I felt that its real source was free-willism, and the erroneous conception of universal atonement, and correspondingly modified interpretations of other elements of salvation doctrine, such as election, grace, love, etc.

Is it not conceivable that God is again calling the church to attention in this whole area of doctrine? And if so, may it not be unduly spiritualizing the principle of the injunctions of Acts. 5:38-39, and 17:30, to say that such may be the real nature and importance of rightly determining the truth of this controversy: "for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God", and "And the times of this 'ignorance' God winked at; but now commandeth all men (the church) every where to repent (of the doctrinal error in question)". Parenthetical insertions mine, to clarify application to our situation.

In closing then, may we, or whoever becomes involved, commit ourselves to the Lord, that we may become of one mind (His mind), because whoever is in error cannot be led of the Lord to the extent of their wrong thinking and teaching. Certainly His grace will permit a measure of time to learn and establish the truth of the matter, but whoever takes a position of knowledge and authority on these issues--speaking^{and} publishing same--is in a very serious position of responsibility to "speak as the oracles of God" (I Pet. 4:11). Obviously, both sides of the issue cannot claim that authority; to which, as we have just noted, there is no alternative, nor excuse permitted.

By His mercy, may we ask together that His truth prevail, and triumph--for His glory, and our mutual benefit. Amen.

Sincerely, in Christ,

Everett N. Falvey
Everett N. Falvey

F/f
Enc.

Copies to: Pastors M. and Y.
Pastor S.

REBUTTAL AND REFUTATION OF N.E./I.F.C.A. Pastor's
12 POINT PRESENTATION:
"DID CHRIST DIE FOR ALL MEN? WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURES?"

8
The first item of his discourse to be dealt with is point #8 (which he says is the strongest argument against the Calvinist point of limited atonement): "The Use of Universal Terms in Connection with Christ's Death" vs. the use of restrictive (limited) terms in connection with the doctrine of election.

First of all, from the standpoint of the unlimited atonement view, the argument which brother N.E.P. and others put forth on this point appears well taken and reasonable. In other words, the contrast between the frequent scriptural use of more universal terms in connection with atonement, vs. the exclusive, non-universal terms used in reference to election does indeed need to be recognized, addressed as an issue (when it is one), and understood.

To say, as he does, that it is one of the strongest arguments against the doctrine of limited atonement is not, upon closer consideration, cogent or able to stand as conflicting evidence at all, but instead supportive and consistent with the complete 5-point TULIP system.

Are the terms in question really universal? Granted they are broader and more general than election terms, but is this conclusive of any contention for unlimited atonement? Can there not be a good reason for this, consistent with particular redemption, or atonement?

I do not hesitate to remark at the outset, from the true Calvinist position, that the ultimate particular people involved in both cases (atonement and election) are one and the same--God's elect! Once determine even the grammatical reason for the difference in terms, and there is no doctrinal problem. But more importantly, the distinctive principles of the two doctrines themselves, provide their own answers to the supposed conflict. All of which, should reveal the problem's real source and cause, being that old diehard nemesis: free-willism.

To begin with, when N.E.P. refers to Gary Long's book "Definite Atonement", and John Murray's article as "admitting" that such "universal" terms are used in reference to Christ's death, why did he not quote their explanation of these terms? The answer is really very well put by what Gary Long, and others have said on the subject.

Any time we deal with the progressive unfolding of God's plan of salvation in the scriptures, we must especially keep in mind the Jewish traditional cast of mind in regard to other nations, as "heathen", "Gentiles", and typically "the world". This means not only the way they thought and spoke, but the way they were taught and spoken to. Paul, a Jew, in speaking to them and Gentiles mixed, often used Jewish customs, etc. as reference points, stepping stones, etc. John, a Jew, wrote to Jews and would logically speak in language familiar to them. Basically, everything moved

outward from Jewish context to the rest of the world (but not entirely, or indiscriminately).

Listen to what John Gill said on the subject (among many other well-defined comments):

"Nothing is more common in the Jewish writings than to call the Gentiles, the world; and the whole world; and the nations of the world; hence the apostle Paul calls them the world, in Rom. 11:12, 15. It was a controversy agitated among the Jewish doctors, whether when the Messiah came, the Gentiles, the world, should have any benefit by him; the majority was exceeding large on the negative of the question, and determined they should not; only some few, as old Simeon and others, knew that he should be a light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the glory of the people of Israel. The rest concluded, that the most severe judgments and dreadful calamities would befall them; yea, that they should be cast into hell in the room of the Israelites. This notion John the Baptist, Christ, and his apostles, purposely oppose, and is the true reason of the use of this phrase in the Scriptures which speak of Christ's redemption. Thus John the Baptist, when he pointed out the Messiah to the Jews, represents him as the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world, the Gentiles as well as the Jews; for by the blood of this Lamb, men are redeemed to God, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. When our Lord was discoursing with Nicodemus, one of their Rabbins, he lets him know that God so loved the world, the Gentiles, contrary to their rabbinical notions, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever of them that believeth on him, should not perish, as they had concluded every one of them should; but have everlasting life; and that God sent not his Son into the world, to condemn the world, the Gentiles, as they imagined, but that the world through him might be saved. When the Samaritans believed in Christ, they declared him to be the Saviour of the world, the Gentiles, and so of themselves, who were accounted by the Jews as Heathens; Christ sets forth himself as the bread of life, preferable to the manna, among other things, from its extensive virtue to the world, the Gentiles; and here the apostle John says, that Christ was not only the propitiation for the sins of the Jews, but for the sins of the whole world, the Gentiles."

And then for some explanation of the variant, and to us, often peculiar uses of the word "world":

" whereas it (the word "world") admits of a variety of senses; and therefore, the sense of it in one place cannot be the rule for the interpretation of it in another, which can only be prefixed as the text or context determine; sometimes it signifies the whole universe of created beings, John 1:10; sometimes the habitable earth, John 16:28; sometimes the inhabitants of it, John 1:10; sometimes unconverted persons, both elect and reprobate, John 15:19; sometimes the worse part of the world, the wicked, John 17:19; sometimes the better part

of it, the elect, John 1:29, and 6:33, 51; sometimes a number of persons, and that a small one in comparison of the rest of mankind, John 12:19; in one place it is used three times, and in so many senses, John 1:10: he, that is, Christ, was in the world, the habitable earth, and the world, the whole universe, was made by him, and the world, the inhabitants of the earth, knew him not; and which is not to be understood of them all, for there were some, though few, who did know him; and I will adventure to affirm, that the word world is always used in the apostle John's writings, in a restricted and limited sense, for some only, unless when it designs the whole universe, or habitable earth, senses which are out of the question, for none will say Christ died for the sun, moon, and stars, for fishes, fowls, brutes, sticks, and stones; and that it is never used to signify every individual of mankind that has been, is, or shall be in the world; in which sense it ought to be proved it is used, if any argument can be concluded from it in favour of general redemption. This phrase (the whole world) in scripture, unless where it signifies the whole universe, or habitable earth, is always used in a limited and restrained sense; a decree went out that all the world should be taxed; which was no other than the Roman empire, and such countries as were subject to it. The faith of the church at Rome, was spoken of throughout the whole world, that is, throughout all the churches, and among all the saints in the world. All the world is said to become guilty before God by the law; which can be said of no more than were under that law, and so not true of all mankind; who, though all guilty by the law of nature, yet not by the law of Moses. The apostle tells the Colossians, that the gospel was come into all the world, and bringeth forth fruit; which can design only real saints and true believers, in whom alone it brings forth fruit. An hour of temptation is spoken of, which shall come upon all the world, to try them which dwell upon the earth; who can be no other than such who will then be in being, and cannot be thought to include all the individuals that have been in the world. All the world wondered after the beast; and yet there were some who did not receive his mark, nor worship him*. Satan deceiveth the whole world; and yet it is certain, that the elect cannot be deceived by him. The whole world will be gathered together to the battle of the great day of God Almighty; who are distinct from the saints, whom they will oppose".

As to brother N.E.P.'s main question under item #8, of why "universal" terms are used with atonement, and restrictive, personal terms with election: (1) The doctrine of the atonement is properly part of the gospel message, which is to be generally, even universally proclaimed (per sense of the "all" nations in Matt. 28:19, etc.). Conversely, (2) The doctrine of election is not evangelical. It is church truth, revealed or taught in the epistles, specifically to believers for their edification in the knowledge of the Lord, and their salvation. There is no purpose in propounding election to the yet unconverted.

*Past sense implication, reflects Gill's interpretation of prophecy, wherein he believed the Antichrist to be the papacy (Pope, of Roman Catholic Church)--with which, I do not agree. Hence, the above-noted scriptural prophecy is yet futuristic, looking ahead to events of the tribulation.

They do not need to know about election to be saved, but they do need to understand it after they become a believer, so that they will be guided by such knowledge into sound salvation theology. This being essential to proper balance in personal relationship to the Lord, and his word, and consequently in determining and establishing priorities in all life responsibilities; including the right way to serve the Lord in evangelism. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he, and does he. Prov. 23;7 paraphrased.

Brother N.E.P. refers to the words in question--"world", "all", "every", etc. as universal in form (and that last word is a good point, though he didn't make it). It is important to consider whether there is any limit to the inclusiveness of the form. With both sides of the free will controversy admitting significant variations in the meaning of some such forms, how do we determine which definition applies? And may we say it loud and clear: we must prove the use in every case.

First and foremost, we can not deviate from the scriptural rules and tools of interpretation. "Rightly dividing" the word of truth demands that we systematize the doctrinal principles in every branch of theology. Each distinct article of truth must be seen as a separate subject for a proper understanding of its distinctives, object, etc., and then its relative place, possible priority, etc. in the system must also be determined, and constitutionally maintained. I observe that this is a characteristic failing of nearly all who espouse the free will concept of salvation, as they are often found harping away on disjointed points of contention, with nearly reckless abandon of the I Tim. 2:15 principle. So consuming must be the mindset of the devotees!

Secondly, word studies, as important as they can be as helps for clarification, insight, etc. into certain aspects or ramifications of truths; do not of themselves establish or decide doctrinal interpretation. Are we not to be logicians (as Luther was wont to put it) more than grammarians? Being overoccupied with linguistics, etc. we often can not see the whole picture. TULIP suggests an illustration that may make the point. Intent and minute examination of a petal, or other part of a flower, may cause not only the flower itself not to be given any notice or attention, but the whole bouquet, or even garden may be ignored or not appreciated. Or, as is more popularly known, we can not see the forest for the trees!

In further answer to item #8, specifically: "Those who deny that the death of Christ was universal (for all men) must nevertheless admit that universal terms are used in passages which relate to the extent of the atonement".-- These so-called universal terms are perfectly consistent with the limited atonement position, because they are similarly consistent with the Gospel message. Only it needs to be said that they are not really universal, but broad or general terms for the elect (that is, applying to the universe of believers-to-be, not all mankind). Note the universal term in Matt. 28:19, "Go ye therefore and teach (or disciple) all nations". This is an example of the type of restriction, or limitation that such broad, general words can carry. We don't imagine that everyone in every nation was to be made a disciple, baptized, and further taught the things of the Lord; per verses 19-20!

In preaching the gospel, man is only an instrumentality of the Lord, and the gospel message or word of God, as precious and important as it is, is yet another means--not itself the efficient cause of regeneration (it is the power of God, per Rom.1:16, or the word as administered internally by the Spirit, not man). Man preaching the word is not enough. Though the man may be indwelt by the Holy Spirit, there is no automatic accompaniment of the Spirit with the use of the word to every object, or hearer of the preaching.

We have on the one hand, the external ministry of man by the preaching of the gospel, and the internal ministry of God in the person and power of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts and minds of those whom he has chosen to salvation. The outward call of man has no efficient power, without the inward call of God directed as he will, to whom he will; I Pet. 2:9 "(God) who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light", and Rom. 8:30, "and whom he called, them he also justified". Man may sound the call among all, but God only calls (or applies the call to) those whom he has elected; Rom. 8:30 again, "whom he did predestinate, them he also called".

When we (Calvinists, or monergists) as witnesses, etc. tell others that they will be saved if they believe, we are not offering them salvation by stating or implying that anyone may believe; we are proclaiming gospel truth, by which God alone draws his elect ones to himself, ultimately enabling them to believe.

N.E.P. illustration of a man handing out lollypops to children --as to whether he is sincere, and they may accept--has a neo-evangelical ring to it which is no argument for the true gospel principle. And I mean to cast no aspersions against his otherwise sound theological position against neo-evangelicalism, per se.

To whom does TULIP apply as doctrinal teaching, or preaching?

T - total depravity, applies to all mankind, and therefore is properly and essentially part of the evangelical gospel message, to help show man his sinfulness, and need of salvation.

U - unconditional election, applies to only those who shall be ultimately saved, and as such is not part of the general gospel message, but is church or believer doctrine; hence, the personal, restricted usage of attendant language. Once saved (converted), there is no further need for indirect, impersonal terms, as with T, or L).

L - limited atonement, contains both elements. (1) the limitation factor--that atonement is not provided for all, is not germane to the gospel ministry, but (2) the message of what atonement is, is a vital part of the gospel and must be proclaimed as such to show the elect sinner his need and availability of that atonement in Christ (his savior to be--though not explainable as such before conversion).

I - irresistible grace, is not requisite to preaching the gospel, and is therefore applicable as doctrinal teaching only to believers.

P - perseverance. also obviously has no purpose in evangelism,

as such, but is properly for the subsequent assurance, constitutional security, and proof of believers.

Note that only 1½ points apply to the unsaved in evangelism, and to take the more general terms referring to the doctrine of atonement, which is consistent with the gospel commission, and substitute them for the personal, specific terms relating to the doctrine of election, which is church teaching, as being synonymous or interchangeable, is neither an argument against limited atonement, nor a very logical conclusion in any real sense.

Why not try the same idea with the doctrine of sin? While it is a vital part of the gospel message, and must be conveyed to prospective believers in general all-inclusive terms, it can not properly be re-applied to believers by the same unspecific words of reference.

For example, in witnessing or in preaching the gospel, we may say with clear scriptural warrant, "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God". Rom. 3:23. By the same line of reasoning which brother N.E.P. uses in applying "universal" atonement terms to election passages, we may re-word the "we", and "us" in John 1:9 with the universal all of Rom. 3:23, as follows:

"If all confess their sins, he is faithful and just to forgive all their sins, and to cleanse all from all unrighteousness".

In so doing, we have confused the contextual meaning of John 1:9-- and have changed the specific qualifying personal terms relating to believers, and made it easy for the "lifters" (those who take verses out of context to accommodate their specious concepts) to apply it to all mankind.

It is wearying to the mind to try to follow a purely moot example of word substitution, when the literal circumstances, or object of scriptural specific language is not served by it, but spoiled. In re-phrasing John 15:16 for purposes of his argument, he ignores or overlooks the reason for the personal direct words which the Lord speaks to the disciples. He is talking directly to them, "Ye have not chosen me, etc.". It makes no contextual sense for him to speak in impersonal remote terms by using the word "world", even if it was perfectly synonymous with them as elect ones. For example, a teacher in giving instructions to his class--and speaking directly to them--doesn't say, "The students are to do such, and such"; he says, "You are to do such and such".

The same misapplication of words is used by brother N.E.P. in Eph. 1:4. Paul in writing personally to the Ephesian church, would not abruptly shift from direct, personal pronouns such as "we", "us", etc. to the abstract term of "all men" right in the middle of such a discourse.

N.E.P. says the "problem" is this: "Concerning the doctrine of election, there is not one passage which uses universal terms to signify the elect". Why should there be? The doctrine of election is specifically revealed and taught to believers, for their own edification and knowledge of the theology of salvation; hence, direct, personal terms.

But lest it be thought that I am skirting the main contention of his argument, I can definitely say that the terms "world", "all", "every man", etc. as used in connection with the application of Christ's death, or the atonement, plus any and all other salvation-related scriptures, are only as universal and inclusive as the elect may be so termed geographically, nationally, etc., and especially in Gentile vs. Jew comparative reference.

Therefore, the unwarranted word change which brother N.E.P. offers in argument --does nothing to undermine the validity of the limited atonement principle.

1 Leaving item #8 now, and quoting from item #1, N.E.P. again misrepresents a Calvinist contention, that the term "world" is synonymous with the "elect". We are certainly as aware of the variant uses of the word "world" as he is, and therefore make no such absurd claim.

Reasonable observance should conclude that Calvinists believe the word "world" to be synonymous for all practical purposes with "the elect" in those passages of scripture which make application of the effect of Christ's death in redemption, or the atonement. In fact, any salvation doctrine employing the word "world" as objects of God's saving grace, would apply only to the elect!

A pet argument which N.E.P. uses to reinforce his free will interpretation of John 3:16, is Numbers 21--the serpent on the pole. I gave a brief answer to this once before, as being far short of any proof for John 3:16, especially for free will support. Apparently what I said was of little or no consideration, but I would like to try again.

We have there (in Numbers 21:8,9) an earthly, physical symbol (or type) of a spiritual principle of New Testament salvation in John 3:16 (the anti-type), etc. In the Old Testament account it was strictly a physical deliverance, or preservation of life from a physical threat. However sure the type may be in symbolism of the judgment of sin in Christ--it is not permissible for us to translate that which is literally only temporal, into spiritual doctrine.

We might as well be allegorists, as to interpret scripture so loosely. Moreover, to remark that John 3:16 cannot be fully understood apart from the Numbers 21:8, 9 account, I feel is similarly ill-advised.

We who decry the simplistic, easy-believism of neo-evangelicalism, ought to be better indoctrinated in our salvation theology than to make such radical assumptions that (1) a typological, temporal example such as Numbers 21:8,9 can equate doctrinally with the spiritual principle of John 3:16, or (2) that the spiritual particularity of John 3:16, both in principle and object, can be reduced to a merely humanistic example of the natural ability of a child to understand and accept the "offer" of candy from a candyman, as adduced.

We have no warrant, or excuse for establishing parallels or complements between that which is literally temporal, and that which is literally spiritual--regardless of the symbolism, similarity, or other values that may be deduced.

Also the misassumption that John 3:16 constitutes a universal offer of salvation--rather than declaring a promise to believers of the eternal life implicit in their election--is a typical contributing factor to much of the error common to the free will concept.

See the February issue of Pastor R. S. monthly publication, "The Teacher" for an excellent expository treatment of John 3:16, in the above underlined context. And again, as quoted from John Gill, page 2 herein, the "whosoever" emphasis made by Jesus to Nicodemus was to underscore to him and all Jews, the Gentile inclusion in God's plan of salvation. See the contrasting effect again in verse 17, where the Lord reinforces what he said in verse 16, that while the Jews traditionally thought in terms of salvation being only for them, with all other nations being condemned --that Jesus said he came to do just the opposite, save other than Jews only, out of the many Gentile nations of the world.

Picking up the reference to Numbers 21:8,9 again, the word "live" accentuated by brother N.E.P. as if obviously comparable to the eternal life of John 3:16, can be shown to be likewise an unfounded assumption. Contextually, as pointed out before, the Old Testament incident only promises the preservation of physical life of the Israelites who obeyed its injunction, and typifies the spiritual principle of deliverance from sin's judgment through faith in Christ. However, the typical evangelistic application made of the account, misses the real spiritual principle intended to be seen.

What was the occasion or cause of the fiery serpents? Does not the situation typically represent the judgment of sins of believers--wherein, the "people", Israel, God's chosen ones (dispensationally temporal, on the whole) were "much discouraged" (sin) vs. 4, and "spake against God", vs. 5?

Is it not typification of the breaking of fellowship with God, as in I John 1:6, and then the looking ^{at} the brazen serpent, an earthly example of the believer's restoration of fellowship with God, as in I John 1:9?

So when N.E.P. says that few who believe in limited atonement discuss Numbers 21, because its implications are far too universal--I see nothing convincing about such a statement, when its premises are examined. Israel as a type of the church is certainly not universal; the sins of that nation typifying the sins of the church (dispensationally understood) is not primarily applicable to unbelievers sins as evangelistic doctrine; and hence, not mainly related to atonement, but fellowship, obedience, etc. in an established family relationship, of the children with the Father--Israel and God; and the church and God.

2 Item # 2: referring to Isaiah 53:6, brother N.E.P. states that the

"all" in the first and last of the verse, applies to all mankind. He not only disavows that the all can be only "elect" Israel, but after making a case for the whole nation of Israel, he doesn't leave it there, but unabashedly applies it to all who have gone astray, which is every human being.

As has been said in other correspondence to brother N.E.P., and others, even the clear example of Rom. 11:26 is apparently unacceptable to him as a qualification of spiritual, elect Israel vs. natural, total Israel, which says, "and so all Israel shall be saved". If that must break down to something less than every Jew, so can Isaiah 53:6, and many other passages; for surely, we can distinguish between spiritual, and natural Israel. Just to zero in on Rom. 9:6-11. ought to settle the question by itself: "For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel"; vs. 7, "but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called"; vs. 8, "the children of the promise (elect) are counted for the seed"; and vs. 11, "that the purpose of God according to election might stand".

To argue that because all are sinners, or lost, or gone astray, etc.-- that they are automatically the objects of God's plan of salvation, whenever the terms appear in related scriptures, is to ignore the particularity of much salvation doctrine. What kind of an election can such ones believe? What concept of God's sovereign will, and ways can be held? Are His will and plans frustrable by man?--

3
On item #3, referring to I Tim. 2:6, I would like to quote from Gill again, as follows:

"The sense of these words (a ransom for all) is best understood by what Christ himself has said, 'The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many'. So the Hebrew word for all, to which this answers, signifies sometimes many, a multitude; and sometimes only a part of a multitude, as Kimchi has observed. Wherefore, it is better by 'all men' to understand some of all sorts, as Austin did long ago, and is the sense in which the word 'all' is to be taken in many places; as in Gen 7:14; Matt. 4:23,24; Joel 2:28; and is the meaning of it in ver. 1 (I Tim.), and well agrees with the matter of fact; since Christ has redeemed some of all nations, some out of every kindred, tongue, and people; and God saves and calls some of every rank and quality, as kings and peasants: of every state and condition, as rich and poor, bond and free; of every sex, male and female; of every age, young and old; and all sorts of sinners, greater and less."

"I rather think that by 'all men' are meant the Gentiles, who are sometimes called the world, the whole world, and every creature, Rom. 11:12,15; I John 2:2; Mark 16:15; which is the sense, I apprehend, in which it is used in ver. 1, where the apostle exhorts, that 'supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all in authority'; which was contrary to a notion that obtained among the Jews, of whom there were many in the primitive churches, that they should not pray for heathens and heathen magistrates. The apostle enforces this exhortation from the advantage which would accrue to themselves; 'that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, in all godliness and honesty; be-

sides, says he, 'This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men', Gentiles, as well as Jews, 'to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth,' and therefore has sent his ministers to preach the gospel among them; and the doctrine of 'the grace of God has appeared' to these, 'all men', in order to bring them to it; 'for there is one God of Jews and Gentiles', who, by his gospel, has taken out of the latter a people for his name and glory; 'and there is one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ', who, not like Moses, who was the Mediator for the Jews only, but is for the Gentiles also; and is become 'our peace, that hath made both one, reconciled both in one body on the cross; preached peace to them that were afar off, and to them that were nigh; through whom', as the mediator, 'both have an access by one Spirit to the Father; who' also 'gave himself a ransom for all; to redeem the Gentiles as well as Jews; which was 'to be testified in due time' to them, as it was by the apostle, who adds, 'Whereunto I am ordained a preacher and an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not,) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity;' and then concludes, 'I will therefore that men pray everywhere,' and not be confined to the temple for public prayer, another Jewish notion and practice, 'lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting.' Seeing then there are some Jewish notions pointed at in the context, and the whole is adapted to the state and case of the Gentiles, under the Gospel dispensation, there is a good deal of reason to conclude that they are designed here; whereby another principle of the Jews is confuted, which is, that the Gentiles should receive no benefit by the Messiah when he came; and is the true reason of most, if not of all, those universal expressions, relating to the death of Christ, we meet with in Scripture. (underscoring, mine).

From the whole, since these words cannot be understood of every individual man, they cannot be thought to militate against God's righteous decree of reprobation, nor to maintain and support universal redemption."

4

Brother N.E.P. asks the question in item #4; "How can we tell lost men and women to be reconciled to God if no such reconciliation has been provided?" We are commissioned to preach the gospel to all, not presumptuously personalize it to individuals, as if every human being is automatically eligible. God personalizes it to his elect, by his Spirit--as we witness, evangelize, etc.

For a simple illustration, it is right to testify of what the Lord has done for us (salvation, etc.); but to say he will do the same for "you" (or anyone) is presuming upon God and his word, and is therefore wrong! But to add to the above (witnessing, testifying to his word, etc.): "if you believe" (without telling them that they can) is the right way to speak. This way we are saying what God's word says. He will do the inward work, of enabling the one to believe, if he is one of his elect. In this way, as we have the right underlying understanding, motive, etc. we are honestly communicating the gospel--leaving the "whosoever" of it to God, where it is all in his secret will and control, anyway.

When we use the gospel, i.e. Rom. 10:11, "whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed", it is not the same as saying to individuals: 'You can believe, and be saved'; or ver. 13, "whosoever shall call upon the Lord shall be saved", does not translate into any such personal assurance as: "You can call upon the Lord, and be saved'. And again the emphasis is more to give assurance to non-Jews of the extension of saving grace to any of them--who because of their election, are led to seek and respond to God for salvation.

Also, there is a twofold reconciliation referred to in II Cor. 5: 18-20--noting the state of the Corinthian church, wherein the Jewish Christians needed to be instructed on the new principle of grace vs. law (new vs. old), and abolition of Jew-Gentile separation--that reconciliation is to be developed, as well as the preaching of the ministry of reconciliation to God of unbelievers (elect unbelievers, though not known, or to be distinguished in evangelism).

5 Item #5--the only reason a little child, as N.E.P. says, would say that I John 2:2 means that Christ died for all men--from the words "whole world"--is because of the conditioning of his mind to contemporary use of the phrase, and because as a child he is not able, or responsible to study and prove the literal meaning of the words. I Cor. 14:20, "be not children in understanding.....but in understanding be men", has good bearing here.

As to the use of the term "world" as cited especially in I John 5: 19, "the whole world is under the control of the evil one", is a poor distinction to include Christians under, or to compare to the "whole world" of I John 2:2. As for the "whole" world of I John 5:19, it is spoken of the wicked (unbelievers), in contrast to the first clause of the verse, which refers to believers.

So the "whole world" is not everybody in that verse, any more than in I John 2:2, where a contrast is also made between the "our" sins of John and whoever he was joined to in the reference "our", and other elect having the same possessive claim, designated as the "whole world" of believers (existing and future). It needs, furthermore, to be reminded that this passage is church truth, spoken to the family of God, for comfort and advice of the advocacy and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, to the children of the Lord, as noted in the discussion of Numbers 21, and John 3:16.

Citing John 11:51-52 as teaching Christ's death as a basis for entire Jewish national salvation, and subsequently the "whole world", is again ignoring the elective decree, and misapplying even such particular words, as gathering the "children of God" that were scattered abroad. N.E.P. says that the result of Christ's death is such that God would be able (basis idea) to gather children. This re-phrasing of the "children of God" is not at all intimately specific as in the scripture sense. Who are the children of God? Anyone naturally, or is it a spiritual relationship, already ordained and counted by God of his elect? See Rom. 8:37-39, and 9: 7-9 for this distinction.

6 Item #6: I have a very difficult time trying to follow the supposed logic of N.E.P. - argument that Paul's, "I am crucified

with Christ" can ever be so technically misconstrued by anyone to mean that Paul is the only one Christ died for. Paul's reference is his own personal testimony of his relationship with Christ; and his epistles abound with the same teaching to all believers. The passage which says that Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, etc., at least indicates a definite limitation upon the extent of his death's application. These are excellent points against universal redemption, which basically has nothing more to claim for its validity than the arbitrary assumption that such variable terms as "world" in redemption passages, always means the maximum scope of such terms, when there are almost innumerable cases to the contrary.

It is certain that Christ died for Paul, and for the church; it is not certain that he died for any greater number than whoever has already been saved, plus elect Israel, and other elect Gentiles to be saved. Are these not specific limitations?

Regarding the comment on John 1:11, "He came unto His own, and His own received him not": John 1:13 gives us a very good clue as to why they refused him (and as may be supported by other scripture). The ones in ver. 12 who did receive him, did so, not of their ("free") wills, but by the will of God as specified in ver. 13. So it may surely be concluded that if as it were, His people received Him not, they did it of their own wills, as to be logically deduced from the ver. 13 principle. Also, "they judged themselves unworthy of eternal life", as in Acts. 13:46.

The act proves their non-election. "His own" being his own kind, Jews, doesn't prove anything as to their eligibility for salvation. Again, we have earthly relationships, and spiritual ones, which cannot be confused as having all things in common. There is nothing in the reference cited in item #6 such as "His people", etc. that cannot be rightfully construed as elect Israel within the nation. Matt. 1:21, which says Jesus shall save his people from their sins, proves the case against a universal basis for redemption. It says he shall save his people, which we know is not universal Jewish salvation, from many scriptures; particularly those teaching the remnant factor.

John 1:11 might as easily have been said, "He came unto the Jews, and the Jews received him not"; at least those Jews, or at that time. When I said before that it proved their non-election--and since so many Christians today believe that giving out the gospel is the all-important thing, implying that anyone can believe and accept gospel truth--it serves to prove the opposite, when they don't believe it. A man may contend he has some excuse for not being converted, if he has never heard the gospel. But such excuse is void, by the actions of those who have been well evangelized, and do not subsequently believe.

Jesus had as much right to prove his unacceptability, as he did the opposite. We are told to preach the gospel, even compassionately, if you will, but are not told how many will believe, or who they will be. Presumption, and false assumption are all too characteristic of much of our contemporary "knowledge".

7 Item #7- Referring to Heb. 2:9, "that he.....should taste death for every man"; listen to an interesting commentary by John Gill:

After quoting a typical free will plea for the universal redemption scheme, Gill replies, "That the word 'man' is not in the original text; which says not that Christ 'should taste death for every man', but (quoting the Greek words), which may be taken either collectively, and be rendered 'for the whole', that is, for the whole body, the church, Eph. 4: 16, for which Christ died, and of which he is the Saviour; or distributively, and translated 'for every one', that is, for every one of the 'sons', Christ, the Captain of salvation, brings to glory, ver 10; for every one, the 'brethren', whom he sanctifies, is not ashamed to own, and to whom he declares the name of God, ver. 11, 12; for every one of the members of the 'church', even the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven, in the midst of which he sang praise, ver. 12, for every one of 'the children' God has given to him, and for whose sake he took part of flesh and blood, ver. 13,14; and for every one of 'the seed of Abraham', taken in a spiritual sense, which are Christ's, whose nature he assumed, ver. 16. Moreover, supposing there is a change of number, and that (certain Greek words) is instead (certain other Greek words), 'for all', that is, for all men, there is, ^mthe context, a plain restraint and limitation of the phrase, to all the sons, the brethren, the members of the church, the children, the seed of Abraham, for all whom Christ tasted death, that is, he really died, and became the author of eternal salvation to them, which does not in the least help the cause of general redemption.

It deserves consideration, whether the (certain Greek words), may not rightly ^{be} rendered, 'that he should taste of every death', or 'of the whole of death'. This hint I have received from an author referred to in the margin. If this reading of the words can be established, as I think it may, agreeably to their grammatical construction, the context, and the analogy of faith, the argument, and any colour of or pretence for one from hence, in favour of the universal scheme, are entirely removed: should it be objected that if this were the sense of the words, they would have been placed thus, (certain Greek words), and not the verb between the adjective and substantive; it may be observed, that there is in the very text itself a like position of words, as (certain Greek words), therefore, such an objection would have no weight in it; (quotes certain Greek words which are put in a way favorable to this), instances of which the lexicons themselves will furnish us with; though the verb (certain Greek word) governs a genitive case without a preposition, yet it is well known that the Greek language abounds in pleonasm of this kind. The context also favours this sense of the words; for if they be considered in connexion with the phrase, 'made a little lower than the angels', or that other, 'crowned with glory and honour', they contain a reason for either; for if it should be asked, Why was Christ so greatly depressed and humbled in the human nature? the answer is ready, that he might be capable of tast-

ing of every death, or of the whole of death; and should it be inquired, wherefore, he is exalted in such a glorious manner, it may replied, Because he has tasted it; for, as in ver. 10, 'the Captain of salvation' is made 'perfect through sufferings'. And it is certain, that Christ has tasted of every death, or of the whole of death, the law required he should, in the room and stead of his people: hence we read of his deaths in the plural number, Isa.53:9, 'He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich (certain Hebrew word), 'in his deaths; he tasted of the death of afflictions, being all his days ' a man of sorrows, and acquainted with griefs'; of a corporal death, being 'put to death in the flesh' in the body or human nature; and of eternal death, or what was equivalent to it, when his Father hid his face from him, poured out his wrath upon him, as the surety of his people, whereby his 'soul' became 'exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death'; he tasted of the whole of death, of the agonies, miseries, bitterness, and curse of it, and so has delivered his people from the sting of it, and from all the wrath which follows upon it.

Whereas it is observed, that the scheme of general redemption more magnifies the grace of God than that of particular redemption does; the contrary is most true; for surely that scheme of redemption which provides for the certain salvation of some, which some are a number that no man can number, more magnifies the grace of God, than that scheme which provides a precarious, uncertain salvation for all, giving only a mere possibility of it, with a probability that all of them may perish; leaving multitudes of them without so much as the means of salvation, and entirely without the Spirit of God to apply it to them; putting them in a salvable state, so that they may be saved if they will; which, if it is effected, must depreciate the grace of God and sufferings of Christ, and exalt the power and free-will of man. The grace of God is magnified, not so much by the number of persons on whom it is conferred, as by the sovereignty of it, the circumstances of the persons interested in it and the manner in which it is bestowed." Parenthetical references to certain untypable Greek and Hebrew words, are mine; as well as underscoring.

9 Item #9--The "our" of I Cor. 15:3 which brother N.E.P. says included all who Paul preached to, is pure supposition on his part, because Paul is referring back to when he preached the gospel to the Corinthians who are now believers. He would have delivered the gospel generally, as anyone does or should, and his reference to "our", only includes believers. A Christian referring to his and others salvation, isn't saying anything that anyone but believers can quote personally. We must be careful how we use the "our's", and "your's", and "us's" and "we's", both of scripture and in our own wording of gospel truth. We can't include unbelievers in such personal possessive terms of salvation. Only God knows before conversion, who the believers to be are, because he ordained their salvation.

What can N.E.P. conclude from the verse he quoted from, that "God had much people" in this city--except that these were his elect out of the mass of unsaved who Paul generally preached the gospel to. To say that Christ died for sinners, is not the same as saying all sinners, nor is it right to say to a group of sinners: Christ died for every one of you--because no one can cite scriptural proof cases of such method of evangelism--at least no pattern of unquestionable biblical examples can be produced. And of course, this is because it is doctrinally wrong.

Again, to sum up arguments against item #9--Paul told the Corinthians the good news all right--and that accordingly Christ died for sinners, and much other gospel truth, but when brother N.E.P. says he told them as individuals that Christ died for each of them--this is the supposition without scriptural proof that he makes. It is typical of the whole free will, erroneous underlying philosophy!

To say that I Cor. 15:3 is part of the gospel message is somewhat misleading--for while it certainly can be used in evangelism--the main purpose of the chapter is to teach the Corinthian Christians (and all believers since) about resurrection. It is only a matter of referring to the gospel to show the order of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection. He immediately begins a discourse on the subject of resurrection for almost the entire chapter. I mean to further say that we have no right to speak this personal reference to salvation in a way that intentionally includes any unsaved in the "our" of it. Nor, do I think that Paul ever spoke that way to the unsaved. He who was given such extensive revelation of spiritual things, and who can be followed throughout the epistles showing such consistent maintenance of ^{the} election position, which we know as Calvinism, can not be conceived of as countenancing anything contrary to that conviction.

10

For item #10 - Comments from Gill are offered, though judging from what N.E.P. referred to in his comments, the word Saviour is not acceptable to him in any sense but spiritual salvation. However, Gill says,

"These words (I Tim. 4:10) stand among others, which are said to contain, in express terms, the doctrine of general redemption. But, 1. If these words represent God, as the 'Saviour of all men', in the sense of a spiritual and eternal salvation, they prove more than any, unless Origen and his followers contend for, namely, universal salvation. To say that Christ is the Saviour of all men, with respect to the impetration of salvation for them, though not with respect to the application of it to them all, is a distinction which must, in part, make the death of Christ in vain; nor can a mere possibility of salvation, nor a conditional one, nor a putting of men into a salvable state, be intended; for then they that believe, would be only in such a precarious and uncertain state; whereas it is certain, that 'he that believeth shall be saved'. Besides, if God is the Saviour of all men, in the sense of eternal salvation, then he must be the Saviour of unbelievers, contrary to many express passages of scripture; such as John 3:18, 36, Mark 16:16, Rev. 21:8.

2. The words are to be understood of providential goodness,

and temporal salvation; which all men have a share in, more or less; God the Father and not Christ, is here called 'the living God', who is 'the Saviour of all men', that is, 'the preserver of all men'; who supports them in their being, and supplies them with all the necessaries of life, and 'especially them that believe', who are the particular care of his providence; for though he is good, and does 'good to all men', yet more 'especially to the household of faith'; which was the foundation of the apostles' trust in him, under all their labours and reproaches, which attended the preaching of the Gospel. Which sense of the words is perfectly agreeable both to the analogy of faith, and to the context, and is owned by some who are on the other side of the question."

11

Item #11--Little needs to be said to offset the undue apprehension expressed here, of wondering how to speak to the unsaved from a limited atonement perspective. As long as one knows how to rightly quote and use the gospel, he is on safe and sure ground, with plenty of scriptural material; without undiscerningly broadcasting church truth as if it were standard equipment for the world at large.

I will admit it takes some getting used to, to get de-programmed from the conditioned thinking of the indoctrinated universal redemption scheme. Those who can tell the unsaved, indiscriminately, that Christ actually died for each one, loved each one (to the extent of wanting to save them), and is definitely the propitiation for everyone's sins, are the ones who ought to really be concerned about how they are misapplying salvation doctrine!

12

Item #12--So much good scriptural explanation has been written against the universal redemption idea by the reliable Calvinists such as Gill, Spurgeon, Owen, Murray, Luther and many more, that I would only offer one fairly brief comment from Gill against the barrage of "all" passages that N.E.P. boldly applies to the whole human race. See again quotation from said author on page 9-10 herein; second paragraph of same.

Addenda
In closing this polemic against the free will, universal atonement presentation noted in the title hereof, I would like to include two excerpts from a manuscript which I have been working on, written in refutation of John R. Rice's book, "Predestined for Hell? No!":

"There are two terms, that I have come across after writing my treatise 'Disputing the Free Will Concept', which I believe eliminate the uncertainty and elusiveness of the terms, Calvinism, and Arminianism. Their meanings further help clarify the related terms of 'free grace'; God's sovereignty, foreknowledge, election, predestination, decrees, and all other related salvation language.

Apparently, the words were used for some time around the reformation era, as may be noted in Hurst's History of the Christian Church, Vol. I. These words are monergy, and synergy --or in other forms, monergism, and synergism, etc. Monergism - one agency; that is, in man's salvation, God is the only active agent; man being entirely passive. This was the Western church view, promulgated by Tertullian (with-

in limits), Augustine, Calvin, etc. One reason maintained being that the depth of human depravity necessitates that the first and (every) controlling part in salvation, be solely divine grace.

Synergism - two agencies; that is, the cooperation of both human and divine agents in achieving man's salvation. This was the predominant tendency of the Eastern church, with Pelagius, the great leader. In this latter connection it is also interesting to observe the Gnostic view of sin and grace:

'While there are certain evils in human nature, and the disposition is warped by inherited infirmities, man is at liberty to choose salvation, and is responsible for neglecting the offer of divine grace'. Quoted from Hurst. The Gnostic association may be resented, but the free will language unquestionably establishes the alliance of thinking, in this vital aspect of salvation theology.

Referring again to the words monergy, and synergy, and related forms, I believe these contrasting words call for such a decision of alignment with one or the other, that they will clearly distinguish (1) those who believe in salvation by God's grace alone, which is the sole active agency, and (2) those who believe that salvation requires the co-operative, co-active agency of man's natural will as being both free and inducible to choose or reject salvation, as "proffered" by grace, versus the monergistic principle of salvation being caused by grace, in every particular.

The elements of the latter principle are absolute in themselves: God is only active, without limit; man is only passive, without limit. Conversely, according to the principle of synergy, the characteristic elements are that God is active, and man is active. But neither element is absolute in itself, nor without limit. God can not be the 100% active agent in the whole spectrum of salvation, and man can't be without some active freedom, and power of choice, positive or negative.

There is an indisputable line of demarcation between the two postulates, monergism, and synergism, which can not be denied as long as the basic word definitions are not modified, as has unfortunately been the case with the meanings of Calvinism, Arminianism, etc.

Is it not more accurate and self-explanatory to use grammatical words with root components, which define and establish their meanings, than proper names--which of themselves prove nothing; often having different connotations, or interpretations, especially given the vicissitudes of time?

This point should be especially valid, when applied to certain biblical doctrines, which have been in the scriptures long before the theological works of Calvin, and Arminius ever occurred in history. In other words, the principle of either monergism, or synergism--is a necessary fact inherent in the subject of grace and salvation from its origin, or inception."

"He (John R. Rice) says that such great evangelists and soul winners as Moody, Torrey, Sunday, Jones, Hyles, etc. were not/are not Arminian because they believed in salvation by grace. To which I reply that if (as is the case) they were/are free will proponents and practitioners (a definite Arminian trait), then they did not/do not know what salvation by grace actually is! Neither do ^{other} such believers today. Salvation by grace is thoroughly monergistic from start to finish. Conversely, these men were/are undeniably synergists.

When grace is taught or explained by most of this (granted, majority) class of Christians, it may include any amount of what God does for man in the way of prevenient leading, opportunity, and circumstances; in fact, practically anything short of actually allowing conversion to be irresistibly caused by God. The irony of this being that they become advocates of what must be essentially "limited" grace. Their perpetual assault against the "limited" atonement of Calvinism, rings rather hollow when matched against the conditional points of their theological system.

It comes down this way: When the Arminian, free willer, or the more definitive term synergist, draws a line on grace, which will not allow it to be an irresistible work of God in bringing his "unconditional" elect to himself--they place a limitation on the fullest extent of what grace may be held to be. And they permit no exception to this for anyone, in their system of salvation; unless perhaps some hold to a similarly unsound idea of a dual plan of salvation, whereby some may be exclusively chosen for special purposes, and all others being potentially eligible for salvation. Now, by contrast, the "particular" redemption that Calvinists hold which is otherwise known as "limited" atonement, is only limited in this sense: it is limited to the elect--but is fully efficacious for them; that is, unlimited in value and power on their behalf--because grace includes how God effects his salvation plan--and therefore, can not be finally thwarted or frustrated from fruition.

Let the reader consider, then, which system espouses the most questionable limitations? Very similar analogies can be drawn with the synergistic view of election--as being inherently more limited, by being made to be "conditional" upon God's 'foresight' of faith (which is itself the free-willist's erroneous interpretation of the "foreknowledge" of predestination).

The comparable modification of "total" depravity, again, carries with it a specific limitation of extent, whereby the fallen Adamic nature--under the Arminian, synergistic concept--is not so completely corrupted and spiritually helpless as Calvinism, or the monergistic interpretation maintains. That is, to make the idea of human free-will workable--however mysteriously--there "has to be" some unique capacity in natural man whereby he has an inviolable freedom of choice, to either accept, or reject personal salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ. In other words, flesh and spirit can communicate according to such theory; despite the teaching of scripture to the contrary in II Cor. 2:14, Gal. 5:17, Rom. 8:5, etc.

The synergist, therefore, places a far more serious limitation on the power and efficacy of the atoning sacrifice of Christ--than the monergist is accused of, who makes no qualification of the absolute application of the atonement, to all who are its God-appointed objects; they being the elect, only. Under the synergistic theory--no one is certain to be saved."

Following is a brief summation chart, contrasting the free will salvation concept, to the historic 5-point Calvinist system:

<u>Calvinist - Free Grace Factors</u>	<u>Arminian (±) - Free Will Factors</u>
(Salvation certain to the elect. Impossible for others.)	(Salvation certain to none. Possible for all.)
<u>Total Depravity</u> - Sinful nature; complete alienation to God; free will lost in fall; no faculty of response to God.	<u>Limited Depravity</u> - Man has sacrosanct human free will; inducible to believe Gospel.
<u>Unconditional Election</u> - God selects ones to be saved, independent of any human decisive factor.	<u>Conditional Election</u> - Personal election based on God's <u>fore-sight</u> of affirmative free will response to Gospel.
<u>Limited Atonement</u> - Provided only for the elect; effectually.	<u>Unlimited Atonement</u> - Provided for all, potentially; <u>basis</u> for universal salvation.
<u>Irresistible Grace</u> - Unfrustrable operation of God's purposing will to save the elect.	<u>Resistible Grace</u> - Gospel "proffered"; subject to free will acceptance, or rejection.
<u>Perseverance</u> - Eternal security of believers.	<u>Perseverance</u> - Except for historic Arminians, many hold to eternal security of believers.

This paper, written in rebuttal to N.E. Pastor's position statement of Dec. 10, 1979, has been diligently prepared for the purpose of refuting the free will arguments of his presentation.

The work is therefore submitted, prayerfully and respectfully; hopeful that brother N.E.P. and any others who come to read its contents will earnestly and faithfully consider whether its propositions are not substantially logical, and essentially consistent with ^{the} teaching of scripture; notwithstanding the consensus of opinion to the contrary.

For the cause of God, His church, and His truth. Amen.

Everett N. Falvey