

A Negative Critique*
of Contemporary Christianity

*Component words, per Webster's New World Dictionary:

Critic 1. a) a person who forms and expresses judgments of people or things according to standards or values, b) such a person whose profession is to write or broadcast such judgments.

Negativism 1. an attitude or system of thought characterized by doubt and question, rather than approval and acceptance.

Observation and analysis of the various subjects of life is a natural and important function in the process of determining and contending for the truth; or making the best judgments of the comparative worths of divergent beliefs, or opinions, and arguments.

Therefore, criticism in the honest, constructive sense is fully justified and, in fact, essential to the establishment and maintenance of the truth involved in any matter of life--especially significant or important subjects.

In conjunction with what I have written in the accompanying material denouncing the prevailing Arminian, free will theology of the modern church, I am adding the following critique of particular persons and ministeries in the church world today, who are the practitioners and purveyors of the revised gospel theology in question.

But first, a little reflection on a serious predisposition of mankind in general ^{to} exemplify the difficulty of trying to get people to consider anything contrary to what they believe, even though it can be substantially proven that what they have believed is wrong.

There is an inveterate trait common to man, that even when practically incontrovertible evidence is cited which makes a great majority of people guilty of a particular fault or failure, most of that majority thinks that they personally are an exception, and not a culpable party.

An example will help make the foregoing point. How many people in a church service, think they are guilty of a specific sin preached about in a sermon. Or, that do anything about it when they do agree that it applies to them.

There seems to be at least two major factors as to why people will not examine questions and challenges to their wrongly held thinking. First, a fear of finding out the negative truth about themselves, and secondly, being falsely comforted with the majority support of those in their camp, that somehow they couldn't be wrong, because of their overwhelming consensus.

But, for the relatively few who will take heed, and be open to the arguments put forth--even a little reformation of the church is better than the status quo remaining unaffected.

It is anticipated that most of the Christians at fault here (which is most Christians), will duck the issue one way or the other--either by not responding, denial, or counter-attack, etc.

Whether or not I refer to specific names of people and organizations, I want you who read this critical composition to allow that I have the inherent right, even responsibility, to expose what I conscientiously believe (after many years of diligent study) to be serious doctrinal error--especially relating to salvation theology. "Disputing and persuading the way of God more perfectly". Acts. 19:8.

In fact, because of the degree and depth of the entrenched, permeating doctrinal corruption, there is need of a complete deprogramming and reformation of the great majority of the universal church!

Which, sadly but prophetically, will not happen to any great extent. Rev. 2 & 3. But the effort should always be made, as God's word would require, to induce as many as possible to respond favorably.

If the credentials of Calvinistic doctrinal interpretation, or representation, is the Bible, what are the credentials of Arminianism? The Bible also? Since the two belief systems are diametrically opposed, and God's truth is determinable, and He is not the author of confusion--how can both parties claim to teach the truth? Or, to speak for God?

Some, erroneously, say there are differences of interpretation that are understandable or allowable. There is, technically only one true interpretation of any biblical principle, or doctrinal subject. And we are commanded to learn it!

God meant something particular in everything he has revealed to us. So, when people get different meanings, ideas, or concepts of His word--it is not all right to perpetuate these variances; especially in His name.

They have to be resolved by study, reasoning, debate, and prayer, in diligent pursuit of the one essential meaning of whatever the subject is, so that the church is unified in its doctrinal beliefs.

Since I contend that the Bible is the documentation and support for the literal, conservative interpretation of salvation doctrine (termed, historically, as Calvinism), what then is the authority for the Arminian concept? Because the philosophy is

is provably wrong, there are no authentic credentials!

If we trace the history of the school of thought, we find it to be not the original, or early church position, but rooted in a later (2nd or 3rd century) departure from the apostles' tradition, or teaching. See the comments in the foreword of the treatise: "Disputing the Free Will Concept", herein, for references to the above subject.

If, as it must follow, that the above-noted departure from the apostles' tradition is in fact a departure from the truth, then the operating principle for such a movement is not Spirit, but flesh. It being one of many cases where man tries to make scripture more palatable, or favorable, to man. That is, man-centered vs. God-centered. Therefore, the credentials, or assumed authority for the deviant theology is man himself (his independent mind), not God or His word!

This is not a scathing accusation or inditement by me only, but as true interpretation of the related doctrine will attest--means that man has tampered with God's word, and promulgated corrupt teaching of His gospel truth for centuries, since the early church era.

Whoever thinks that he is "walking in the Spirit", or "in God's will", while espousing erroneous doctrine, is woefully deceived, and instead "walking in the flesh". That is, not walking with God. Can we escape the admonishment of scripture, that two cannot walk together except they be agreed?

And to not know that in such case one is not honoring God, but playing into the hands of the devil, is just further evidence of the deception. And all his otherwise "good" works, cannot offset or ameliorate that particular unfaithfulness.

Do you think a Christian who holds a wrong doctrinal interpretation, can ever claim that he is "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ", or heeding many other similar principles and admonitions? It cannot be!

At this point, most who read this will, no doubt, mainly disagree with me--and I believe mostly unjustifiably. But, if I indicate actual personalities or churches, and ministries by name--your objections will probably turn to anger and attack.

In deference, therefore, to the general respect and favor in which many of such people are held, I will refrain from listing their names--but must say that the problem is so widespread and pervasive, that I can scarcely think of any such evangelists, pastors, teachers, and regular believers who are not involved in

the engulfing tide of Arminian theology that has subjugated practically the whole universal church.

The sad commentary is attested to in Rev. 2 & 3 in the prophecy relating to the degenerate church of Laodicea (which is the history written beforehand representing the negative example of today's church).

As I have stated elsewhere in this publication, in so many words--it would have been easier for me not to have written this strong critical commentary denouncing the church in general for its failure to "keep the faith" of the gospel truth as it was delivered by the apostles to the original church.

The fact that I am in such a relatively small minority with these particular doctrinal beliefs, makes it difficult and disheartening, but I cannot, in conscience, draw the line anywhere short of the position I have taken, without compromising the truth, as I have come to know it.

Which leads me to say that over the many years of the encroachment of Arminianism (free will evangelism, with its associated gospel modifications) there must have been no small percentage--literally many thousands of Christians--who consciously drew back and capitulated from coming to the logical and consistent interpretations that would have kept them faithful to the word. There are many scriptures, all too explicit and decisively clear to miss their obvious meanings.

It is the awesome implications of those defining revelations that have caused many to compromise, and rationalize away the real meaning of them; thus producing the radically altered "gospel" that purports to be salvation truth.

But, the absolute principles, however extreme they are to our humanistic judgments--nonetheless require our complete subscription and allegiance to them. While it may appear too difficult for such a degree of commitment, and rarely to be seen--we need to remember that the early church (as testified in Acts 2:42-47) held those principles faithfully to a man. A total oneness of beliefs and practices, that should have been the ideal strived for by every believer and church ever since.

But, to our shame, how far we have fallen. Even daring to call our word, His word! "My brethren, these things ought not so to be". Jas. 3:10.

How can so many who have betrayed the sacred trust of the gospel, conscientiously expect, or even hope, to hear the words: "thou good and faithful servant"? It ought to make one shudder in fear of such a loss of commendation and reward!