

Why I Wrote My Critical Commentary
On The State of The Church

1. To try to tell the church what is wrong with its gospel doctrine (though they think its all fine). And, which, it is responsible to know, firsthand from the related scriptures-- but has, instead, "sold the truth, and bought a lie." Per Prov. 23:23, in effect.
2. To show what effect its false doctrinal beliefs have on the quality of its service and testimony-- both personally and corporately.
3. And, also, what it does to their concept of God, as to (1) who he is, (2) what his will is, and (3) how he thinks and acts—regarding his plan of salvation.

Which, in essence, because the church's interpretation of gospel principles is fundamentally and extensively erroneous—is, therefore, false doctrine. In other words, it misrepresents the gospel, and God.

Question: Does that not put a Christian continually out of God's will; hence, out of fellowship with Him? "Except two walk together, how shall they be agreed?" And the mandate, "keep that which is committed to thy trust" (as stewards of the truth, not "the commandments of men." Col. 2:22. And, "But as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak, not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts." 1 Thess. 2:4.

Further thought to consider—comparing the contemporary church with the original church: If the apostle Paul, or any of the others, were to come into practically any one of today's churches—would they commend, or denounce it? I speak especially of its gospel doctrine.

But, what a Christian constitutionally believes in such a major area as salvation theology has to affect his thinking on other subjects, and consequently how he lives and works for the Lord, as well. "As he (a man) thinketh in his heart, so is he." Prov. 23:7.

I anticipate strong adverse reaction to what I have contended to be universally neglected salvation truth. There is surely a part of me, as probably with most anyone, that does not want to thrust such antithetical doctrinal arguments upon the church; it being largely united in a contrasting liberal gospel theology.

But, more importantly, there is the compelling sense of responsibility, or duty to contend for, and expound the truth—no matter what intense opposition may be encountered. The cost, or consequences of error—whether constituting heterodoxy, or heresy is far worse. But not honoring God, in defense and confirmation of his word, is the most serious failure of all! Phil. 1:7, Acts 18:26, 19:8.

What I have written on the subject of gospel doctrine is predicated on the principle of God's sovereign, independent decrees, and exercise of selective grace. Which ought to be every Christian's constitutional belief.

To advocate a different theology, incorporating a doctrinal philosophy that maintains the

concept of universal atonement and salvation opportunity, and “free will” capacity to believe the gospel—constitutes a radical departure from, and contradiction of scriptural truth, that God will neither allow, nor excuse!

Why would not one who subscribes to, and disseminates such unsound doctrine, risk being found “to haply fight against God? Acts. 5:39.

No plea of innocence, or ignorance will avail anything but negative consequences. Certainly some kind of serious judgment or loss of commendation and rewards (both here, and “there” will result from such unfaithful works.

If--having sounded the alarm--anyone is helped to see and act upon the truths that (by God's grace) I have been able to learn and pass along, it will be worth it “all”, whatever personal, and collective fallout that last word may include.

If I might be trusted to have no self-serving, or ulterior motive in presenting this critical material to the church at large—may I ask that you be willing to study and consider the interpretations of doctrine contained in the writings, and to “search the scriptures daily to see if those things be so.” Acts 17:11, slightly adapted.

Thank you!.