

“Will” Power Problem

Someone (and probably many others) said that my writing on the controversy of literal vs. liberal gospel interpretation is too technical for him. Now, I take no offense at that! Because, it is very detailed, and comprehensively studied and presented.

I have explained within my website publication why that is the case. It has to be! To reiterate why I believe that such thorough treatment of the subject is required—I will use an example of the doctrinal issue in question, to illustrate the depth and scope of the problem.

First, I will touch on the status quo situation, of practically the entire universal church. The liberal, Arminian, gospel theology with which it is indoctrinated has been increasingly entrenched in the church for centuries, having usurped the authority of the apostles’ tradition of the literal gospel.

The erroneous philosophy—over such a period of time—has created an insulated constitutional atmosphere, which is almost impossible to penetrate, and to introduce the required teaching needed to reform it. It fits the dictionary definition of “brainwashing” to a “t”: “indoctrination so intensive and thorough as to effect a radical transformation of beliefs and mental attitudes”. Webster’s College Dict., 4th Ed.

To be trapped in a state of doctrinal deception, because of disobedience to God’s command to learn the truth, and gullible vulnerability to false teaching, has drawn the church into the snare of the devil, and nobody seems to be even suspicious of it—let alone, know the precarious position they are in.

For all of which, there is no excuse; only corresponding negative judgmental consequences! Certainly, there will be no “well done, thou good and faithful servant”, for living and serving the Christian life based on false gospel beliefs. What shameful disservice, and dishonor to God!

In an interview with Bill Maher, on the subject of whether there is a God, or if one can know it for sure, Mike Huckabee made a rather quick—but poignant remark. In fact, Maher was taken a bit aback by it, as evidenced by a knitted brow reaction—even though he didn’t comment on it (though he appeared to try to interject a question, or some reaction).

While it wasn’t directly germane to the subject in discussion, Huckabee said words to the effect that if God forced one to positively respond to the gospel message of salvation, it would essentially be a form of “rape” of his will. By which, he was implying that God would not do such a thing! And, no doubt, most of you reading this would agree with him, and rightly so, but for the wrong reason. God does not force our old, natural will, but gives the elect a new will, with which to spiritually believe!

Huckabee’s strong statement is a key example of the captivating influence of the theology

underlying it. Which is a good thing if you are right. But, what if you are wrong in your related doctrinal belief? Is it not correct to say that it is incumbent upon a Christian to be sure that his interpretation of a biblical revelation or principle is literally true? In other words, must he not prove to himself that what he believes is the incontrovertible truth?

It is not a hope-so, think-so, opinion matter, but a know-so interpretation of doctrine that we are responsible for. But, that is not the case, or the church would not be in the misguided, irresponsible false belief situation with which it is obsessed!

Let's think about what one has to believe, and not believe, for Huckabee's implication about man's "will" to be true.

Assumptions

1. Man can intellectually conform to particular gospel truth "requirements", and become a Christian.

Reply: Disagreement! To be explained under Problems section below.

2. Man's will must not be coerced to accept salvation.

Reply: Absolute agreement! See following comments.

Problems: That the above assumptions encounter scripturally.

1. Per the definitive doctrinal truth contained in 1 Cor. 2:11-14,

That natural man cannot understand the gospel, spiritually. And since the gospel is, of course, a spiritual thing, how do you resolve the obvious conflict that the liberal Arminian gospel theology runs into here? The answer is, that you can't—and I have never seen any kind of scripturally logical explanation for it.

2. Admittedly, John 3:16 says that "whosoever believeth" in Jesus shall have eternal life. But, what is it to believe? The word "belief" is synonymous with faith, trust, reliance, etc.—per Strong's Concordance, and even a regular dictionary. However, the only use of the word "faith" that we should be concerned with, regarding salvation, is spiritual faith—not the simple natural, intellectual kind.

And, if that faith is a "fruit of the Spirit", as we are told in Gal. 5:22, how can an unsaved person possess it, or use it in response to the gospel or any other spiritual truth?

I mean, then, that it can be scripturally proven that believing is what a Christian does after he is regenerated (by a direct, independent act of God, as a result of predestination), not what an unbeliever supposedly can do to become a Christian—when, in fact, he can do nothing which would result in his salvation!

3. Predestination is a positive, exclusive doctrine, designating who is to be saved—which is personal election, of a limited, unchangeable number of believers-to-be!

4. Total depravity of fallen man, including total inability to believe spiritual matters (in a natural, carnal state).

5. The efficacy of the blood of Christ, in his sacrificial death.
Is it logical that the blood of the Lord would be shed in vain for anyone? Or, that God's purpose could be frustrated by the possible refusal of man to accept such a "provisional" atonement?

6. That God's will (if for universal salvation opportunity) would be technically subject to the required cooperative exercise of man's will.

7. In summary of items 5 and 6, that one would think that God's saving grace is resistible.

8. And that anything as eternally important as man's salvation would ever be left to chance, or to the fickle will of man!

When I indicated agreement that man's will be not coerced by God, it isn't because there is an essential decisive ability of that will to respond to God, effectually, for salvation.

It should be clearly understood by every Christian that when Adam sinned, the spirit of God was completely withdrawn from him, leaving his entire nature—mind and body—corrupted by sin. God designed and created man with His spirit in him, by which they would fellowship and communicate.

After Adam's fall, without the spirit of God in him, man would not have any further capacity for a mutual relationship with God—until such time as the Lord would restore His spirit to the ones he would redeem.

By which, I mean that no communication takes place between God and natural man, until after his spiritual regeneration. So, that instead of God forcing man to believe, he gives His elect a new will, by which they are able to believe in Him. Which all happens by God's doing—independently of any human action, not even a cooperative decision—man being entirely passive!

That is the literal biblical interpretation of Gospel truth, not the contrived, free will concept with which nearly the entire universal church is brainwashed (or more explicitly, brain-polluted).

What is it that makes a Christian careless, or gamble with the word of God? Even though most of them don't think, or know that they are guilty of that fault. It is so easy to think we hold sound doctrine; probably because we quote scriptures verbatim, and interpret them the same as the majority of the church does.

Consensus of itself, proves nothing but consensus! Which is false comfort if the subject or doctrine involved is wrongly interpreted and maintained.

I hope this doesn't appear as a dogmatic claim of being one of a correct minority, but I would rather be alone and right, than one of a vast majority and be wrong. Especially when the truth is self-evident and determinable—either readily, or with adequate study.

If we make the fundamental mistake of thinking that there is any uncertainty about the meaning of any particular biblical doctrine, or principle, and thereby allow for different opinions of any important elements of those subjects—we are justifying opinions, and exhibiting disunity, disagreement, and confusion in the church, and the world! But, more importantly, casting aspersions against God's intent and ability to make his word perfectly clear and understandable.

The misuse and abuse of language, which we see throughout our country and the world in politics and ideologies, is a serious matter of dishonesty, lack of integrity, and being disingenuous, which is a cause of much difficulty and divisiveness among people, that is deplorable and disgusting to see being so typical of our national and global life.

But, for a Christian to mishandle the language of scripture is by far the most egregious failure of all! Knowing what I have learned about the literal (Calvinist) vs. liberal (Arminian) conflict and controversy, puts the case in point in sharp perspective.

To help note how subtle and mind-controlling the effect of the free will misinterpretation of the gospel is, let me use a particular psalm to illustrate it. Let's say, which is true, that I am a right wing conservative, and you (which is true for a great percentage of the church) are a left wing liberal on the subject.

In Psalm 119, practically every verse refers to God's word, in one form or another—his truth, law, judgments, ordinances, commandments, statutes, etc.

So, when you and I read it, and it says for example: "I delight in thy law", etc., etc., surely we both agree with David's words of praise and prayer. But, does that mean that we have no problem?

If, regarding doctrine, we have a different interpretation of its meaning—which is a material disagreement—does that not affect, and establish our constitutional belief and theology on that subject? Which, if so, qualifies what we mean by delighting in his law, etc. For example, "His law", etc., according to a concept of it, not purely what it is. It is a distinction we make, not only about a particular part of God's word, but, by deduction, our image of God himself!

In broad contrast, let's say that one sees God as more paternalistic to man, in general, than another does. If that characterization forms our impression of who God is, it will influence how we see Him, in his thinking, his works, and administration of the world. It tempers our image of

him. Which ought to be a learned, objective one vs. a subjective, rationalized impression.

In another way of looking at our issue here, a Christian who is oriented to, and guided by, a more literal interpretation of scripture, sees revealed principles in an absolute vs. relative sense. Or, declared literal meanings, not ones subjectively determined by the fleshly thinking of our old nature.

That is, what God actually says, not what we assume, or wish he said. Building a church empire on the latter basis, is essentially what has happened to corrupt and largely destroy the church's testimony to God, and the world. Which, unfortunately, is just the opposite of the positive light that the church sees itself in!

And, sad to say, it scarcely has any idea that the prophetic, judgmental description of Rev. 3: "wretched, poor, blind, and naked", etc., is the real picture of today's degenerated church. And, as sorely as it is needed, there is no indication in the prophecy of any serious reformation, but the admonition and appeal is made to whoever might listen and respond. I pray that many might see the plight they are in, while there is yet time!

Following are excerpts from a prophetic study by a particular author (whose name I will omit, because I don't want to diminish the credibility of his excellent work on end-time prophecy, especially from the book of Daniel). The quotes are examples of the captivating effect that the Arminian, free will salvation concept has had on most of the church for centuries

On the use of the words, saints, and holy ones, he says: "Those indeed, who have been partakers of the divine nature by that supernatural operation of the Holy Ghost which we recognize to be the immediate result of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." He is saying that the new birth is the result of faith, whereas the opposite is true, that faith is the result of the new birth, because faith is part of the spirit, which is received upon conversion.

As to saints, he writes: "In whom the Holy Spirit of God has performed the supernatural work of conversion to God, 'by grace.....through faith' in the Lord Jesus Christ." The act of conversion is, of course, by grace, but faith cannot precede regeneration—because spiritual faith cannot exist in man prior to his regeneration. However, when we put in the part of the verse that faith applies to, which is "saved" by faith—we can properly interpret it, as referring to the future event of actually entering heaven, and escaping hell! We cannot automatically equate conversion with salvation as the same event, even though the latter is guaranteed to subsequently occur.

It is very disappointing to note how well a commentator, pastor, teacher, etc. can so accurately and comprehensively discuss one—even relatively difficult doctrine—and then be wrong on another one. God would commend any good, faithful service, but would denounce and castigate him for any doctrinal misinterpretation. There is no middle ground, excuse, or tolerance. It's a matter of right or wrong; true or false!

Where is the godly fear of disobeying God's mandatory requirements—including knowing the truth of his scriptures, in all doctrinal subjects? Where is the reverence for His will? The diligent seeking of it? The dedication, and desire to please and honor Him in everything we are responsible for? Like Daniel, who “purposed” in his heart to be faithful to God, which was not simply a general commitment, but a continuous resolve.

We, instead, are too concerned with how we can make the gospel more acceptable and “effective”; trying to enhance man's hoped-for response. If he “can” believe, don't we have to do everything we can to facilitate it? Which is the driving rationale behind it!

That philosophy is, however, dead wrong! But, having made that the constitutional premise of the established church's gospel theology, by radicalizing certain doctrinal elements to accommodate a relative concept, instead of absolute gospel doctrine, it naturally follows that there would be a corresponding tempering of one's belief about the very nature of God.

For example, it makes the subject of God's love more inclusive, instead of exclusive (as it is inherent in the decree of the election, or predestination of certain ones to be redeemed and saved. Which is clearly the biblical doctrine, but that literal, extreme interpretation of it is contrary to the liberal gospel view, that salvation is universally available to everyone.

If we say, as the bible does, that God heareth not sinners, or that natural man has no access to God, or living relationship with him, it is too restrictive and difficult for the free will, God-loves-everyone, and wants-them-to-be-saved, Christian to accept, and live and serve accordingly.

If we really knew anywhere near how abominable every form and aspect of sin is to God, we could appreciate the fact that he could not, and therefore would not love the sinful creature that man has become. He can only love a Christian because he is cleansed from the corruption of sin by the blood of Christ. Or, God loves the believer because of his identity with, and imputed righteousness of Christ—not of ourselves, but in him!

However right we may about something we are responsible to know, or how faithfully we may serve in some other way, does not compensate for some area of disservice! Works stand on their own merits, even if a preponderance of good ones outnumber negative ones.

And, the importance of not misrepresenting God's word—especially doctrine, must be right at the top of all Christian testimony, and service. It is so directly connected with God, that it is, in effect, inseparable from Him. Reverence for Him is measured by our commitment to learn the literal meaning of all of his word, which is the authority and guidance for everything we believe and do!

How can one properly worship God, who misrepresents the truth of any part of His word—especially anything as serious as the gospel?

