

Exposing The Illogic of Today's Man-made Gospel

Does the typical Christian ever wonder, or question whether the interpretation of certain gospel principles he believes are actually correct?

Has he ever attempted to prove his beliefs, or are they based on assumption? A simple, but critical, question. Because those two methods of learning are diametrically opposed to each other.

Proof requires careful, conscientious, diligent study to determine the true meaning of stated doctrine, and related principles. Assumption is gambling that whether what one chooses to believe is the truth, or not. "Prove all things" applies to every aspect of a Christian's responsibility, especially scriptural truth.

What must one incorporate into his learning process to properly understand biblical doctrine? Logic! Reasoning! Careful Analysis! Determination! Diligence! Proof!

But, even more fundamentally necessary than those things, is the desire to be faithful to God in the knowledge of his word, and the trust in him that one will be able to accomplish that desire—no matter how difficult the subject may be. "My grace is sufficient for thee" (in everything). 2Cor. 12:9.

But, that degree of thorough devotion is apparently rare, because to their shame the great majority of Christians have not learned the literal truth of the gospel, and are not willing to test the assumed truth of their belief.

They have adopted a liberal concept of the gospel, which contradicts some of the essential factors of the doctrine of salvation. What key principles of learning did they violate? All of the items in paragraph 4 above. Per item 1, isn't God's word always logical? In addition to all of his other perfections, he couldn't be anything but logical. How many times do we judge God's actions by our comparatively finite minds, instead of remembering who he is, and how right and exact everything he does would be?

His word would never be confusing, nor open to more than one interpretation. And, neither would he countenance any ideas of man that deviate from his intended meanings. He would, instead, regard any material misinterpretation as unfaithfulness to him, and his word. And not simply due to misunderstanding of his principles—but, as irresponsibility, or willful disobedience.

Once Christians are indoctrinated with the belief of universal atonement and salvation opportunity, they seem uninterested, and unwilling to even hear the literal interpretation which

the scriptures present. And that only proves that they are thinking and acting in the flesh (their old natures), because in the spirit (their new natures) they would not be adamant and closed-minded to the truth that they have refused to learn, and follow.

How can such a one be sure that other areas of his Christian life are spiritually motivated and conducted? I cannot see how he can ever know that he is not living most of his Christian life according to his old nature.

Meaning that is he is really only intellectually worshiping, praying, serving in various areas, singing hymns, etc., but not with actual spiritual commitment, or consciousness. What other conclusion does the situation permit that conforms to governing biblical principles?

I do not believe a Christian can be out of God's will in an important doctrinal area—which, again, most of the church is with its false gospel theology, and be in his will in other parts of his life.

Has not a believer with such a major unfaithful fault, broken fellowship with God, and would he not stay in that condition, as long as he remains in disagreement with God's true gospel doctrine?

The logical answer of yes, per the biblical question of "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?", should be decisively applicable to the foregoing situation.

Looking at the factors in the "TULIP acronym of Calvinism, consider the following comments:

1. Total Depravity, must logically include total inability to comprehend spiritual truth, which is clearly stated in the principle of 1Cor. 2:14, that the "natural man receiveth not the things of God, for they are spiritually discerned?" Including the gospel, which is indeed a "thing of God"

A natural person can only believe things in the natural realm. Belief of the gospel is a spiritual belief, and he has no capacity for that, unless God has chosen to make him a Christian. The biblical use of the word "believing", in connection with salvation is synonymous with "faith", which is a fruit of the Spirit' And that cannot exist before conversion. It is an integral part of the spiritual transformation.

2. Unconditional Election The choice by God of specific ones to be saved, independent of external factors—including assumed pre-conversion belief of the gospel for the new birth to occur, is guaranteed to happen at God's appointed time, and under his controlled circumstances.

3. Limited Atonement, which means that the sacrificial death of Christ only applies to the elect, and that efficaciously—not as a provisional act of God for all mankind, as the Arminian, free will view contends.

4. Irresistible Grace. This is a distinction of how God works in man's salvation. It is not an "offer" of God for man to be saved. It is how he carries out, or fulfills his plan and promise of particular redemption. It is a positive, independent, inevitable act of God, whereby he brings his chosen ones to himself. Nothing can prevent, or interfere with what God has ordained to happen.

5. Perseverance, which assures eternal security. Once regenerated, the Christian is guaranteed never to lose his salvation. Eternal life is not subject to the believer's works, or faithfulness of any kind.

Now, to consider the question of "logic" of the liberal gospel concept extant in the contemporary church. The main fault of the Arminian view is that the rationale for it is illogical, when looked at from the perspective of God's will, as revealed in his word.

There are several mistakes contributing to the false gospel concept:

1. That God wants everyone to be saved. 2. That natural man can believe the gospel.
3. That God wants man to exercise his will, and not be forced to believe.
4. That Christ shed his blood for all. 5. That natural, unsaved man has access to God in prayer.

Comment on assumption No. 1, above:

If God wants everyone to be saved, why wouldn't he ensure it, as he has for the elect? Many scriptural passages can be cited which express the certainty of salvation, for those predestinated for it. Yet, in face of all that positive doctrine on the subject, the free-willers insist that the grace of God "offers" salvation to all mankind, which must be believed, and accepted before one can become a Christian.

In other words, the most eternally important decision that man could ever make is subject to his fickle will, which much more often than not refuses the "proposition"- when God could make it happen, without fail, if it was his will! It is a typical example of the muddled, unspiritual thinking that characterizes the false gospel theology that prevails throughout the church today.

Comment on assumption No. 2:

If we acknowledge the truth of 1 Cor.2:14, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of God, for they are spiritually discerned", then how can anyone say that an unsaved person can believe the gospel—which is surely a "thing of God" (a spiritual thing)? I can practically assure you, that the majority of Christians today, do not, and cannot incorporate that fundamentally relevant principle into their contrived gospel diatribe. They would, therefore, either ignore it, or misinterpret it, as with many other scriptures that do not support their false concept.

Simply, but poignantly put, belief as it relates to any spiritual subject, is synonymous with faith, which is a fruit (result) of the spirit, received by man in his regeneration. It cannot exist in a

natural, non-Christian person to any extent, or in any way, ever! Hence, it cannot be a

prerequisite to becoming a Christian, but when properly understood believing (and its related forms) always applies to only what Christians are capable of, or what one must be (a believer) to escape hell, and enter heaven. Which is their status after they are converted, and does not refer to anything that occurs before that event, because nothing of any eternal significance can.

Comment on assumption No. 3 (as to man's "free" will):

God would never appeal to the corrupt will of sinful man, expecting him to comprehend a spiritual matter, which is strictly beyond his natural, carnal capacity. Nor would he force the depraved will of fallen man to believe in him. But, instead, when he transforms his chosen ones into Christians, he gives them a new, spiritual will with which to believe, and live in fellowship with him.

Comment on assumption No. 4 (application of the atonement):

This particular misinterpretation does violence to the truth of a precious act of God, and Jesus, by judging the crucifixion to be a provisional sacrifice for all, rather than the effectual one that it was for the elect. It should be unthinkable to a Christian that any part of God's work of salvation would be conditional, or ever unsuccessful, by being left to mortal, unsanctified man to decide whether to accept any aspect of what God has done to save him. He would never condescend to the will of man, especially an unregenerated one.

Comment on assumption No. 5 (relating to access to God, in prayer):

How does one (which unfortunately, like most Christians) who thinks that a natural, carnal person can believe the spiritual truth of the gospel, get around such scripture as John 9:31. Which says "we know that God heareth not sinners?" Even a Christian who has been sanctified, comes before the Lord through Christ, our mediator. That is partly why we pray in Jesus' name. How can an unconverted sinner have access to the throne of God, in his unholy condition? Oh, I know the subtlety of thinking that there is some mysterious special provision made for those who seek, or would respond to the gospel for salvation. That, however, is all rationalization, against principle. For God doesn't work that way, and there is no rightly interpreted scripture that can attest otherwise.

I wish there was something that could jolt the church out of its spiritual blindness, and complacency with its false gospel beliefs. I realize that God probably never sends thunderbolts to get our attention, when we have neglected our responsibility to heed his word directly, which always fully and clearly reveals the truth God intended to convey on any given subject.

However, for what it may be worth, I will offer one more example of the seriousness of the error in misinterpreting the gospel. I was doing a crossword puzzle, and a particular clue for a four letter word was "changed facts." The answer, as you may have guessed, is "lies".

Applying it to the controversy, at issue, it means that the prevalent gospel concept held by nearly all Christians, is a lie. Because the facts have been changed by certain perpetrators, or unfaithful church leaders, and has been gullibly and irresponsibly accepted by the vast majority of believers for centuries now.

So, then, who is the father of lies? Satan, of course, and he has succeeded in drawing most believers away from the truth--which has been a major strategy of his, ever since the temptation of Adam and Eve, Job, and countless other believers ever since.

So, whoever has strayed from the truth has lied about the gospel, and every time it is repeated, the lie is spread, reinforced, and entrenched in the church's thinking. What else do you think you are doing but lying? Stating an honest opinion, or interpretation? How so? There is only one true meaning of basic doctrinal principles, and you do not have it regarding the gospel, and likely other subjects. Because, if you so radically mishandle the truth in one area, you are very likely to do it in others. And, remember, you left yourself open to Satan's influences and control. He is not going to leave you alone, although, because he has you captive with a misconceived version of the gospel, he probably can't do anything else more important, to render you ineffective.

This accusation of serious doctrinal error has been made and proven by noted theologians, pastors, and others in the church's history, but sadly has been ignored, and neglected by most of the church, then, and now—who by such actions show no shame, or guilt for their betrayal.

And even though I may not be one of particular note for you to listen to, you can be sure that the Lord will get your attention, and proper reaction at the judgment seat, if you do not do something about it before then. And that something is to get on the right side of the controversy, by recanting your false beliefs, and accepting the true interpretation of the gospel.

More than likely you are angry at me for making such judgmental charges against you (which is rightfully exposing a grievous fault), but if you were to react to the truth as you should, you would be angry at yourself, and begin to do something to correct your erroneous thinking.

But think instead, if you would, about who has really got a right to be angry. Literal gospel believers, like myself. And why shouldn't we be upset, and protest the travesty that has overtaken the church? But our righteous indignation, does not compare with the offense and abomination that the whole matter is to God.

The Arminian, free will concept permeates the contemporary church, so that the corrupted state of affairs has disenfranchised true gospel believers from membership in practically every local church in the world. If such ones stay in any of those assemblies, where no form of reformation is taking place, they are compromising their faith. It requires them to separate themselves, not abide or tolerate a situation they know is doctrinally wrong, when no effort is made by that church to straighten itself out.

Even if they have no other acceptable church to attend, the scriptural admonition of “Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together”, has no application to theologically incorrect organizations. Doctrinal integrity demands refusal to participate in churches unfaithful to God’s word.

It would be hypocritical to be involved with Christians who have compromised their beliefs. And, probably worst of all, is that all they have for mutual comfort, and agreement is each other. Do you dare to think God approves and sanctions believers who have tampered with his word? And, do you think that excuse-making and pleading for mercy (without reform) will in any way offset the disobedient and dishonorable act that you have committed against him?

The indictment against man, being without excuse in not acknowledging God as creator in Rom. 1, will be the sense of the gravity of your failure to learn the true gospel. Not “well done, thou good and faithful servant”, but “shamefully done, thou disobedient and unfaithful servant, or words to that effect. Will you keep on foolishly risking judgment for your actions?

Also, you may think I am being too general, or inclusive by using the words you, and your, but the percentage of Christians who believe the liberalized gospel at issue, is extremely high. In fact, I scarcely know anyone who holds to the literal interpretation of the doctrine, even though, of course, there are still some who do. Thankfully, that no matter how bad the church has degenerated, God always has a remnant who do not defect, even as he had in Israel’s case of unfaithfulness to him.

As I have written elsewhere on the situation, majority consensus does not prove rightness, and in this crucially important matter of Christian responsibility to know scriptural truth, it is merely false security, not proof, of the gospel interpretation (more like fabrication) that the church universally maintains.

Probably the worst thing involved, as to why God’s people are immersed in gospel doctrine error, is that they do not take God literally at his word. The classic precedent, of which, was Adam and Eve. Why didn’t they obey God’s specific command not to partake of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (the way of sin and death), and instead, choose the fruit of the tree of immortal life—of which, lest anyone question their ability to clearly understand their option, God would have made them fully aware. Just like he has with his word to us, in every way needed for us to know the truth of his revelations.

You may say that the consequences of your erroneous beliefs (which you typically deny), are not of eternal effect, but the damage to the church is immensely serious, and you remain oblivious and blinded to the gravity of your fault.

How ironic it is, that Christians who should be devoted to being doctrinally correct, are instead afraid of the truth! Or, of having to change their misguided beliefs because of it. Can it really be that bad? There certainly is no justification for whatever reason they maintain.

