

Table of Contents to my critical review of Loraine Boettner's, The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Tilling Tainted Soil

2. An All-Embracing Decree

3. Controlling The System

4. Permissio Efficax

5. Bauble Of Scientia Media Invaluable In Calvinist Hand

6. Eyes Have They, But They See Not

7. Else Work Is No Longer Work

8. Euphemisms For A Contradiction

9. Clear Scripture Enshrouded By Insolent Fog

10. To Follow A Stranger

11. Jonathan Edwards' Spoon

12. Adam Is God

13. Learn Not The Way Of The Heathen

14. Cacophony Of Rebellion
15. Mind-Blowing Idiocy
16. Propelling The Prattling Pen
17. Romans 10:14, 17 Is Ordinarily True
18. Extraordinary Method Of Ignorance
19. The Great Majority Are Chosen
20. Salvation Of Infants
21. Effectual Atonement Made Possible By An Ineffectual Atonement
22. Think Like A Calvinist, Preach Like A Calvinist
23. The Death Of Meaning
24. Bistro Of Belligerence
25. And God Mocked Them
26. Helpless Heretics
27. Grotesque Monstrosity
28. Grandiloquent Doxology
29. Portrait Of Preservation
30. Angel Of Light

31. Beatification Of The Human Will
32. Responsible Because Not Free
33. In League With The Assyrian King
34. Exalt Thyself As The Eagle
35. Inscrutable Operation Of Sovereign Unsovereignty
36. Author Of Sin
37. A Most Favorable Opportunity To Erase Jesus Christ From History
38. Welcome To The Reformed Faith
39. As Deep As A Raindrop On A Flat Sidewalk
40. Faith Is Assurance
41. Walk Not In The Counsel Of The Wicked
42. Fashionable Foundation Of A False Jesus
43. Truly A Skandalon To Calvinist Chameleons
44. The Spirit Of God Or The Spirit Of The World?
45. Exchange Old Doctrines, Retain Same Idols
46. Wherever The True Church Is, The True Gospel Always Is

INTRODUCTION

Though Loraine Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* is not considered a "scholarly treatment," it is nevertheless an EXTREMELY POPULAR piece of writing. The popularity and widespread influence of this book is one factor that prompted my review of it. Boettner does not attempt to "reinvent the theological wheel" of basic Calvinism in this book.

Boettner's first chapter (which he names the Introduction) contains the following:

"The purpose of this book is not to set forth a new system of theological thought, but to give a re-statement to that great system which is known as the Reformed Faith or Calvinism, and to show that this is beyond all doubt the teaching of the Bible and of reason" (Loraine Boettner, The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination, p. 1).

The Lord willing, I will endeavor to show that "the Reformed Faith" is "beyond all doubt" NOT the teaching of the Bible, and is in fact, damnable heresy. This "book review" of sorts, in its original format was 46-blog posts long (now longer in this PDF format). With that said, I move on to quote a few things from others concerning Boettner's book of popular consumption.

According to Dr. Curt Daniel:

"Boettner was a student who graduated in the last class at Princeton Seminary before the split with Machen. It comes as a great surprize [sic] to readers of his books that he has never been a pastor or theologian (though he did teach religion briefly at a Christian college). In other words, Loraine Boettner has been a 'lay theologian.' And yet his Calvinistic influence has been great" (Curt Daniel, The History and Theology of Calvinism, p. 168).

Dr. C. Matthew McMahon writes the following concerning Boettner:

“In 1925 he furthered his education while attending Princeton. In 1928 he received his Th.B, and in 1929 his Th.M. While attending Princeton he found the flavor of Calvinistic doctrine to be sweet. While on summer break in his second year he devoured Hodge’s Systematic Theology volumes two and three. After being so influenced by Hodge’s teaching, the urge to write his Master’s thesis on predestination became apparent. While attending Princeton he studied under Hodge’s grandson, Casper W. Hodge. His influence strengthened Loraine in the Reformed doctrines. Loraine also met occasionally with another mentor/friend named Samuel G. Craig, editor of The Presbyterian. Craig and Boettner would meet for dinner to discuss the latest happenings at the college between the liberals and the Reformed influence of Machen.

After graduating Princeton, Loraine began teaching at Pikesville Presbyterian College in Eastern Kentucky until 1937. While at this school he met his wife to be, Lillian Henry. They married in 1932. He also published Reformed Doctrine of Predestination in 1932; this was an exceptional year for him.

From 1935 to 1939 Loraine worked with Dr. Allis on a magazine called Christianity Today. This was not in any relation to the magazine of today. In 1937 he began working at the Library of Congress and the Bureau of Internal Revenue; he had left the teaching position at Pikesville. Though working in an environment which was not related to Biblical studies or Theology, he still continued to write producing many books at this stage of his life. Here he revised the ‘Reformed Doctrine of Predestination’ from his

original thesis word count being 8,000 words, to the revised count of 30,000 words.”

Commenting on Boettner’s *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* Daniel writes:

*“His first book was based on his Master’s thesis, The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination. It has been in continual publication since 1932. Sooner or later every budding Calvinist gets around to reading this excellent volume. It is large but not ponderous, for Boettner writes in a remarkably lucid manner. It covers each of the ‘five points,’ objections, a brief history of Calvinism, and related issues like the free offer, assurance and practicalities” (Curt Daniel, *The History and Theology of Calvinism*, p. 168).*

In their book *The Five Points of Calvinism*, David N. Steel and Curtis C. Thomas highly recommend Boettner’s book as “the best overall treatment” of “the Calvinist system in general or with the broader area of God’s sovereignty” (p. 62). They write further:

“Of all the works on Calvinism with which we are familiar, this in our opinion is the best overall popular treatment of the subject. It is clear in style and logically arranged...We strongly recommend this work; it is one of those rare books written in a style that is readable and profitable for the beginner as well as for the more advanced student (pp. 62-63).

Again, the extreme popularity of this book and the fact that it is given to multitudes of “brand new” or “budding Calvinists” is a big reason for doing this review. Using the touchstone of Scripture we will see, the Lord willing, that “The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination” presents a “partially-sovereign” figment of the vain Calvinist’s imagination rather than the true Sovereign Controller of the universe.

NOTE: I think Wedgeworth makes some fair criticisms here, especially concerning the need for Boettner to broaden out a bit his understanding of the “Reformed Tradition”:

“Boettner was trying to do the right thing but suffered from such a narrow understanding of the subject. This is perhaps the first major use of ‘TULIP’ to explain predestination. It lacks the larger covenantal context, as well as any well-informed explanation of moderate Calvinism. The exegesis is strained as well. This book is historic but flawed” (Steven Wedgeworth).

Perhaps Boettner thought “moderate Calvinism” did not represent “Reformed Orthodoxy” as well as the “higher Calvinism” Boettner appears to be detailing in his book.

CHAPTER ONE

TILLING TAINTED SOIL

Mr. Loraine Boettner was born March 7th 1901 in Linden, Missouri. One of his most popular books (*The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* published in 1932) is said by some to have been a significant factor in the popularizing of Calvinism — particularly, what has been referred to by some as “high Calvinism.”

In the Introduction, Boettner writes:

“The purpose of this book is not to set forth a new system of theological thought, but to give a re-statement to that great system which is known as the Reformed Faith or Calvinism, and to show that this is beyond all doubt the teaching of the Bible and of reason.

The doctrine of Predestination receives comparatively little attention in our day and it is very imperfectly understood even by those who are supposed to hold it most loyally” (p. 1).

Allow me to make clear that the Reformed doctrine of predestination is NOT the Biblical doctrine of predestination. As we will see, the Lord willing, the Biblical teaching presents an absolutely sovereign God, while the Reformed Calvinistic teaching presents a partially-sovereign god. And quite obviously, a “partially-sovereign god” is no god at all, but only an idol forged in the fire of men’s vain imaginations.

“The great majority of the creeds of historic Christendom have set forth the doctrines of Election, Predestination, and final Perseverance, as will readily be seen by any one who will make even a cursory study of the subject. On the other hand Arminianism existed for centuries only as a heresy on the outskirts of true religion, and in fact it was not championed by an organized Christian church until the year 1784, at which time it was incorporated into the system of doctrine of the Methodist Church in England” (p. 2).

Boettner says that Arminianism was considered to be “a heresy.” But is it a “damnable heresy”? Marc Carpenter writes:

“Is Arminianism a damnable heresy? Most people who say they believe the doctrines of grace would agree that Arminianism is a theological error. But as soon as one throws in the word ‘heresy,’ the number of people who would go that far drops off quite a bit. When one goes so far as to say that Arminianism is a damnable heresy (thus saying that all who believe in Arminianism are unregenerate), then the number of people who agree is narrowed to a very few. In fact, the ‘tolerant sovereign-gracers’ would call such a person an unloving, divisive schismatic who is arguing over minute and complex theological issues. Believing the doctrines of grace is just part of their ‘tradition’ or ‘heritage.’ Oh, the doctrines of grace are ‘precious truths,’ but they are not essential to Christianity; they are merely a ‘more Biblical perspective.’ Arminians are seen to be just ‘happily inconsistent’ Christians who ‘just need a little different emphasis in their theology.’ Calling Arminians unregenerate is almost unheard of.

But we who believe the true gospel know that this issue lies at the heart of Christianity. The doctrines of grace are the basics of the Christian faith, not some higher theology that only seminarians are able to understand. It is a life and death issue; for if one is an Arminian, he is dead in his sins. It is an issue of truth versus lies; an issue of the true gospel versus another gospel;

an issue of the true God versus a false god. In fact, the doctrines of grace are what differentiate Christianity from every other false religion.”

In the present day, “Arminianism” and “Arminians” are usually used as broad terms to (at the very least) describe persons who believe that Jesus Christ died for everyone without exception — not only do true Christians use these broad terms as a form of theological short-hand, but so do many God-hating tolerant Calvinists who count “Arminians” as their spiritual brethren. Boettner continues:

“The great theologians of history, Augustine, Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Zanchius, Owen, Whitefield, Toplady, and in more recent times Hodge, Dabney, Cunningham, Smith, Shedd, Warfield, and Kuyper, held this doctrine and taught it with force. That they have been the lights and ornaments of the highest type of Christianity will be admitted by practically all Protestants” (p. 2).

It certainly is NOT the “highest type of Christianity.” But as we will see, the Lord willing, it IS probably the highest and most refined type of antichristianity that has defiled the earth with its abominations.

“Prof. F. E. Hamilton says,

‘It seems to be tacitly assumed by a large number of people in the Presbyterian Church today that Calvinism has been outgrown in religious circles. In fact, the average church member, or even minister of the gospel, is inclined to look upon a person who declares that he believes in Predestination, with a glance of amused tolerance. It seems incredible to them that there should exist such an intellectual curiosity as a real Calvinist, in an age of enlightenment like the present. As for seriously examining the arguments for Calvinism, the idea never enters

their heads. It is deemed as out of date as the Inquisition, or the idea of a fiat world, and is looked upon as one of the fantastic schemes of thought that men held before the age of modern science.'

Because of this present day attitude toward Calvinism, and because of the general lack of information concerning these doctrines, we regard the subject of this book as one of great importance" (p. 3).

A common attitude among Arminians toward the Biblical doctrine of predestination is NOT usually one of "amused tolerance," but one of seething, indignant rage. And even those who call themselves Reformed or Calvinist, object and scoff at the Biblical doctrine of predestination. These Calvinists object, in effect, that if God is truly "*this sovereign*," then He could not at all find fault with them — *for who resists His will?*

"This doctrine of Predestination has perhaps raised a greater storm of opposition, and has doubtless been more misrepresented and caricatured, than any other doctrine in the Scriptures.

'To mention it before some,'

says Warburton,

'is like shaking the proverbial red flag before an enraged bull. It arouses the fiercest passions of their nature, and brings forth a torrent of abuse and calumny. But, because men have fought against it, or because they hate it, or perhaps misunderstand it, is no reasonable or logical cause why we should turn the doctrine adrift, or cast it behind our backs. The

real question, the all-important question, is not: How do men receive it? but, Is it true?" 1 (p. 5)

1 *Calvinism*, p. 23.

Many Calvinists misrepresent and caricature the Biblical doctrine when they react to it by saying that God does not “force” or “tempt” a man to sin. Of course, since to actively cause a man to sin in order to demonstrate His power and wrath is NOT to tempt, nor is it to force. Also, many Calvinists would call these “enraged bulls” (cf. Romans 9:18-20) their “weaker brethren.”

“A careful study of the Bible would convince many people that it is a very different book than they assume it to be” (p. 6).

A careful study of the Bible ought to convince Arminians and Calvinists alike (with their various anti-God versions of “predestination”) that it is a very different book than they assume it to be.

“Furthermore, we do not deny that the Arminians hold many and important truths. But we do hold that a full and complete exposition of the Christian system can be given only on the basis of the truth as set forth in the Calvinistic system” (p. 7).

Boettner WOULD say that since the difference between Arminianism and Calvinism is NOT a difference in *kind*, but ONLY a difference in *degree*. Presumably one “important truth” that Boettner would say Arminians hold to is the deity of Christ. But those who actually know what the Bible teaches and know what Arminians teach, know that the Arminians have blasphemously attached the Biblical name of “Jesus” to a vain idol of their imaginations.

CHAPTER TWO

AN ALL-EMBRACING DECREE

Chapter 2 is called “Statement of the doctrine.” The doctrine being referred to is the doctrine of predestination. Boettner:

“In the Westminster Confession, which sets forth the beliefs of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches and which is the most perfect expression of the Reformed Faith, we read:

‘God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established’” (p. 13).

Boettner says that the Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF) is “the most perfect expression of the Reformed Faith,” of which many in Reformed circles would heartily agree. I have dealt at length with the WCF in my article “The Wicked Westminster Confession of Faith,” and so a few comments here should suffice:

When God took hold of the king of Assyria, the rod of His anger, and actively swung him against a hypocritical nation in order to tread them down like the mire of the streets, did God become the “author” of the king’s sins? Obviously, a clear answer depends on a clear definition of the phrase, “author of sin.”

For now, let it be duly noted that God had determined to punish the Assyrian king for his stout heart, and the boastfulness of his haughty looks (Isaiah 10:12). Wherein lieth this king's pride that God would punish him so? In reading Isaiah 10:13-15, the answer is clear: The wicked king's extreme arrogance was his Arminian and Calvinist boast that God had not actively caused him to sin by destroying many nations — his vaunt (and the Arminian and Calvinist vaunt) was that axes are able to swing or be permitted to swing themselves.

As we will see later, the Lord willing, not only do most who call themselves Reformed or Calvinist resonate with Paul's mutinous critic in Romans 9:19-20, but they also mimic the saw that dares magnify itself against Him who saws with it. Boettner continues:

“Everything outside of God Himself is included in this all-embracing decree, and that very naturally since all other beings owe their existence and continuance in existence to His creative and sustaining power. It provides a providential control under which all things are hastening to the end of God's determining” (p. 13).

To continue the Biblical analogy of the vaunting axe in Isaiah 10:15, it is quite strange how an axe is alleged to be under a “providential control” when there is actually no active controlling, but only a “willing permission” and “powerful bounding” (WCF V.4). Evidently, the woodsman allows or “willingly permits” the axe to swing itself — all while “powerfully binding” the axe as it initiates its own swing — but does not actually swing the axe himself. An extremely important and pertinent question is this: Does an axe swing the woodsman, or does a woodsman swing the axe?

CHAPTER THREE

CONTROLLING THE SYSTEM

Chapter 3 of Boettner's book is entitled "God has a plan":

"The very essence of consistent theism is that God would have an exact plan for the world, would foreknow the actions of all the creatures He proposed to create, and through His all-inclusive providence would control the whole system" (p. 23).

In view of the Calvinist semi-dualistic/semi-deistic notion of a "passive" or "permissive decree," Boettner's phrase "control the whole system" is equivocal. Boettner:

"Even the sinful acts of men are included in this plan. They are foreseen, permitted, and have their exact place. They are controlled and overruled for the divine glory" (p.24).

Boettner needs to explain how it is possible for God to permit specific "sinful acts of men" without actively causing these acts, and yet immutably decree them to happen in a way that is not merely an expression of divine prescience (mere foreknowledge). If Boettner cannot explain this, then where does he differ from the Arminian on this point?

"The crucifixion of Christ, which is admittedly the worst crime in all human history, had, we are expressly told, its exact and necessary place in the plan (Acts 2:23; 4:28). This particular manner of redemption is not an expedient to which God was driven after being defeated and disappointed by the fall of man. Rather it is 'according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord,' Ephesians 3:11. Peter tells us that Christ as a sacrifice for sin was 'foreknown indeed before the foundation of

the world,' 1 Peter 1:20. Believers were 'chosen in Him before the foundation of the world' (or from eternity), Ephesians 1:4" (p. 24).

In light of what Boettner writes above, one wonders why most Calvinists say that the entrance of sin into the world is an "inscrutable mystery." That's just pseudo-pious nonsense. Clearly it was because God desired to demonstrate His wrath and also to make known the riches of His mercy, grace, and love to a particular people, that He actively caused the Fall of Adam (cf. Romans 9:22-24; Ephesians 3:11; 1 Peter 1:20).

CHAPTER FOUR

PERMISSIO EFFICAX

Boettner begins chapter IV (*The Sovereignty of God*) by writing:

“Every thinking person readily sees that some sovereignty rules his life. He was not asked whether or not he would have existence; nor when, where, or what he would be born; whether in the twentieth century or before the flood...By virtue of the fact that God has created every thing which exists, He is the absolute Owner and final Disposer of all that He has made. He exerts not merely a general influence, but actually rules in the world which He has created...Even the sinful actions of men can occur only by His permission. And since he permits not unwillingly but willingly, all that comes to pass — including the actions and ultimate destiny of men — must be, in some sense, in accordance with what He has desired and purposed” (p. 30).

In the darkened idolatrous mind of Loraine Boettner the distinction between a *“willing permission”* and an *“unwilling permission”* is an all-important one. For one view presents a “king” who *unwillingly permits* himself to be ripped off his “sovereign throne” by his “libertarianly free” subjects, while the other view presents a “king” who, for fear of “offering violence” to those with inalienable rights (cf. WCF 3.1), *willingly permits* himself to be ripped off his “sovereign throne” by his “compatibilistically free” subjects. And since this “king” permits not *unwillingly* but *willingly* his subjects to do this, it must be in some sense, in accordance with what he has desired and purposed. Make sense?

“The affairs of the universe, then, are controlled and guided, how?

‘According to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of

His will.’ The present day tendency is to set aside the doctrines of Divine Sovereignty and Predestination in order to make room for the autocracy of the human will. The pride and presumption of man, on the one hand, and his ignorance and depravity on the other, lead him to exclude God and to exalt himself so far as he is able; and both of these tendencies combine to lead the great majority of mankind away from Calvinism” (pp. 32-33).

Boettner refers to Ephesians 1:11 to answer how God controls the affairs of the universe. The Greek word translated “worketh” is “*energeō*,” which means to be active or efficient; to be mighty in or work effectually in. The context of Ephesians 1:11 clearly includes the sinful acts of men — but most Calvinists deny that God works effectually in the wicked in order to show wrath and to make His power known in them (cf. Romans 9:17, 22). And thus they deny that God truly “*worketh ALL THINGS after the counsel of His own will.*” The tendency in fashionable Calvinism (that “rich Reformed heritage”) is to set aside the doctrine of God’s absolute Sovereignty by means of a “permissive decree” in order to make room for the autocracy of the human will as it pertains to sinful thoughts and actions. Fashionable Calvinists have a partially-sovereign god — and a partially sovereign god is NOT sovereign at all. Either you have an absolutely Sovereign God, or you do not have God. The fashionable Calvinists do not have God, but a vain idol that conforms to their own humanistic sensibilities.

“The Arminian idea which assumes that the serious intentions of God way in some cases at least be defeated, and that man, who is not only a creature but a sinful creature, can exercise veto power over the plans of Almighty God, is in striking contrast with the Biblical idea of His immeasurable exaltation by which He is removed from all the weaknesses of humanity. That the plans of men are not always executed is due to a lack of power, or a lack of wisdom; but since God is unlimited In these and all other resources, no unforeseen emergencies can arise, and to Him the

causes for change have no existence. To suppose that His plans fail and that He strives to no effect, is to reduce Him to the level of His creatures” (p. 33).

Since most who call themselves Reformed or Calvinist believe Arminians are their spiritual brethren, they show that they believe in basically the same god (i.e., vain idol) as the Arminians do.

CHAPTER FIVE

BAUBLE OF SCIENTIA MEDIA INVALUABLE IN CALVINIST HAND

In Chapter V (*The Providence Of God*), Boettner writes:

“Throughout the Bible the laws of nature, the course of history, the varying fortunes of individuals, are ever attributed to God’s providential control. All things, both in heaven and earth, from the seraphim down to the tiny atom, are ordered by His never-failing providence. So intimate is His relationship with the whole creation that a careless reader might be led toward pantheistic conclusions. Yet individual personalities and second causes are fully recognized, — not as independent of God, but as having their proper place in His plan. And alongside of this doctrine of His Immanence the Scripture writers also present the kindred doctrine of His Transcendence, in which God is distinctly set forth as entirely separate from and above the whole creation” (p. 35).

According to the Calvinistic scheme of things, individual personalities and second causes ARE independent and free from God’s sovereign control when one factors in the anti-Biblical Calvinistic doctrine of a “permissive” or “passive decree.”

“If it be asked why He...does not save all, the only available answer is found in the words of the Lord Jesus, ‘Yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight.’ Only the Scripture doctrine of the fall and redemption will give us any light on what we see about us” (p. 36).

The only available answer? How about the entire chapter of Romans 9?
Also, Jesus’ words in context are:

“Answering at that time, Jesus said, I praise You, Father, Lord of Heaven and of earth, because You hid these things from [the] sophisticated and cunning and revealed them to babes. Yes, Father, for so it was pleasing before You. All things were yielded up to Me by My Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father; nor does anyone know the Father, except the Son, and the [one] to whom the Son purposes to reveal [Him]” (Matthew 11:25-27).

Jesus says that the Father hides knowledge of salvation from certain people. Jesus also says that He purposes to reveal the Father to only some people. The obvious answer to “*why God does not save all?*” is that He has purposed to display His power, wrath, and hatred of sin and unbelief in the vessels of wrath having been fitted out for destruction in order that He make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy which He before prepared for glory (cf. Romans 9:1-24).

“Nations, as well as individuals, are thus in the hands of God, who appoints the bounds of their habitation, and controls their destiny. He controls them as absolutely as a man controls a rod or a staff. They are in His hands, and He employs them to accomplish His purposes. He breaks them in pieces as a potter’s vessel, or He exalts them to greatness, according to His good pleasure. He gives peace and fruitful seasons, property and happiness, or He sends the desolations of war, famine, drought and pestilence. All of these things are of His disposing, and are designed for intelligent ends under His universal providence. God is no mere spectator of the universe He has made, but is everywhere present and active, the all-sustaining ground, and all-governing power of all that is” (pp. 36-37).

Boettner says that God controls men as “*absolutely as a man controls a rod or a staff.*” This is absolutely impossible given Boettner’s belief in a “permissive decree” where God is said to leave men to themselves. What Boettner should’ve said is that his god is as absolutely sovereign and active

as a man who permits a rod to lift itself up off the ground, then move itself around, while being mysteriously and inscrutably governed and bound (cf. WCF 5.4).

*“Man’s sense of moral responsibility and dependence, and his instinctive appeal to God in times of danger, show how universal and innate is the conviction that God does govern the world and all human events. But while the Bible repeatedly teaches that this providential control is universal, powerful, wise, and holy, it nowhere attempts to inform us **how** it is to be reconciled with man’s free agency. All that we need to know is that God does govern His creatures and that His control over them is such that no violence is done to their natures. Perhaps the relationship between divine sovereignty and human freedom can best be summed up in these words: **God so presents the outside inducements that man acts in accordance with his own nature, yet does exactly what God has planned for him to do**” (p. 38; bold emphasis Boettner’s—CD).*

The biblical teaching is that man has absolutely no freedom whatsoever relative to God. The reason why Calvinists such as Boettner struggle to “reconcile” things the way they do, is that they desire a little sovereignty for themselves. If they would abandon the devil’s lie that they shall be as God, then there wouldn’t be this need to “reconcile” God’s sovereignty with their own.

Just below the 1932 copyright (one page prior to the table of contents) is this statement:

“Anyone is at liberty to use material from this book with or without credit. In preparing this book the author has received help from many sources, some acknowledged and many unacknowledged. He believes the material herein

set forth to be a true statement of Scripture teaching, and his desire is to further, not to restrict, its use.”

I'm not sure if Boettner received specific help from the following excerpt by R.L. Dabney, but it's certainly consistent with Boettner's summary that:

“God so presents the outside inducements that man acts in accordance with his own nature, yet does exactly what God has planned for him to do” (p. 38).

Here is R.L. Dabney expounding upon Boettner's summarized view of what he calls, “sovereignty”:

“This, then, is my picture of the providential evolution of God's purpose as to sinful acts; so to arrange and group events and objects around free agents by His manifold wisdom and power, as to place each soul, at every step, in the presence of those circumstances, which, He knows, will be a sufficient objective inducement to it to do, of its own native, free activity, just the thing called for by God's plan. Thus the act is man's alone, though its occurrence is efficaciously secured by God. And the sin is man's only. God's concern in it is holy, first, because all His personal agency in arranging to secure its occurrence was holy; and second, His ends or purposes are holy. God does not will the sin of the act, for the sake of its sinfulness; but only wills the result to which the act is a means, and that result is always worthy of His holiness. e. g., A righteous king, besieged by wicked rebels, may arrange a sally, with a view to their righteous defeat, and the glorious deliverance of the good citizens, in which he knows the rebels will slay some of his soldiers. This slaying is sin; the good king determines efficaciously to permit it; not for the sake of the slaying, but for the sake of the righteous triumph of which it is part means. The death of

these good soldiers is the sin of the rebels; the righteousness of the end in view, is the king's.

Is God's intelligence herein Scientia Media?

It may be said, that this scheme represents God, after all, as governing free agents by a sort of scientia media. I reply: Let us not be scared by unpopular names. It is a knowledge conditioned on His own almighty purpose, and His own infallible knowledge of the dispositions of creatures; and it is, in this sense, relative. But this is not a dangerous sense. For only lay down the true doctrine, that volitions are efficiently determined by dispositions, and there is, to God, no shadow of contingency remaining about such foreknowledge (That was the ugly trait). As I showed you, when explaining this scientia media, in the hands of him who holds the contingency of the will, it is illogical; in the hands of the Calvinist, it becomes consistent" (R.L. Dabney, Systematic Theology, pp. 288-289).

There you go. A modified form of *scientia media* that dares NOT provoke the mighty potsherd (Romans 9:19-20), but DOES dare to command the Potter that He has no authority over the clay, out of the one lump to make one vessel to honor, and one to dishonor (Romans 9:21). Boettner's and Dabney's versions of "divine sovereignty" is what you get when you fight with the One who made you, and say to the One who formed you, He has no hands (cf. Isaiah 45:9).

CHAPTER SIX

EYES HAVE THEY, BUT THEY SEE NOT

Chapter VI is entitled *The Foreknowledge of God*. Boettner begins by saying:

“The Arminian objection against foreordination bears with equal force against the foreknowledge of God. What God foreknows must, in the very nature of the case, be as fixed and certain as what is foreordained; and if one is inconsistent with the free agency of man, the other is also. Foreordination renders the events certain, while foreknowledge presupposes that they are certain” (p. 42).

Take the origin of sin (evil) in created beings (e.g., Adam, Eve, Satan) as an object of God’s foreknowledge. The Arminian would say that God knew from eternity, that sin would enter His universe — then the question to the Arminian is what is this aforementioned foreknowledge based upon? Clearly, the Arminian “potter” is accounted as the clay since it is the clay that ultimately determines and forms what the potter will do, rather than the other way around:

“Oh your perversity! Shall the former be counted as the clay? For shall the work of its maker say, He did not make me? Or shall the thing formed say to him who formed it, He does not understand?” (Isaiah 29:16)

Calvinists such as Boettner would say that God’s foreknowledge of sin’s entrance in the universe is based upon His sovereign eternal decree. That is, God foreknows that this event will occur because He has decreed that it shall occur. But what kind of “divine decree” are we talking about here? Are we speaking of the incoherent Calvinist “decree” that “efficaciously permits” the axe, saw, and rod to lift themselves up in their initial act of defiance?

Or, are we talking about the Biblical active decree whereby God efficiently and powerfully causes the fall of created beings because He desires to be glorified in demonstrating His wrath and in saving a particular people through the atoning blood and imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ alone?

Boettner continues:

“The Socinians and Unitarians, while not so evangelical as the Arminians, are at this point more consistent; for after rejecting the foreordination of God, they also deny that He can foreknow the acts of free agents. They hold that in the very nature of the case it cannot be known how the person will act until the time comes and the choice is made. This view of course reduces the prophecies of Scripture to shrewd guesses at best, and destroys the historic Christian view of the Inspiration of the Scriptures. It is a view which has never been held by any recognized Christian church. Some of the Socinians and Unitarians have been bold enough and honest enough to acknowledge that the reason which led them to deny God’s certain foreknowledge of the future acts of men, was, that if this be admitted it would be impossible to disprove the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination” (p. 42).

According to Boettner, the Socinians and Unitarians say that God from eternity, made, at best, the shrewd guess that the Egyptians would turn their own hearts to hate His people:

“He turned their heart to hate His people, to deal craftily with His servants” (Psalm 105:25).

Unlike the Socinians and Unitarians, Boettner would like to believe that this heart-turning event being decreed from eternity was thus made certain. But since Boettner and the Calvinistic creeds make the common anti-God distinction between an efficient and a “permissive decree,” they have the

insurmountable difficulty of explaining how God can make a specific sin certain by a “permissive decree.”

The Calvinist position is that God “permitted” the Egyptian heart to hate His people, rather than the truth that God actually TURNED their heart to hate His people. Some common objections to this truth are that God does not tempt, force, coerce, or compel people into the sin of hating His people.

Obviously God’s powerfully efficient TURNING of the Egyptian heart to hate His people is NOT tempting, forcing, or coercing (cf. James 1:13-14). But what of the word “compel,” as in *to compel by an irresistible power* (cf. Romans 9:18-19)? What if God, by virtue of an efficient decree, irresistibly TURNED the Egyptian heart to hate His people? What would Calvinists like Boettner say to that? At least some (e.g., W.G.T. Shedd) would say that God cannot find fault with them for hating His people since their hating of His people was not made a certainty by a “permissive decree,” but made a certainty AND a necessity by an efficient decree that made their hatred of His people *irresistibly compulsory* (cf. W.G.T. Shedd, *Calvinism: Pure & Mixed*, p.90).

“But our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased. Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men’s hands. They have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not” (Psalm 115:3-5).

Presumably most Calvinists would say that the idol of the Socinians, Unitarians, and Open Theists “have eyes, but they see not” since they deny God’s foreknowledge of future events. The Calvinist would claim that his “god” DOES have eyes and DOES *actually* see. But what does it mean, biblically, for God to TRULY SEE that an event will happen in the future? Is not God’s foresight, His foreknowledge, based upon His eternal decree? Of

course it is. But what KIND of decree? Certainly NOT a “passive” one. For God to TRULY SEE, must He not TRULY DECREE?

The Calvinist “god” is only a “little bit more powerful” than the pipsqueak Arminian god who foresees events through the telescope of time and then claims the risible idiocy that he’s actually just made a predestinating decree.

The Calvinist god (though considering the Arminian god to be quite the humorous character) finds himself abruptly stifling a hasty chortle when asked to explain *wherein he differs* from the Arminian god in making a specific event involving specific sins certain, apart from an efficient or active decree. The Calvinist god does not want to look the hypocritical fool by giving a forthright answer, so he just shrugs his shoulders and calls the whole thing an “inscrutable mystery.”

CHAPTER SEVEN

ELSE WORK IS NO LONGER WORK

Chapter VII of Boettner's book is called *Outline of Systems*. In his view there are really only three systems which claim to set forth a way of salvation through Christ (p. 47). He then proceeds to name and briefly explain (1) Universalism (2) Arminianism, and (3) Calvinism. Regarding Arminianism he writes that it:

"... holds that Christ died equally and indiscriminately for every individual of mankind, for those who perish no less than for those who are saved: that election is not an eternal and unconditional act of God; that saving grace is offered to every man, which grace he may receive or reject just as he pleases; that man may successfully resist the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit if he chooses to do so; that saving grace is not necessarily permanent, but that those who are loved of God, ransomed by Christ, and born again of the Holy Spirit, may (let God wish and strive ever so much to the contrary) throw away all and perish eternally.

Arminianism in its radical and more fully developed forms is essentially a recrudescence of Pelagianism, a type of self-salvation" (p. 47).

And yet those who do believe in a type of self-salvation are regarded by Boettner and most Calvinists as their spiritual brethren.

"History shows plainly that the tendency of Arminianism is to compromise and to drift gradually from an evangelical basis" (p. 48).

This implies that Arminianism of itself is not damnable heresy (See: <https://agrammatos.wordpress.com/2017/08/07/the-damnably-heresy-of-arminianism/>), but only something that merely has the “tendency...to drift gradually from an evangelical basis.”

“The third system setting forth a way of salvation through Christ is Calvinism...Calvinism holds that the fall left man totally unable to do anything meriting salvation, that he is wholly dependent on divine grace for the inception and development of spiritual life” (pp. 48-49).

This supposed Calvinistic “grace” irresistibly enables the elect sinner to meet alleged “non-meritorious conditions” for his salvation, contrary to what God said through the apostle Paul in Romans 4:4 and Romans 11:6. It is vain for the Calvinist to say that because a man is freely and “*graciously enabled*” to work, the reward is therefore according to grace, rather than according to debt. Clearly, when grace is said to enable one to meet conditions for salvation, *grace is no more grace* (cf. Romans 11:6).

“The chief fault of Arminianism is its insufficient recognition of the part that God takes in redemption. It loves to admire the dignity and strength of man; Calvinism loses itself in adoration of the grace and omnipotence of God. Calvinism casts man first into the depths of humiliation and despair in order to lift him on the wings of grace to supernatural strength. The one flatters natural pride; the other is a gospel for penitent sinners. As that which exalts man in his own sight and tickles his fancies is more welcome to the natural heart than that which abases him, Arminianism is likely to prove itself more popular. Yet Calvinism is nearer to the facts, however harsh and forbidding those facts may seem.

‘It is not always the most agreeable medicine which is the most healing. The experience of the apostle John is one of frequent occurrence, that

the little book which is sweet as honey in the mouth is bitter in the belly. Christ crucified was a stumbling-block to one class of people and foolishness to another, and yet He was, and is, the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation to all who believe'1" (p. 49).

1 Mcfetridge, Calvinism in History, p. 136.

Calvinism loses itself in adoration of its own net and drag (cf. Habakkuk 1:11, 15-16). This adoration is owing to its ignorance of the sole ground of acceptance before God, and thus it seeks to establish its own righteousness by adding it to Christ's.

True faith believes that salvation is conditioned SOLELY on the atoning blood and imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ (Romans 10:4). Calvinism's adding of conditions to salvation is a DENIAL that Christ is the end of law for righteousness.

Boettner's citation of Mcfetridge is interesting. Does Boettner mean to imply that specific flesh-and-blood Arminians stumble at the stone of stumbling and count the cross of Christ as foolishness? Or, rather, does Boettner just mean to imply that a null (or phantom) class called "ArminianISM" stumbles at the stone of stumbling and counts the cross of Christ as foolishness?

"Men constantly deceive themselves by postulating their own peculiar feelings and opinions as moral axioms. To some it is self-evidently true that a holy God cannot permit sin; hence they infer that there is no God" (p. 49).

To most Calvinists it is "self-evidently true" that a holy God cannot actively cause sin. Hence they infer that there is no God such as this. They are among the various and sundry fools who say in their hearts, "*There is no God.*"

“To others it is self-evident that a merciful God cannot permit a portion of His rational creatures to be forever the victims of sin and misery, and consequently they deny the doctrine of eternal punishment” (p. 49).

One such God-hater who denied the doctrine of eternal punishment was John Stott. Stott held to the doctrine of annihilationism which nullifies the propitiatory cross-work of Jesus Christ. I would be shocked if **even one** Calvinist dared to judge this Christ-dishonoring blasphemer unregenerate based on his annihilationism since it's quite the fashionable thing for tolerant Calvinists to spit on God's redemptive glory just so long as man is "saved." In other words, for the tolerant Calvinists the "salvation" of man trumps the redemptive glory of God seen in the face of Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Corinthians 4:3-6).

CHAPTER EIGHT

EUPHEMISMS FOR A CONTRADICTION

Chapter VIII is called, *The Scriptures Are the Final Authority by Which Systems Are to Be Judged*. Boettner writes:

“In all matters of controversy between Christians the Scriptures are accepted as the highest court of appeal. Historically they have been the common authority of Christendom. We believe that they contain one harmonious and sufficiently complete system of doctrine; that all of their parts are consistent with each other; and that it is our duty to trace out this consistency by a careful investigation of the meaning of particular passages 1.”

1 For the most exhaustive and scholarly treatment of the doctrines of Revelation and Inspiration, see Warfield, “The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible,” 1948, edited by Dr. Samuel G. Craig.

Boettner affirms that the Bible is harmonious and consistent. This is an interesting affirmation in light of the popular and fashionable Calvinist notion that the Bible contains “tensions” and “paradoxes” that must be “swallowed by ‘faith’” (see:

<https://agrammatos.wordpress.com/2011/08/20/spurgeon-on-1-timothy-23-4/>).

One of these so-called Biblical “tensions” or “paradoxes” is the relationship between human responsibility and Divine sovereignty. “Tensions” and “paradoxes” are simply euphemisms for a contradiction. The real contradiction is NOT within the Biblical revelation itself, but is between the

Biblical revelation and the cavalier attitude of these rebellious theologians. Just like Paul's God-hating critic, the fashionable Calvinist theologians presuppose that human responsibility implies human freedom from God's invincible, decretive will:

"So, then, to whom He desires, He shows mercy. And to whom He desires, He hardens. You will then say to me, Why does He yet find fault? For who has resisted His will?" (Romans 9:18-19).

In addition to the words "tension" and "paradox," the aforementioned theologians will throw out the word "mystery" in order to cloak their slanderous accusation that God's Word contradicts itself. This is so they may persist in their rebellion against the Most High, while deceitfully attempting to maintain a semblance of genuine faith and piety. If they were candid, honest, and forthright they would come right out and say that humans are NOT responsible to God for their actions if God sovereignly and efficiently causes these actions.

In principle these Calvinist theologians are no different than Muslims and atheists who allege that the Bible contradicts itself, only they exert a much more concerted, cunning, and *extremely convoluted* effort at hiding the fact that they, too, have rejected the sovereign Potter and set up in His place an idol made in their own image.

CHAPTER NINE

CLEAR SCRIPTURE ENSHROUDED BY INSOLENT FOG

Chapter IX of Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* has the title: *A Warning Against Undue Speculation*. Up to this point Boettner has done his best to cover the clarity and perspicuity of the Scriptural teaching of predestination with insolent fog. One cannot but infer that Boettner chose to dip the quill of his pen into the seditious inkwell when writing that title.

“Just at this point we shall give a few words of warning against undue speculation and curiosity in dealing with this lofty doctrine of Predestination. Perhaps we can do no better than to quote the words of Calvin himself which are found in the first section of his treatment of this subject:

‘The discussion of Predestination — a subject of itself rather intricate — is made very perplexed, and therefore dangerous, by human curiosity, which no barriers can restrain from wandering into forbidden labyrinths, and from soaring beyond its sphere, as if determined to leave none of the Divine secrets unscrutinized or unexplored . . . First, then, let them remember that when they inquire into Predestination, they penetrate into the inmost recesses of divine wisdom, where the careless and confident intruder will obtain no satisfaction to his curiosity . . . For we know that when we have exceeded the limits of the word, we shall get into a devious and irksome course, in which errors, slips, and falls will be inevitable. Let us then, in the first place bear in mind, that to desire any more knowledge of Predestination than that which is unfolded in the Word of God, indicates as great folly as to wish to walk through

impassible roads, or to see in the dark. Nor let us be ashamed to be ignorant of some things relative to a subject in which there is a kind of learned ignorance'¹" (p. 54).

1 Institutes, Ch. XXI, sect. I, II.

The subject of predestination is, of itself, a rather simple and elementary subject. But it's made very perplexed and incoherent by men like Boettner who reek of false humility and piety in their "*learned ignorance*" of what God has clearly revealed in His Word concerning the origin of evil, unconditional and active reprobation, etc.

"We are not under obligation to 'explain' these truths; we are only under obligation to state what God has revealed in His word, and to vindicate these statements as far as possible from misconception and objections" (p. 54).

The fashionable Calvinists say they are not under obligation to explain to us how their "god" can be IN CONTROL without ACTUALLY CONTROLLING. They are not under obligation to explain how their "god" can lift up and swing the axe, without actually lifting up the axe and swinging it. How convenient.

"In the nature of the case all that we can know concerning such profound truths is what the Spirit has seen fit to reveal concerning them, being confident that whatever God has revealed is undoubtedly true and is to be believed although we may not be able to sound its depths with the line of our reason" (p. 54).

Such "profound truths" are clear to those without a jaundiced eye toward the absolute sovereignty of God in doing what He will with His own creatures. Boettner speaks of sounding the depths — but the only sound

I've been hearing the last several chapters, is that of persistent vociferous winds blowing across mutinous seas (cf. Romans 9:11-24).

"In our ignorance of His inter-related purposes, we are not fitted to be His counselors. 'Thy judgments are a great deep,' said the psalmist. As well might man attempt to swim the ocean as to fathom the judgments of God. Man knows far too little to justify him in attempting to explain the mysteries of God's rule" (pp. 54-55).

Yet, in spite of this supposed admission of ignorance, Boettner (in his own blinded estimate) IS fitted to be God's counselor in judging God by his own autonomous standard which says it's unrighteous and unjust for God to endure the reprobate with longsuffering, for the express purpose of showing His efficacious power and wrath in them by unconditionally hardening them for destruction, IN ORDER THAT HE MAKE KNOWN THE RICHES OF HIS GLORY ON THE VESSELS OF MERCY.

"The importance of the subject discussed should lead us to proceed only with profoundest reverence and caution. While it is true that mysteries are to be handled with care, and while unwarranted and presumptuous speculations concerning divine things are to be avoided, yet if we would declare the Gospel in its purity and fullness we must be careful not to withhold from believers what is declared in the Scriptures concerning Predestination. That some of these truths will be perverted and abused by the ungodly is to be expected. No matter how plainly it is taught in Scripture, the unenlightened mind considers it as absurd, for instance, that one God should exist in three persons, or that God should foreknow the entire course of world events, as that His plan should include the destiny of every person. And while we can know only as much about Predestination as God has seen fit to reveal, it is important that we shall know that much;

otherwise it would not have been revealed. Where Scripture leads we may safely follow” (p. 55).

And no matter how plainly God’s absolute sovereignty is taught in Scripture, unregenerate, unenlightened, and unstable men such as Boettner (and other fashionable Calvinists) will continue to show themselves to be Isaiah’s vaunting axe and Paul’s God-hating critic (cf. Isaiah 10:15; Romans 9:19).

CHAPTER TEN

TO FOLLOW A STRANGER

Chapter X of Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* is called "*Total Inability*." He writes:

"Man is a free agent but he cannot originate the love of God in his heart. His will is free in the sense that it is not controlled by any force outside of himself" (p. 62).

The teaching of fashionable Calvinism is that when it comes to sinful actions, man's will is NOT controlled by God. Thus the fashionable Calvinists are those who rage against the Lord and His Anointed, and vainly say to Him, "*Let us break Their decreative bonds in pieces and cast away Their controlling cords from us.*" What shall be the Divine response?

"He who sits in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall mock at them" (Psalm 2:4).

The Sovereign King who sits on His heavenly throne shall laugh in the face of those who vainly imagine He has such an incoherent and blasphemous thing as a "*permissive*" or "*passive decree*."

"Fallen man sees nothing desirable in 'the One who is altogether lovely, the fairest among ten thousand'" (p. 63).

The fashionable tolerant Calvinist reveals that he sees nothing desirable in the True Jesus Christ when he claims that those who believe Jesus Christ died for everyone without exception are his spiritual brethren. By committing spiritual fornication with God-haters in this manner, these

Calvinists brazenly declare which “christ” they believe in, and which “christ” they believe is the starting point and foundation of the Christian life.

“The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone. This was the LORD’s doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes’?” (Matthew 21:42).

“And when he puts forth his own sheep, he goes in front of them, and the sheep follow him because they know his voice. But they will not follow a stranger, never! But they will flee from him, because they do not know the voice of the strangers” (John 10:4-5).

“According to God’s grace given to me, as a wise master builder, I laid a foundation, but another builds on it. But let each one be careful how he builds. For no one is able to lay any other foundation beside the One having been laid, who is Jesus Christ” (1 Corinthians 3:10-11).

“For if, indeed, the one coming proclaims another Jesus, whom we have not proclaimed...” (2 Corinthians 11:4).

The “christ” who died for everyone without exception (“universal atonement”) is a stranger, and therefore no regenerate sheep will follow him. The “christ” of universal atonement (e.g., “Arminianism”; “moderate Calvinism”) is “another Jesus” whom the apostles did not proclaim. By speaking peace when there is no peace (cf. 2 John 9-11), tolerant Calvinists proclaim that they are foolish and reckless builders who have laid a foundation with a different Jesus than the Apostles did — they believe that the false christ of universal atonement IS foundational, while the True Christ of efficacious atonement is just an optional add-on to the building. The Stone which these builders rejected has become the Chief

Cornerstone. This is the Lord's doing and it is marvelous in every true believer's eyes. For further elucidation on this, please read "*Gospel Atonement*"

(<https://agrammatos.wordpress.com/2009/10/10/gospel-atonement/>).

Speaking of how the message of the cross is received by the unregenerate man, Boettner writes:

"He may have an intellectual knowledge of the facts and doctrines of the Bible, but he lacks all spiritual discernment of their excellence, and finds no delight in them" (p. 64).

The aforementioned "*Gospel Atonement*" article puts forth the tolerant Calvinist as a brightly shining example of those who have knowledge of the Word of the cross (cf. 1 Corinthians 1:18), but who lack the spiritual discernment to see that it is foolishness to those being lost, and the power of God to those being saved. The reason they cannot see the excellence of the Word of the cross is because they have not the true Spirit of God, but the false spirit of the world (cf. 1 Corinthians 2:10-14).

"For such ones are false apostles, deceitful workers transforming themselves into apostles of Christ. And did not Satan marvelously transform himself into an angel of light? It is not a great thing, then, if also his ministers transform themselves as ministers of righteousness, whose end will be according to their works" (2 Corinthians 11:13-15).

CHAPTER ELEVEN

JONATHAN EDWARDS' SPOON

Continuing with Chapter X (*"Total Inability"*), Boettner writes the following concerning *"the fall of man"*:

"Only Calvinists seem to take the doctrine of the fall very seriously" (p. 72).

Fashionable Calvinist doctrines such as "common grace" and "common operations of the spirit" prove this statement to be utterly laughable. See the article *"Common Grace?"* for evidence of how ridiculous that statement by Boettner truly is.

Earlier Boettner asserted that the WCF was "the most perfect expression of the Reformed Faith" (p. 13). So let's see how *"seriously"* the Calvinists at Westminster Abbey took the doctrine of the fall:

"Our first parents, being seduced by the subtilty and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory" (6.1).

Calvinists like Boettner and the WCF men evidently find the extreme simplicity of Paul's razor-sharp Creator/creature distinction quite mysterious, inscrutable, and perplexing (Romans 9:19-21). So perplexing is this distinction that they are compelled to dream up concepts that can only be applied to idols, and not to the True and Living God. The WCF men and those like-minded with them (e.g., Boettner) are afraid of, and in rebellion against, God's sovereign causing of the fall of man. So they make up things that are absolutely unbiblical and anti-God in order to make God more palatable to their own and others' depraved minds. To *"permit, having*

purposed to order it to his own glory” means that, at times the creature is “permitted” to do things apart from God’s active controlling sovereignty. This is idolatrous blasphemy.

“Dr. A. A. Hodge has given us a very good statement of the doctrine of the fall which we shall take the privilege of quoting:

‘As a fair probation could not, in the nature of the case, be given to every new member in person as it comes into existence a undeveloped infant, God, as guardian of the race and for its best interests, gave all its members a trial in the person of Adam under the most favorable circumstances — making him for that end the representative and personal substitute of each one of his natural descendants. He formed with him a covenant of works and of life; i. e., He gave to him for himself, and in behalf of all whom he represented, a promise of eternal life, conditioned upon perfect obedience, — that is, upon works. The obedience demanded was a specific test for a temporary period, which period of trial must necessarily be closed either by the reward consequent upon obedience, or the death consequent upon disobedience. The ‘reward’ promised was eternal life, which was a grace including far more than was originally bestowed upon Adam at his creation, the grant of which would have elevated the race into a condition of indefeasible holiness and happiness for ever. The ‘penalty’ threatened and executed was death; ‘The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.’ The nature of the death threatened can be determined only from a consideration of all that was involved in the curse actually inflicted. This we know to have included the instant withdrawal of the divine favor and spiritual intercommunion upon which man’s life depended. Hence the alienation and curse of God; the sense of guilt and

corruption of nature; consequent actual transgressions, the miseries of life, the dissolution of the body, the pains of hell'¹" (p. 72-73).

1 A. A. Hodge, pamphlet, *Presbyterian Doctrine*, pp. 19, 20.

The necessary implication of what Hodge says is that, "as a fair probation" and with "the most favorable circumstances," God gave Adam an opportunity to thwart His eternal purpose in Christ Jesus. According to A.A. Hodge, God promised to grant Adam eternal life on condition that Adam vitiate Christ's cross, rob His redemptive glory, and impugn His imputed righteousness. What self-righteous, anti-christian dung spewed out by Hodge.

"We live in a lost world, a world which if left to itself would fester in its corruption from eternity to eternity, — a world reeking with iniquity and blasphemy. The effects of the fall are such that man's will in itself tends only downward to sets of sin and folly. As a matter of fact God does not permit the race to become as corrupt as it naturally would if left to itself. He exercises restraining influences, inciting men to love one another, to be honest, philanthropic, and considerate of each others welfare. Unless God exercised these influences, wicked men would become worse and worse, overlapping conventions and social barriers, until the very zenith of lawlessness would soon be reached, and the earth would become so utterly corrupt that the elect could not live on it" (pp. 74-75).

At the time Boettner penned this he was NOT being left to himself, but was being efficiently caused by God's powerful wrath to reveal himself as a festering potsherd who reeks of cosmic mutiny. By a holy demonstration of power and wrath, God actively caused Boettner in this paragraph to be as corrupt as God desired Boettner to be (cf. Romans 9:22).

There is no such mutinous monstrosity as the “*restraining influences*” of which Boettner speaks. For God is the Sovereign Controller of the universe who actively and efficiently turns the hearts of men to do His will (i.e., decree). One reason why God powerfully and wrathfully causes lost men to be “*honest, philanthropic, and considerate of each others welfare*” is to benefit the elect (Romans 8:28).

“In the next world the wicked, with all restraint removed, will go headlong into sin, blaspheming and cursing God, growing worse and worse as they sink deeper and deeper into the bottomless pit” (p. 79).

This pernicious pablum that Boettner regurgitates from atop his impudent high-chair was probably fed to him with the spoon of Jonathan Edwards. This wickedness teaches that God totally “lets go” of His sovereignty in hell — and thus, in hell, man is COMPLETELY AND TOTALLY SOVEREIGN (he shall be as God; cf. Genesis 3:4-5).

CHAPTER TWELVE

ADAM IS GOD

Chapter XI is called “*Unconditional Election.*” Boettner writes:

“The doctrine of Election is to be looked upon as only a particular application of the general doctrine of Predestination or Foreordination as it relates to the salvation of sinners; and since the Scriptures are concerned mainly with the redemption of sinners, this part of the doctrine is naturally thrown up into a place of special prominence...The Reformed Faith has held to the existence of an eternal, divine decree which, antecedently to any difference or desert in men themselves separates the human race into two portions and ordains one to everlasting life and the other to everlasting death. So far as this decree relates to men it designates the counsel of God concerning those who had a supremely favorable chance in Adam to earn salvation, but who lost that chance” (p. 83).

I think we can accurately say that when it comes to God’s sovereignty over evil, a modified form of deism and dualism has been THE consensus among Calvinist Reformed persons throughout history. Boettner asserts that the human race (all who were represented by Adam) “*had a supremely favorable chance in Adam to earn salvation, but who lost that chance.*” Interesting — “*a supremely favorable chance in Adam*” to THWART God’s eternal decree and to ROB the cross of Christ of its redemptive glory. A “*supremely favorable chance*” to put God in their DEBT. What self-righteous DUNG.

One might be scratching their head in bewilderment in light of Boettner’s professed adherence to the WCF, saying to themselves:

“The Westminster Confession of Faith states in chapter 6 that God was ‘pleased, according to His wise and holy counsel, to permit’ the fall, so what’s with this ‘supremely favorable chance’ stuff, Boettner?”

The Calvinist notion of a so-called *“permissive decree”* is a modified form of deism and dualism. But *“a supremely favorable chance in Adam”* doesn’t seem to make sense, even according to their scheme. Their scheme *affirms* that God *“decreed to permit”* the *“mysteriously inscrutable”* fall of Adam, AND vehemently *denies* the biblical teaching that God decreed to actively cause the fall of Adam.

So, how may one reconcile this Calvinistic incoherence and confusion of an allegedly certain, immutable, infallible *“decree to permit”* Adam’s fall with this supposed *“supremely favorable chance in Adam to earn salvation”* by ripping the Triune God off the throne of His sovereign redemptive glory? Well, one can’t reconcile it because it’s utter nonsense. It’s similar to the Calvinistic nonsense that asserts that God can be *“IN CONTROL”* of things which He is not *“ACTUALLY CONTROLLING.”*

The so-called *“decree”* of popular and fashionable Calvinism is NOT the true decree of Scripture. Furthermore, fashionable Calvinism believes that pre-fall Adam was free from God’s sovereign control which is nothing but atheism cloaked in religious garb. Obviously if pre-fall Adam’s will is free from God’s active control and causation, then atheistic notions such as *“luck”* and a *“supremely favorable chance”* make a bit more sense.

What of the Calvinist *“sovereign determination”* to *“permit,”* and thus *“make infallibly certain,”* the fall of Adam? Who *REALLY* is the ultimate determiner of Adam’s fall according to fashionable Calvinism? God OR Adam? Genuine historical Mormonism has an *“Adam is God”* doctrine. And not to be outdone, genuine historical Calvinism has its own version of an *“Adam*

is God” doctrine. In fact, they dreamt up their particular version much earlier than Brigham Young did his.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

LEARN NOT THE WAY OF THE HEATHEN

Continuing with chapter XI (*Unconditional Election*) Boettner speaks of God's sovereign decision concerning the various times, places, and circumstances into which men and woman are born:

“One child is born with health, wealth, and honor, in a favored land, in a Christian home, and grows up with all the blessings which attend the full light of the Gospel. Another is born in poverty and dishonor, of sinful and dissipated parents, and destitute of Christian influences. All of these things are sovereignly decided for them” (pp.89-90).

God's sovereign diffusing of the gospel in various lands achieves infallibly the purpose for which He sends it (cf. Isaiah 55:11). He diffuses the fragrance of the knowledge of Christ in order to irresistibly save and bless the unregenerate elect and in order to actively harden and curse the unregenerate reprobate for destruction (2 Corinthians 2:14-16). A “land” is NOT favored. Only God's elect are unconditionally, mercifully, and graciously favored in Christ from before the foundation of the world (cf. Ephesians 1:3-14).

To say an immeasurably great privilege is to the child born and raised in a true Christian home where the true gospel is believed and preached, is an understatement. With great privileges come great responsibilities, and not all who are nurtured, trained, and admonished in the Lord continually appreciate so being. For “coming of age” and growing wanton they kick against tenderly firm and loving pricks, while spitting out the pure milk of the Word so painstakingly fed to them (Ephesians 6:1-4; 1 Peter 2:1-3).

These are like ungrateful Esaus who sell their “immeasurably great gospel birthright” for a mess of pottage (Hebrews 12:16-17; cf. 2 Timothy 4:10).

Boettner’s mention of “*sinful and dissipated parents, and destitute of Christian influences*” describes much of the United States of America (including most who come in the name of Christianity). It’s not only the “*dissipated*” irreligious and secular types shirking their parental roles by carting their children off to government schools, it’s also the professing Christians who do this (cf. Ephesians 6:1-4; 1 Timothy 5:10, 14; Titus 2:3-5).

And it’s not only the “*dissipated*” irreligious and secular types who take pleasure in the wickedness on the movie or television screen, it’s also the professing Christians who do this. Many professing Christians are hypocrites who tell their irreligious neighbors to not commit adultery while they go and entertain themselves with adultery through the medium of movies or television (cf. Romans 1:32, 2:22). Many (if not most) who come in the name of Christianity are NO DIFFERENT than those they would judge to be immoral. Residing in their glass houses they cast hypocritical stones at those who enjoy watching the exact same gutter-box they do.

“I will set no wicked thing before my eyes; I have hated the work of those who turn aside; it shall not fasten upon me” (Psalm 101:3).

“For your obedience reached to all; therefore, I rejoice over you. But I desire you to be truly wise as to good, but simple toward evil” (Romans 16:19).

“Brothers, do not be children in your minds, but in malice be like infants, and in your minds be mature” (1 Corinthians 14:20).

“Do not love the world nor the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him, because all that which is in the world: the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world” (1 John 2:15-16).

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

CACOPHONY OF REBELLION

In *Unconditional Election* (chapter XI), Boettner pontificates:

“Conditions in the world at large and our own experiences in every day life show us that the blessings bestowed are sovereign and unconditional, irrespective of any previous merit or action on the part of those so chosen. If we are highly favored, we can only be thankful for His blessings; if not highly favored, we have no grounds for complaint. Why precisely this or that one is placed in circumstances which lead to saving faith, while others are not so placed, is indeed, a mystery. We cannot explain the workings of Providence; but we do know that the Judge of all the earth shall do right, and that when we attain to perfect knowledge we shall see that He has sufficient reasons for all His acts” (p. 90).

Here’s blackguard Boettner immuring the crystal-clear scriptural teaching of unconditional reprobation in false humility and pseudo-pious blasphemy. Is it REALLY *indeed a “mystery”* why Pharaoh was placed precisely in the circumstances he was placed? Of course NOT. God’s purpose in raising Pharaoh up was to display His power and wrath in him. God desired to condemn Pharaoh. God did not desire to save Pharaoh. There is absolutely no “mystery” about that.

Boettner proceeds to CONTRADICT himself by attempting to EXPLAIN *“the workings of Providence”* pertaining to reprobation by saying they cannot be explained. And WHY can’t they be explained according to Boettner? Supposedly it’s because they have not been explained in

scripture. God has indeed spoken very loud and clear, while Boettner sticks rebellious fingers in both ears:

“For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, ‘For this very thing I raised you up, so that I might display My power in you, and so that My name might be publicized in all the earth.’ So, then, to whom He desires, He shows mercy. And to whom He desires, He hardens. You will then say to me, Why does He yet find fault? For who has resisted His will? Yes, rather, O man, who are you answering against God? Shall the thing formed say to the One forming it, Why did You make me like this? Or does not the potter have authority over the clay, out of the one lump to make one vessel to honor, and one to dishonor? But if God, desiring to demonstrate His wrath, and to make His power known, endured in much long-suffering vessels of wrath having been fitted out for destruction, and that He make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy which He before prepared for glory, whom He also called, not only us, of Jews, but also out of nations” (Romans 9:17-24).

Boettner:

“Paul makes no attempt to explain how God can be just in showing mercy to whom He will and in passing by whom He will. In answer to the objector’s question, ‘Why doth He still find fault?’ (with those to whom He has not extended saving mercy), he (Paul) simply resolves the whole thing into the sovereignty of God, by replying, ‘Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?’ Romans 9:19-21. (And let it be noticed here that Paul says that it is not from different kinds of clay, but ‘from the same lump,’ that God, as the potter, makes one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor.) Paul

does not drag God from His throne and set Him before our human reason to be questioned and examined” (p. 93).

Boettner heaps further gratuitous abuse on God the Holy Spirit's perspicuous scriptural revelation. Paul DOES explain how God is just in showing mercy to whom He will and, NOT in “*passing by*” whom He will, but in *unconditionally and actively hardening* whom He will (Romans 9:18). God does NOT merely refrain from extending saving mercy to the reprobate, but He powerfully, actively, and unconditionally hardens them for destruction. God forms from the same lump vessels of wrath whom He desires to destroy — and by destroying them, His desire that the riches of His glorious mercy be made known to the elect is thus fulfilled (see Romans 9:17-24).

And just so Boettner and the like-minded fashionable Calvinist potsherds don't forget, it is God who makes the pots evil by forming them into dishonorable vessels to display His holy wrath in (I realize I'm going against popular opinion and sentiment by having the audacity to say that it's the Potter who makes the pots, rather than saying that it's the pots who make themselves).

” ...Shall the thing formed say to the [One] forming [it], Why did You make me like this?” (Romans 9:20)

Boettner *et al* say that God did NOT make you a vessel of wrath (and if He did, then He couldn't find fault since who has resisted His will to make you like this?). In stark contrast to this cacophony of rebellion, God through the apostle Paul says that God DID make you a vessel of wrath and that He has the Sovereign right to do so. And yes, God will, can, and does find fault with the reprobates' rebellious life, even though their rebellious life is being lived out as an irresistible result of His unconditional and active (NOT “*passive*”) decree. What will your response be to this? Will your response

be like Paul's? Or, will it be like Paul's mutinous critic's? Whose side are you on?

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

MIND-BLOWING IDIOCY

More from Boettner's lengthy 11th chapter entitled "*Unconditional Election*":

"Furthermore, the reason that God did not choose all to eternal life was not because He did not wish to save all, but that for reasons which we cannot fully explain a universal choice would have been inconsistent with His perfect righteousness" (p. 97).

So, "the reason that God did not choose [Pharaoh, say] to eternal life was not because He did not wish to save [Pharaoh]"? REALLY? Boettner is saying that God WISHES to save those He did NOT CHOOSE to save. *What kind of mind-blowing IDIOCY is this?* It's because of asinine assertions like this that compel me to say that Boettner's Calvinism is more repugnant and repulsive to me than Arminianism. Compare Boettner's statement above with the following:

"Hence if it is just for God to forbear saving some persons after they are born, it was just for Him to form that purpose before they were born, or in eternity. And since the determining will of God is omnipotent, it cannot be obstructed or made void. This being true, it follows that He never did, nor does He now, will that every individual of mankind should be saved" (p. 117).

In the context of the first quote, Boettner says that God "*wishes*" to save all. But here in the second quote he says that God "*never did, nor does He now, will that every individual of mankind should be saved.*" The necessary inference drawn is that Boettner believes that in some irrational sense, God "*wishes*" to save those whom He does not "*will*" to save. The first quote

shows that by “*wish*,” Boettner does not mean “*commands*.” Boettner appears to be enunciating the nefarious nonsense of those Calvinists (e.g., Murray & Stonehouse) who say that God has an “*ardent desire or wish*” to save those whom it is His “*good [and ardent??] pleasure*” to condemn.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

PROPELLING THE PRATTLING PEN

Continuing with the 11th chapter, Boettner now considers the topic of “*Reprobation*.” In this section Boettner is alleged to be “*defending*” this doctrine. This calls to my mind the “*defense*” of John Bunyan in his ironically titled book, “*Reprobation Asserted*,” that should have been named “*Reprobation Denied*” (cf.

<https://agrammatos.wordpress.com/2017/06/17/unconditional-reprobation-and-active-hardening-a-study-on-romans-911-22/>).

“Those who hold the doctrine of Election but deny that of Reprobation can lay but little claim to consistency. To affirm the former while denying the latter makes the decree of predestination an illogical and lop-sided decree. The creed which states the former but denies the latter will resemble a wounded eagle attempting to fly with but one wing. In the interests of a ‘mild Calvinism’ some have been inclined to give up the doctrine of Reprobation, and this term (in itself a very innocent term) has been the entering wedge for harmful attacks upon Calvinism pure and simple. ‘Mild Calvinism’ is synonymous with sickly Calvinism, and sickness, if not cured, is the beginning of the end” (p. 105).

What does “*the beginning of the end*” mean to Boettner? If this is the “*beginning of the end*” for “*sickly Calvinism*,” then what, pray tell, is the end result for “*sickly Arminianism*”? If a particular sickness goes uncured what is the end result? Is it necessarily death? Obviously not since it’s evident that Boettner believes the “*sickness*” of damnable heresy is the theological equivalent of the common cold (or something). It’s merely the “*beginning of the end*” of their (so-called) “*Christian*” health and vigor.

“In all the reprobate there is a blindness and an obstinate hardness of heart; and when any, like Pharaoh, are said to have been hardened of God we may be sure that they were already in themselves worthy of being delivered over to Satan. The hearts of the wicked are, of course, never hardened by the direct influence of God, — He simply permits some men to follow out the evil impulses which are already in their hearts, so that, as a result of their own choices, they become more and more calloused and obstinate” (p. 112)

Let's say that God DOES harden whom He will harden by direct influence (cf. Romans 9:18) in order to see what kind of response we will elicit from the God-haters. If the term *“harden”* in Romans 9:18 be accurately understood, it is obvious that it's NOT synonymous with the term *“tempt”* in James 1:13. Clearly, God does NOT tempt by direct influence (as James teaches), but He DOES unconditionally harden by direct influence (as Paul teaches). *And the God-hating objection to this is...? WHY does God find fault with those who are in no way able to resist His will (cf. Romans 9:19)?*

“And while it is said, for instance, that God hardened the heart of Pharaoh, it is also said that Pharaoh hardened his own heart (Exodus 8:15; 8:32; 9:34). One description is given from the divine view-point, the other is given from the human view-point. God is ultimately responsible for the hardening of the heart in that He permits it to occur, and the inspired writer in graphic language simply says that God does it; but never are we to understand that God is the immediate and efficient cause” (p. 112).

So graphic is Paul's language that while Boettner was propelling his perverse pen, God was *“immediately and efficiently propelling”* Boettner by His direct hardening and wrathful influence, to suppress its clear truth in unrighteousness. God is the immediate and efficient cause of Boettner's

voluntary choice to change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image more conformable to his depraved and corrupt mind (cf. Romans 1:18-23).

“Strange to say, many of those who insist that when people come to study the doctrine of the Trinity they should put aside all preconceived notions and should not rely simply upon the unaided human reason to decide what can or cannot be true of God, and who insist that the Scriptures should be accepted here as the unquestioned and authoritative guide, are not willing to follow those rules in the study of the doctrine of Predestination” (p. 113).

To those who’ve been paying attention thus far, Boettner’s perniciously hypocritical prattling has not just become palpable for the first time.

“Many people talk as if salvation were a matter of human birthright. And, forgetful of the fact that man had and lost his supremely favorable chance in Adam, they inform us that God would be unjust if He did not give all guilty creatures an opportunity to be saved” (p. 116).

As a dog returns to his own vomit, so Boettner returns to his own vomit that he expelled in the chapter called, “Adam Is God.” It was there that he brought up from his virulent gut the *“supremely favorable chance in Adam”* that his posterity had to nullify the cross of its glory, and to worship and serve the creature in perpetual bliss.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

ROMANS 10:14, 17 IS ORDINARILY TRUE

In the chapter on “*Unconditional Election*,” Boettner considers the “**State of the Heathens**”:

*“The fact that, in the providential working of God, some men are left without the Gospel...**virtually** involves the principle set forth in the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. ...For centuries the Jews, who were very few in number, were the only people to whom God was pleased to make any special revelation of Himself. Jesus confined His public ministry almost exclusively to them and forbade his disciples to go among others until after the day of Pentecost (Matthew 10:5, 6; 28:19; Mark 16:15; Acts 1:4). Multitudes were left with no chance to hear the Gospel, and consequently died in their sins. If God had intended to save them undoubtedly he would have sent them the means of salvation. If he had chosen to Christianize India and China a thousand years ago, He most certainly could have accomplished His purpose. Instead, they were left in gross darkness and unbelief” (p. 117; **emphasis mine—CD**).*

The “*principle set forth in the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination*” is that since God (“*ordinarily*”) uses the means of the gospel to save sinners, it follows that God does not intend to save those whom He denies this means of salvation. Clearly this doesn’t follow in their scheme, since they readily acknowledge “*extraordinary cases*” in which the gospel must be DENIED as the power of God to salvation for EVERYONE BELIEVING. Therefore, the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination does NOT VIRTUALLY INVOLVE, but ACTUALLY INVOLVES the pernicious principle that Romans 1:16 is NOT TRUE in “*extraordinary cases*.” To adapt the language of Westminster: Since God the Holy Spirit worketh when, and where, and how

He pleaseth, Romans 1:16 is *ordinarily true*. And thus, Boettner's statement would have been more accurate, had he NOT said this:

"If God had intended to save them undoubtedly he would have sent them the means of salvation" (p. 117).

But had INSTEAD said this:

*"If God had intended to save them **[most likely, but not necessarily undoubtedly]** he would have sent them the **[ordinary]** means of salvation."*

Behold, the travesty of those who denigrate and deny God's desire to glorify Himself in the hearts of His people (cf. John 16:13-14; 2 Corinthians 4:3-6):

"The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ORDINARILY wrought by the ministry of the Word" (WCF, Of Saving Faith, 14.1; emphasis mine—CD).

For Scriptural proof of this "ORDINARILY wrought by the ministry of the Word," they actually dared to cite Romans 10:14, 17. These cavalier men at Westminster Abbey actually had the GALL to use Paul's "NO EXCEPTIONS" argument to MAKE AN EXCEPTION. WOW. What audacity. It's as if these men looked right at that text and said: "WE DON'T BELIEVE THIS."

As if we needed to further enhance our nausea:

"Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So

also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word” (WCF, Of Effectual Calling, 10.3).

Those who adhere in full to WCF 10.3 and 14.1 have the temerity and unmitigated gall to deny the irresistible regenerating purpose of God the Holy Spirit to magnify and make known the redemptive work of Jesus Christ in the hearts of ALL His people without exception (cf. John 16:13-14; Romans 1:16; 2 Corinthians 4:3-6). Contrary to Romans 10:1-4, these WCF adherents further blaspheme by stating that in extraordinary cases God the Holy Spirit leaves some of His elect people who are supposedly “*incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word,*” ignorant of the righteousness of God that is revealed in the gospel.

In light of WCF 10.3 and 14.1, it ought to be abundantly clear why Boettner need NOT have used the term “virtually.” since it’s NOT “*virtually,*” but ACTUALLY and REALLY part and parcel of “*the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination*” to make exceptions to the Romans 1:16 rule, and to completely undercut and vitiate Paul’s argument in Romans 10:14.

The cavalier men of Westminster Abbey did NOT believe what God said through the apostle Paul in Romans 10:14-15. Evidently, it’s not ALWAYS the case, but only “ORDINARILY” the case that those who are ignorant of God’s righteousness are seeking to establish their own righteousness. Apparently, there are “extraordinary instances” in which people are able to submit to a righteous they are ignorant of (cf. Romans 10:1-4).

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

EXTRAORDINARY METHOD OF IGNORANCE

More from Boettner regarding the **“State of the Heathens”**:

“In fact the belief that the heathens without the Gospel are lost has been one of the strongest arguments in favor of foreign missions. If we believe that their own religions contain enough light and truth to save them, the importance of preaching the Gospel to them is greatly lessened. Our attitude toward foreign missions is determined pretty largely by the answer which we give to this question.

We do not deny that God can save some even of the adult heathen people if He chooses to do so, for His Spirit works when and where and how He pleases, with means or without means. If any such are saved, however, it is by a miracle of pure grace. Certainly God’s ordinary method is to gather His elect from the evangelized portion of mankind, although we must admit the possibility that by an extraordinary method some few of His elect may be gathered from the unevangelized portion” (pp. 119-120).

I like Marc’s comments on Blackguard Boettner’s comments (and those like-minded with him), so I quote them here. Marc writes:

“Do you see their reasoning? There are three kinds of people that they usually mention to make their point: infants, individuals with diminished intellectual capacity, and heathens. In the first two cases, they say that infants and people with diminished intellectual capacity are not ABLE to understand and believe. In the last case, they say that heathens have not been given the OPPORTUNITY to understand and believe, because they

have not come in contact with the gospel. And they say that there are some people who are not ABLE to understand and believe and some people who have not been given the OPPORTUNITY to understand and believe who are nevertheless regenerate.

Notice that they blasphemously use the very sovereignty of God to defend their heresy. They say that since God is sovereign, He can save in any way that He chooses. There are two responses to this: First, what does the sovereign God SAY in His WORD about how He saves people? The Westminster Confession is correct in saying that the Spirit works when, where, and how He pleases. But does the Spirit work when, where, and how He pleases, even if it is contrary to the Word of God? Of course not! A spirit who works when, where, and how he pleases, even if it is contrary to the Word of God is not the TRUE Holy Spirit but is a false damnable spirit. And think about this: You can use God's sovereignty to promote any heresy you want to! For example, what's wrong with this: God uses the teachings of the Koran to save people. Is there anything wrong with that? After all, God is sovereign, and He can do whatever He wants. How about this: The Holy Spirit regenerates Hindus, and these regenerate Hindus continue believing Hinduism to their death. What's wrong with that? After all, the Spirit works when, where, and how He pleases. What if He pleases to save an atheist and then pleases to keep that person believing atheism? He does whatever He pleases, right? And you know what — even some of the more sophisticated Arminians use God's sovereignty to promote their false gospel. They say that God sovereignly gave up some of His sovereignty and sovereignly chose to give man free will. What's wrong with that, since God can sovereignly choose whatever He wants to do? What's wrong with God sovereignly choosing to make salvation conditioned on works? Right? You can see how the doctrine of God's sovereignty can be twisted to endorse any heresy. The question is this: What does the sovereign God say in HIS WORD about what He does and does not do? The sovereign

God says in HIS WORD that He does things in a PARTICULAR WAY that GLORIFY HIMSELF.

Sometimes I get accused of limiting God or putting God in a box. Really? I'M limiting God? Who said that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to EVERYONE believing? Who said that those who are ignorant of the righteousness of God are not saved? Who said that God saves through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth? Who said that the gospel is hidden in those who are lost and that the lost are blinded to the gospel of the glory of Christ, and those who have gone from being lost to being saved have been shown the brightness of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ? Was that me? Or was that the Holy Spirit in Romans 1:16, Romans 10:3, 2 Thessalonians 2:13, and 2 Corinthians 4:3-6? When Paul says that THIS IS THE WAY IT ALWAYS IS, NO EXCEPTIONS, is he putting God in a box? Is he denying that God can do whatever He wants to do? Is he denying God's sovereignty? Well, we've been accused of that when we say that certain things that are ALWAYS the case based on God's Word. But that's the key, isn't it — it's based on GOD'S WORD! When GOD HIMSELF says that this is the ONLY way He does things, are the objectors going to talk back to God? When the Sovereign God says that this is the way He has sovereignly chosen to do things in order to magnify His glory, are the objectors going to tell God that He needs to make exceptions in order to show that He's sovereign?

GOD says how He saves people. And when you look at how GOD says how He saves people, you see that he makes NO EXCEPTIONS. As I said before, if there were even ONE EXCEPTION to this logical string of rhetorical questions, then the whole argument fails and God's Word is not true. These people who make exceptions must ultimately conclude that this passage in Romans 10:14 and 15 is logically flawed, and thus conclude

that the Bible is not inerrant. “Oh, no!” they protest, “All we’re doing is interpreting it in a different way!” And how are they interpreting it? In light of their exceptions, which totally undermine the passage. Did God say that the gospel is USUALLY or ORDINARILY the power of God unto salvation? Did God say that it is USUALLY or ORDINARILY the case that those who are ignorant of the righteousness of God are lost? Did God say in Hebrews 11:6 that USUALLY or ORDINARILY without faith it is impossible to please God, unless someone is incapable of having faith? Away with such God-dishonoring dung. God clearly shows in the Scriptures that when He saves someone, He immediately gives that person a knowledge of the gospel of salvation conditioned on the atoning blood and imputed righteousness of Christ alone. It matters not if this person is an infant or someone with a mental handicap or was a heathen. And why does He do this? It is to glorify Himself in the hearts of His people. WITHOUT EXCEPTION, God is glorified in the hearts of EVERY SINGLE REGENERATE PERSON, because EVERY SINGLE REGENERATE PERSON believes the gospel. The second response to the sovereignty argument is this: These people claim to exalt the sovereignty of God in salvation, yet THEY are the ones who put limits on what God says He does in salvation. If there is a heathen in some remote part of the world who has never heard of the gospel, is God not able to sovereignly bring the gospel to him so he will believe? If there is an unborn baby or a person with a mental handicap, is God not able to sovereignly cause that person to understand and believe the gospel? How much does one limit God when he says that God cannot do things the way He said He would do things in His Word? What’s to keep God from sovereignly bringing the gospel to a heathen or infant or person with a mental handicap? To you who would charge us with limiting God’s sovereignty, we bring the charge against YOU, and unlike you, we have the backing of Scripture. The sovereign God SAYS in HIS WORD how He saves people, and YOU would say NO, God

CANNOT do that in every case. It is YOU who deny the sovereignty of God.

I'd also like you to notice something from the Boettner quote. He said that 'If any such [meaning the heathen] are saved, however, it is by a miracle of pure grace.' What — is it NOT a miracle of pure grace when God saves people through belief of the gospel? Is it somehow 'less than pure' grace when God regenerates a person and immediately causes that person to believe the gospel? Could he be saying that regeneration without means is more pure grace because regeneration with means involves some kind of condition or prerequisite on the part of the sinner? Something to think about."

"Something to think about." Yes indeed. Could it be that Calvinists like Boettner realize that their so-called "*non-meritorious-condition*" is a fraudulent attempt to evade the charge of putting forth a view of "*grace*" that puts God in their debt, and is therefore no longer grace (cf. Romans 4:4, 11:6)?

"It is unreasonable to suppose that people can appropriate to themselves something concerning which they know nothing. We readily see that so far as the pleasures and joys and opportunities in this world are concerned the heathens are largely passed by; and on the same principle we would expect them to be passed by in the next world also. Those who are providentially placed in the pagan darkness of western China can no more accept Christ as Savior than they can accept the radio, the airplane, or the Copernican system of astronomy, things concerning which they are totally ignorant. When God places people in such conditions we may be sure that He has no more intention that they shall be saved than He has that the soil of northern Siberia, which is frozen all the year round, shall produce crops of wheat. Had he intended otherwise He would have supplied the means

leading to the designed end. There are also multitudes in the nominally Christian lands to whom the Gospel has never been presented in any adequate way, who have not even the outward means of salvation, to say nothing of the helpless state of their heart” (pp. 119-120).

Boettner says it's “*unreasonable to suppose...*” But obviously he doesn't mean it's ALWAYS unreasonable to suppose, since he leaves open the “extraordinary possibility” that God would deny His own redemptive glory by being unable or unwilling to shine in His peoples' hearts the illuminating (regenerating) knowledge of His glory in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Corinthians 4:6).

CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE GREAT MAJORITY ARE CHOSEN

“Many are chosen” (contra Matthew 22:14) is the provocative subtitle selected by Boettner in chapter XI (*“Unconditional Election”*):

“When the doctrine of Election is mentioned many people immediately assume that this means that the great majority of mankind will be lost. But why should any one draw that conclusion?” (p. 130)

Many people *“immediately assume”* this probably because of verses like the following:

“For many are called, but few chosen” (Matthew 22:14).

“Go in through the narrow gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leads to destruction, and many are the ones entering in through it. For narrow is the gate, and constricted is the way that leads away into life, and few are the ones finding it” (Matthew 7:13-14).

“And one said to Him, Lord, are the ones being saved few? But He said to them, Labor to enter in through the narrow gate, for I say to you that many will seek to enter in and will not have strength” (Luke 13:23-24).

“I say then, Did not God thrust away His people? Let it not be! For I also am an Israelite, out of Abraham’s seed, of the tribe of Benjamin. God did not thrust away His people whom He foreknew. Or do you not know what the

Scripture said in Elijah, how he pleaded with God against Israel, saying, Lord, they killed Your prophets, and they dug down Your altars, and only I am left, and they seek my life. But what does the Divine answer say to him, I reserved to Myself seven thousand men who did not bow a knee to Baal. So then, also in the present time a remnant according to election of grace has come into being” (Romans 11:1-5).

Boettner would cavalierly shoehorn an errant definition of an (elect) “remnant” into the Scripture as an (elect) “majority.” Evidently, “majority” is Boettner’s twisted neologism for “remnant.” Three words: *Boettner burbles balderdash.*

“God is free in election to choose as many as He pleases, and we believe that He who is infinitely merciful and benevolent and holy will elect the great majority to life. There is no good reason why He should be limited to only a few” (p. 130).

There is “no good reason,” except for Romans 11:1-5 teaches that it’s God’s good pleasure to save “only a few” (that is, a “remnant”). The Scriptures teach that “the great majority” are chosen for death and damnation (does this fact somehow make God less than infinitely merciful?). God is NOT “limiting Himself” to only a few, Boettner. It’s simply God’s good pleasure to sovereignly elect “only a few” (Romans 11:5).

“We are told that Christ is to have the preeminence in all things, and we do not believe that the Devil will be permitted to emerge victor even in numbers” (p. 130).

Boettner impiously exhibits ineptitude in Biblical logic and arithmetic with this assertion. If only one sinful soul were to perish, does this mean that the Devil was “permitted to” eek out a victory, albeit an extremely small and infinitesimal one? According to Boettner, the remnant will perish while the vast majority will be saved. Is Boettner, then, conceding that while the Devil

will not emerge the (ultimate) victor in the war of numbers, he will nevertheless have “*emerged as victor*” in a few of the smaller battles? Who does Boettner believe is running the universe, anyway? God, or the devil? Is Boettner enunciating some perverted mishmash of Open Theism or Arminianism? Some kind of Calvinistically-modified dualism? Does not Boettner’s allegation of the devil’s emergence of victor in numbers, imply that Boettner believes that God “desires” (in some “sense” or other) the salvation of the numbers (whether few or many) that perish?

To reiterate an above point: Did the devil eek out a tiny victory in the case of Pharaoh’s eternal destruction (cf. Romans 9)? Did the devil “*emerge as a tiny victor*” when God’s purpose and desire to unconditionally harden and destroy Pharaoh, was successfully fulfilled and accomplished?

“So far as the principles of sovereignty and personal election are concerned there is no reason why a Calvinist might not hold that all men will finally be saved; and some Calvinists have actually held this view. ‘Calvinism,’ wrote W. P. Patterson, of the University of Edinburgh, ‘is the only system which contains principles — in its doctrines of election and irresistible grace — that could make credible a theory of universal salvation.’

And Dr. S. G. Craig, Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and one of the outstanding men in the Presbyterian Church at the present time, says:

‘No doubt many Calvinists, like many not Calvinists, have, in obedience to the supposed teachings of the Scriptures, held that few will be saved, but there is no good reason why Calvinists may not believe that the saved will ultimately embrace the immensely greater portion of the

human race. At any rate, our leading theologians — Charles Hodge, Robert L. Dabney, W. G. T. Shedd, and B. B. Warfield — have so held”

(pp. 131-132).

No “good reason” except for the fact that the Bible clearly teaches that few will be saved in comparison to those who will be lost. Even one of their own prophets will offer them a scathing rebuke for their fanciful “interpretation” of verses like Romans 11:1-5 and Matthew 7:13-14:

“An idea of candour and philanthropy leads many to adopt sentiments directly repugnant to the scriptures. They imagine that few, if any, perish; and that, though the bulk of mankind live in total neglect of God, they find mercy at the last. But no pretence of candour should induce us to contradict the plainest declarations of God. If there be any truth in the scriptures, there are comparatively few who go to heaven” (Charles Simeon, Helps to composition; or six hundred skeletons of sermons).

So far as I know, Boettner and his biblically illiterate company are not saying that those who “*live in total neglect of God*” will find mercy in spite of this neglect (so this part of Simeon’s rebuke does not apply to them, but the remainder of it does). However, Blackguard Boettner and his horde of bandits HAVE adopted “*sentiments directly repugnant to the scriptures.*” They exude a “*pretence of candour*” that contradicts “*the plainest declarations of God.*”

CHAPTER TWENTY

SALVATION OF INFANTS

This is the last post on the lengthy chapter of “Unconditional Election” (chapter XI), before the next chapter called “Limited Atonement” (chapter XII). In the section on “Infant Salvation” Boettner writes the following:

“Most Calvinistic theologians have held that those who die in infancy are saved. The Scriptures seem to teach plainly enough that the children of believers are saved; but they are silent or practically so in regard to those of the heathens. The Westminster Confession does not pass judgment on the children of heathens who die before coming to years of accountability” (p. 144).

There is no such thing as an “age of accountability” — every person, no matter what age, is accountable.

Boettner:

“Concerning those who die in infancy, Dr. Warfield says:

‘Their destiny is determined irrespective of their choice, by an unconditional decree of God, suspended for its execution on no act of their own; and their salvation is wrought by an unconditional application of the grace of Christ to their souls, through the immediate and irresistible operation of the Holy Spirit prior to and apart from any action of their own proper wills...And if death in infancy does depend on God’s providence, it is assuredly God in His providence who selects this vast multitude to be made participants of His unconditional salvation...This is

but to say that they are unconditionally predestinated to salvation from the foundation of the world. If only a single infant dying in irresponsible infancy be saved, the whole Arminian principle is traversed. If all infants dying such are saved, not only the majority of the saved, but doubtless the majority of the human race hitherto, have entered into life by a non-Arminian pathway.’ [1]

[1] Two Studies in the History of Doctrine, p. 230.

Certainly there is nothing in the Calvinistic system which would prevent us from believing this; and until it is proven that God could not predestinate to eternal life all those whom He is pleased to call in infancy we may be permitted to hold this view” (pp. 143-144).

Boettner favorably quotes Warfield denying that the gospel is the power of God to salvation to EVERYONE BELIEVING (Romans 1:16). All of the elect without exception — from the elect infant, to the elect mentally handicapped person — will be regenerated and saved by Christ and will immediately be given knowledge and faith in Him. Men like Warfield and Boettner come to the text of Scripture with their false premise, their false presumption regarding the mental capacity of infants. They assert that infants are not able to believe due to their supposed lack of mental capacity, or to the “fact” that infants cannot hear and understand anything while inside their mother’s womb. But Jesus Christ Himself obliterates this pseudo-scientific-psychological nonsense by saying that infants and/or little children, ARE ABLE TO RECEIVE the kingdom of God (Luke 18:17). And if that is not enough, we have the infant John the Baptist in addition to the passages already mentioned (e.g., Romans 1:16).

More from Boettner:

“The doctrine of infant salvation finds a logical place in the Calvinistic system; for the redemption of the soul is thus infallibly determined irrespective of any faith, repentance or good works, whether actual or foreseen. It does not, however, find a logical place in Arminianism or any other system. Furthermore, it would seem that a system such as Arminianism, which suspends salvation on a personal act of rational choice, would logically demand that those dying in infancy must either be given another period of probation after death, in order that their destiny may be fixed, or that they must be annihilated” (pp. 144-145).

The blatant denial of the gospel as the power of God to salvation for everyone believing, finds a “logical place” in various Calvinistic systems (e.g., Westminster Confession of Faith, The Second Helvetic Confession). For they deny that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God to salvation to everyone believing (Romans 1:16). Presumably, to the chagrin of Warfield and Boettner (and all Calvinists of similar belief), their gospel-denying view in the case of the salvation of infants has much in common with Hyper-Calvinism:

“Another common Hyper-Calvinist heresy has to do with the difference between regeneration and conversion. Since regeneration is without means, they argue, then it has no temporal connection whatsoever with repentance and belief of the gospel. Thus, they believe that a person can go for a period of hours, days, weeks, or even years between being regenerated (saved, born again) and being converted (repenting, believing the gospel). They believe that a regenerate person can go for hours, days, weeks, or even years being ignorant of the only ground of salvation that is revealed in the gospel and even being openly hostile to the gospel. They say that this glorifies God’s sovereignty in salvation. They say that to believe that conversion is an immediate and inevitable fruit of regeneration is to believe that God cannot save someone without the means of the gospel, thus denying God’s sovereignty”

[\(https://agrammatos.wordpress.com/2011/11/01/damnable-hyper-calvinist-heresy/\)](https://agrammatos.wordpress.com/2011/11/01/damnable-hyper-calvinist-heresy/).

Here is what the Bible says compared to what is believed by Hyper-Calvinists AND Calvinists like Warfield, Boettner, and adherents to those Reformed Confessions that make exceptions to the Romans 1:16 and Mark 16:16 rule regarding infants:

“For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is [the] power of God to salvation to everyone believing, both to Jew first, and to Greek; for in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; even as it has been written, But the just shall live by faith” (Romans 1:16-17).

Hyper-Calvinists AND the aforementioned Calvinists do NOT believe that the gospel is the power of God to salvation to everyone believing. It is interesting how MULTITUDES of Calvinists who falsely accuse us of Hyper-Calvinism, actually have much in common with their Hyper-Calvinist friends (or spiritual brothers?).

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

EFFECTUAL ATONEMENT MADE POSSIBLE BY AN INEFFECTUAL ATONEMENT

Chapter XII of Loraine Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, is called "Limited Atonement." Here's Boettner:

"The question which we are to discuss under the subject of 'Limited Atonement' is, Did Christ offer up Himself a sacrifice for the whole human race, for every individual without distinction or exception; or did His death have special reference to the elect? In other words, was the sacrifice of Christ merely intended to make the salvation of all men possible, or was it intended to render certain the salvation of those who had been given to Him by the Father? Arminians hold that Christ died for all men alike, while Calvinists hold that in the intention and secret plan of God Christ died for the elect only, and that His death had only an incidental reference to others in so far as they are partakers of common grace" (p. 150).

Note Boettner's phrase: "...or did His death have special reference to the elect?" If Christ died ONLY for those whom He represented at the cross (and absolutely no others), then WHY speak of a "special reference" of Christ's death towards those whom He did NOT represent (i.e., the non-elect or reprobate)? In his penetrating polemic against the damnable heresy of "common grace," Marc Carpenter writes:

"In fashionable Calvinism, 'common grace' (the grace that is shown to everyone without exception) is contrasted with 'special grace' (the grace that is shown only to God's people). In fact, whenever you hear or read of the 'special grace' of God, the heresy of 'common grace' is usually not far away, either lurking in the shadows or brazenly trumpeted. For if God's

grace were always special and never universal, then the phrase 'special grace' would be a redundancy."

Likewise, when fashionable Calvinists like Boettner use the phrase "special reference" when speaking of Christ's atonement, the damnable heresy that Christ "died in some sense for the non-elect" is usually not far away, either lurking in (relatively) subtle shadows, or boldly and brazenly trumpeted. Boettner (somewhat vaguely) indicates what this other than "special reference" entails, when he asserts that Christ's death has "only an incidental reference to others in so far as they are partakers of common grace."

Evidently for Calvinist heretics like Boettner an "atonement" of "incidental reference," supposedly composed of mere "common grace," is NOT sufficient to make the non-elects' salvation "certain." but IS sufficient to make the non-elects' salvation "possible." The ingenuous question to ask those who profane the efficacious cross-work of Jesus Christ is this:

"How can you maintain without any trace of disingenuousness, that the non-elects' salvation is made 'possible' by an 'atonement' that has a mere 'incidental reference' that merely includes so-called 'common grace'?"

I'm not saying that Loraine Boettner and A.A. Hodge are in particular agreement about this convoluted Calvinist teaching regarding how Christ's atonement relates to the non-elect, or in what "sense" Christ is blasphemously asserted to "die for" those who ultimately perish, but here is Hodge's explication:

"2nd. He is, in the complete and permanent and saving sense, the Priest only of his own people, his sheep, those from the beginning given him by the Father, those who believe on him through the effectual call of his Spirit. Nevertheless, it is true that in a very important sense he has always been the Priest of the whole historic human race. He is the second Adam. He

took upon himself human nature, the seed of Abraham. He was made under the law, and fulfilled the obligations, preceptive and punitive, which rest upon all men alike. He arrested, in behalf of the whole race as a body, the immediate execution of the legal penalty. The whole course of human history, of all peoples and nations, of all religions and civilizations, has been evolved under the shield of his cross, under a dispensation of arrested judgment or forbearance secured through his mediation. He, by his expiation, removed utterly out of the way of all men alike the objective hindrances in the justice of God and in the judgment of the law which rendered their salvation absolutely impossible. In this general sense, Christ, as the man whom God has appointed Priest, is the common bond of the whole human race, and his meritorious service the common basis of all human history.

*3rd. But while he, in his priestly work, has made the salvation of all men possible on the condition of their accepting it, he has made the salvation of those whom the Father has given him certain by purchasing for them that faith which is the condition of their personal participation in his work” (A.A. Hodge, *Evangelical Theology*, pp. 218-219).*

A.A. Hodge does not specifically mention the phrase “common grace” but the wicked teaching of it is clearly implied in such statements as, “*He arrested, in behalf of the whole race as a body, the immediate execution of the legal penalty.*” Though many “common grace” and “dualist atonement” [1] Calvinists (Boettner included) may disagree with the particular way A.A. Hodge enunciated the “sense” in which Christ can be said to be a “Mediator” and “High Priest” for the “historic human race,” they nevertheless must agree in a general sense since they all wish to maintain that the non-elect partake of “common grace.” And since they all wish to

assert the heresy of “common grace,” they must all answer the question:
From whence cometh this grace?

[1] “Dualist atonement Calvinist” is a phrase I’ve chosen to employ to describe Calvinists who believe that Jesus Christ “died” in “some sense” for the non-elect (i.e., reprobate). This God-hating, Christ-dishonoring, precious-propitiatory-blood-profaning “some sense” garbage is seen in Calvinists who assert that Jesus Christ actually bore the sins of the reprobate, as well as those Calvinists who might vehemently deny that Jesus Christ bore the reprobates’ sins but who nevertheless maintain that Christ “died for” them.

Despite the somewhat confusing variations and permutations of the wicked Calvinistic doctrine of “common grace” (and related doctrine of the non-elects’ supposed relation to Christ’s atonement), this remains clear:

“[Those] who have adopted this term [“common grace”–CD] and who advocate and promote universal grace are the unwitting agents of Satan to destroy the gospel. The true gospel is the gospel of grace — the one and only grace of God as manifested in the work of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. Those who hold to ‘common grace’ must either believe that God shows grace at the expense of His justice or that Jesus Christ’s death in some way merited grace for everyone without exception.”

More from Boettner:

“The meaning might be brought out more clearly if we used the phrase ‘Limited Redemption’ rather than ‘Limited Atonement.’ The Atonement is, of course, strictly an infinite transaction; the limitation comes in, theologically, in the application of the benefits of the atonement, that is in redemption. But since the phrase ‘Limited Atonement’ has become well established in

theological usage and its meaning is well known we shall continue to use it” (p. 150).

Many people lose sight by focusing too much on what has been called “the extent of the atonement.” The focus needs to be on the nature — the EFFICACY of Christ’s atonement. The essential (or main) point is that the atonement actually saved, that the atonement actually atoned for ALL whom Christ represented. That’s the key.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

THINK LIKE A CALVINIST, PREACH LIKE A CALVINIST

Continuing with Chapter XII (“*Limited Atonement*”) of Loraine Boettner’s *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*:

“It will be seen at once that this doctrine necessarily follows from the doctrine of election. If from eternity God has planned to save one portion of the human race and not another, it seems to be a contradiction to say that His work has equal reference to both portions, or that He sent His Son to die for those whom He had predetermined not to save, as truly as, and in the same sense that He was sent to die for those whom He had chosen for salvation. These two doctrines must stand or fall together. We cannot logically accept one and reject the other. If God has elected some and not others to eternal life, then plainly the primary purpose of Christ’s work was to redeem the elect” (p. 151).

Boettner mentions the phrase “equal reference” in the context of Christ’s atoning work. Boettner is referring to the Arminian pseudo-atonement that teaches an “equal reference” to all men without exception — that is, the Arminian believes that Jesus Christ died for all without exception in the exact same way. This, of course, is an atonement that does not atone; a satisfaction that does not satisfy. This is a false (or *pseudo*) atonement that finds its ultimate “atoning efficacy” in the self-righteous effort of the sinner. This is called “autosoterism,” or an “autosoteric” view of salvation in theological jargon. In plain terms, it is called blatant in-your-face self-salvation. In self-salvation the self-savior enjoys crediting his “god” with enabling him to meet “non-meritorious conditions,” while believing that his “god” has “graciously condescended” by so “graciously” enabling the sinner to put him in his debt (cf. Romans 11:6). This “gracious enabling” and

meeting of “non-meritorious conditions” comes in a variety of forms (e.g., Calvinist form, Arminian form, Roman Catholic form, etc.).

The Arminian would say that Christ died in the “same sense” for Peter (elect) as He did for Judas (non-elect). This is what is meant by equal reference. Boettner is NOT denying that Christ died for Judas. He affirmed elsewhere that *“His death had only an incidental reference to others in so far as they are partakers of common grace”* (p. 150). So, for Boettner, this is the “sense” in which he believes that Christ “died for” Judas. According to Boettner, Jesus “died for” Judas, but He did not “die for” Judas “as truly as” He died for Peter. What kind of Satanically self-righteous nonsense is that?

If you have the stomach for it, more from Boettner:

“The atonement, therefore, was infinitely meritorious and might have saved every member of the human race had that been God’s plan. It was limited only in the sense that it was intended for, and is applied to, particular persons; namely for those who are actually saved” (p. 151).

Perhaps I was a little hasty (or not) in reaching for the proverbial Tums or Alka-Seltzer. For here Boettner is simply enunciating a common hypothetical “high calvinist” statement, that the atonement of Christ “might have saved” Judas (the non-elect) “had that been God’s plan.” They say this in order to emphasize (in their own minds) the “infinite value” of Christ’s atonement.

“While the value of the atonement was sufficient to save all mankind, it was efficient to save only the elect. It is indifferently well adapted to the salvation of one man to that of another, thus making the salvation of every man objectively possible; yet because of subjective difficulties, arising on account of the sinners own inability either to see or appreciate the things of God, only those are saved who are regenerated and sanctified by the Holy

Spirit. The reason why God does not apply this grace to all men has not been fully revealed” (p. 152).

For Boettner, this “value,” this “sufficiency” of the atonement “to save all mankind,” is seen in the hypothetical phrases “might have saved” and “had that been God’s plan.” Evidently for Boettner, an “*atonement*” that has “*only an incidental reference to others [i.e., the non-elect] in so far as they are partakers of common grace*” (p. 150) is able to make their salvation “*objectively possible.*” Really Boettner? Some might say that Boettner talks this way in order that he may “*believe like a Calvinist and preach like an Arminian.*” But why not just say Boettner speaks as he does so that he may “*believe like a Calvinist AND preach like a Calvinist*”? For the Arminians will preach their version of universal atonement, and Calvinists like Boettner will preach their version of universal atonement. *So, what substantial difference does it really make?* They BOTH are preaching the damnable false gospel of salvation conditioned on the sinner, their verbal variations notwithstanding (cf. Galatians 1:8-9).

Apparently Boettner is baffled concerning the reason why God does not save all men. Like many learned theologians before and after him, Boettner is incapable of understanding exceedingly simple things:

“For He said to Moses, I will have mercy on whomever I will have mercy, and I will pity whomever I will pity. So, then, it is not of the one willing, nor of the one running, but of the One showing mercy, of God. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, For this very thing I raised you up, so that I might display My power in you, and so that My name might be publicized in all the earth. So, then, to whom He desires, He shows mercy. And to whom He desires, He hardens. You will then say to me, Why does He yet find fault? For who has resisted His will? Yes, rather, O man, who are you answering against God? Shall the thing formed say to the One forming it, Why did You make me like this? Or does not the potter have authority over

the clay, out of the one lump to make one vessel to honor, and one to dishonor? But if God, desiring to demonstrate His wrath, and to make His power known, endured in much long-suffering vessels of wrath having been fitted out for destruction, and that He make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy which He before prepared for glory, whom He also called, not only us, of Jews, but also out of nations” (Romans 9:15-24).

To reiterate one thing Boettner had said:

“The reason why God does not apply this grace to all men has not been fully revealed” (Lorraine Boettner).

Is Romans 9:15-24 a full enough revelation for ya, Boettner? God “*does not apply this grace to all men*” because He desires to demonstrate His wrath by damning some men; and in this desire to damn and not to save the vessels of wrath, the vessels of mercy are made to know the riches of His glory.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

THE DEATH OF MEANING

Here's the next section on "*Limited Atonement*" found in Boettner's book:

"Jesus Himself limited the purpose of His death when He said, 'I lay down my life for the sheep.' If, therefore, He laid down His life for the sheep, the atoning character of His work was not universal. On another occasion He said to the Pharisees, 'Ye are not my sheep;' and again, 'Ye are of your father the Devil.' Will anyone maintain that He laid down His life for these, seeing that He so pointedly excludes them?" (p. 156)

Let's combine what Boettner says there above with what he says here:

"There is, then, a certain sense in which Christ died for all men, and we do not reply to the Arminian tenet with an unqualified negative. But what we do maintain is that the death of Christ had special reference to the elect in that it was effectual for their salvation, and that the effects which are produced in others are only incidental to this one great purpose" (p. 161).

Blackguard Boettner writes that one purpose of Christ's death "for" (i.e., in "*a certain sense*") the non-elect is to produce or effect in them only incidental non-saving things. In Boettner's doctrine of false atonement, the Pharisees who have the devil as their father and are not Christ's sheep, are NOT pointedly excluded from having Jesus lay down His life for them *in another or different sense*, which is that blasphemous "*certain sense*" that Boettner spews here:

"Arminians hold that Christ died for all men alike, while Calvinists hold that in the intention and secret plan of God Christ died for the elect only, and

that His death had only an incidental reference to others in so far as they are partakers of common grace” (p. 150).

According to Boettner’s evil equivocation of Christ’s death, Christ is supposedly a “propitiation” in “*a certain sense*” on behalf of the non-elect who will endure wrath everlastingly. This “*certain sense*” trash is probably what gave rise to such insidious Calvinist doctrines as “common grace,” “common operations of the spirit,” and “restraining grace.”

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

BISTRO OF BELLIGERENCE

Chapter XIII of Loraine Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* is entitled: "*Efficacious Grace.*"

"Under the covenant made with Adam, man's destiny depended on his own works. We know the results of that trial. Now if man could not work out his salvation when he was upright, what chance has he to do so since he is fallen? Happily for us, God has this time taken the matter into His own hand. And if God again gave man free will by which to work out his own salvation, what would He be doing but again instituting the dispensation which has already been tried and which ended in failure?" (p. 169)

Boettner candidly acknowledges that prior to the Fall, man's destiny depended on his own works as he was (allegedly) provided an opportunity to "*work out his salvation when he was upright.*" For Boettner and those who adhere to such demonic documents as the Westminster Confession of Faith, Adam (man) was afforded the "chance" to catapult into the Heavens and rip God from His sovereign decretal throne and thwart His eternal purpose to glorify Himself in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. While insidious and audacious in the extreme, I do appreciate the forthrightness of Boettner in acknowledging his belief in the Reformed figment that Adam was provided a "chance" to vitiate the cross of Christ, rob Him of His redemptive glory, and impugn His imputed righteousness.

"We are very sure that no property does, or can, attach to the will of man, whether fallen or unfallen, that can take it beyond the reach of God's sovereign control. Saul was called at the height of his persecuting zeal and was transformed into the saintly Paul. The poor dying thief on the cross

was called in the last hour of his earthly life. When Paul preached at Antioch 'as many as were ordained to eternal life (and only they) believed,' Acts 13:48. If God purposed that all men should be saved He most certainly could bring all to salvation. But for reasons which have been only partly revealed, He leaves many impenitent. Through all of His works, however, God does nothing which is inconsistent with man's nature as a rational and responsible being" (p. 169).

The reason Boettner says "for reasons which have been only partly revealed, He leaves many impenitent" is that he believes in a partly sovereign "god" whose creatures ARE beyond the reach of his "sovereign control" when it comes to their evil thoughts and actions. Boettner (and most Calvinists) avowedly deny that God unconditionally and actively causes men to sin in order that He may justly punish them — and yet this is what the Bible teaches. Boettner's assertion that Adam (man) was given free will before the Fall, and his earlier assertions that the non-elect are "left to themselves," is an admission that his "god" is NOT the sovereign God of Scripture, but a palatable idolatrous morsel that is being served up at the bistro of belligerence to those of similar taste.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

AND GOD MOCKED THEM

We continue with Chapter XIII (“Efficacious Grace”) from Boettner’s *The Reformed Doctrine Of Predestination*:

“It is unreasonable to suppose that the sinner can thus defeat the creative power of Almighty God. ‘All authority hath been given to me in heaven and on earth,’ said the risen Lord. No limit is set to that authority. ‘Is anything too hard for Jehovah?’ ‘He doeth according to His will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and no one can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest thou?’ In view of these passages and many others to the same effect it ill becomes us to imagine that God is struggling along with man as best He can, persuading, exhorting, pleading, but unable to accomplish His purpose if His creatures will otherwise. If God does not effectually call, we may imagine Him saying, ‘I will that all men should be saved; nevertheless, it must finally be, not as I will but as they will.’ He is then put into the same extremity with Darius who would gladly have saved Daniel, but could not (Daniel 6:14)” (pp. 170-171).

As the extremely influential God-hater C.S. Lewis stated in *The Great Divorce*:

“There are only two kinds of people in the end: those who say to God, ‘Thy will be done’ and those to whom God says, in the end, ‘Thy will be done.’ All that are in hell choose it” (Lewis)

C.S. Lewis and the Arminians Boettner is referring to, believe that in salvation and damnation, God is NOT sovereign, but that Man IS sovereign. This blasphemous and risible view has God bowing in reverence

to the dignity and honor of the sovereign choice of man. Evidently, man's will is a kind of *Holy of Holies* where even the Sovereign Controller of the universe is to tread with trepidation. In sober contrast to the Satanic shenanigans of C.S. Lewis and the Arminians, here is the Scriptural teaching on the matter:

“And Sihon the king of Heshbon was not willing to let us pass by him, for Jehovah your God had hardened his spirit, and had emboldened his heart, so as to give him into your hand, as it is this day” (Deuteronomy 2:30).

“And Joshua made war many days with all those kings. There was not a city that made peace with the sons of Israel except the Hivites, ones living in Gibeon. They took all in battle. For it was of Jehovah to harden their hearts, so that they should come against Israel in battle, so that they might be destroyed, so that they might have no favor, but that He might destroy them, as Jehovah commanded Moses” (Joshua 11:18-20).

“For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, For this very thing I raised you up, so that I might display My power in you, and so that My name might be publicized in all the earth. So, then, to whom He desires, He shows mercy. And to whom He desires, He hardens” (Romans 9:17-18).

More from Boettner:

“No Christian who is familiar with what the Scriptures teach about the sovereignty of God can believe that He is thus defeated in His creatures. Is it not necessary that a creature must have power to defy and thwart the purposes of Almighty God before his actions can be rewarded or punished. Furthermore, if God actually stood powerless before the majesty of man's lordly will, there would be but little use to pray for Him to convert any one. It

would then be more reasonable for us to direct our petitions to the man himself” (pp. 170-171).

The consistent position for C.S. Lewis and the Arminian petitioner is to offer up their prayers, NOT to the blasphemous figment of their own benighted brains, but to the true object of their religious affections: the sovereign man himself (cf. Revelation 13:18).

The Christian Confession of Faith (CCF) states:

“The truth of total depravity does not mean that all men are as outwardly immoral as they possibly could be. It means that every faculty of the soul of every natural (that is, unregenerate) descendant of Adam is completely polluted with hatred of the true and living God, and all of the natural man’s thoughts, words, and deeds (even his kindness, morality, and religion) are dead works, evil deeds, and fruit unto death. It means that every natural descendent of Adam owes a debt to God’s law and justice that he cannot pay. It means that every natural descendent of Adam is spiritually dead, having no spiritual understanding, a lover of darkness rather than light, a slave of sin, unable and unwilling to obey God and come to Jesus Christ for salvation. This truth is contrary to the damnable poison known as ‘free will,’ which seeks to make the creature independent of the Creator and seeks to make the Potter depend on the clay, according to the devil’s lie, ‘You shall be as God.’” [Gen 3:5; Psa 14:2-3; Pro 12:10; 15:8; Isa 45:20; 64:6; Jer 13:23; 17:9; Mat 7:18; Joh 3:19-20; 6:44-45; Rom 1:20-23; 3:9-12,20; 5:12; 6:16-23; 7:5; 8:5-8; 10:2-3; 1Co 2:14; 2Co 4:3-4; Eph 2:5; 4:18; Col 1:21; 2:13; Heb 9:14; 11:6]” (CCF).

C.S. Lewis, the Arminians, and yes, even Loraine Boettner’s representative semi-deist/semi-dualist Calvinism, are ALL striking instances of the

creature seeking a seditious secession from the sovereign control of his Maker. And God mocked them:

“Why have the nations raged and the peoples are meditating on vanity? The kings of the earth set themselves; yea, the rulers have plotted together against Jehovah and His Anointed, saying, We will break their bands in two, and throw off their cords from us. He who sits in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall mock at them” (Psalm 2:1-4).

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

HELPLESS HERETICS

In hopes that my review of Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* will not exceed Boettner's book in length, I press on:

"We now come to discuss the sufficiency of Christ's work in the matter of redemption. We believe that by His vicarious suffering and death He fully paid the debt which His people owed to divine justice, thus releasing them from the consequences of sin, and that by keeping the law of perfect obedience and living a sinless life He vicariously earned for them the reward of eternal life. His work fully provided for their rescue from sin and for their establishment in heaven. These two phases of His work are sometimes referred to as His active and passive obedience...Had He only paid the penalty for sin without also earning the reward of eternal life, His people would then only have been raised up to the zero point. They would then have been on the same plane as was Adam before he fell, and would still have been under obligation to earn eternal life for themselves" (pp. 172-173).

Contrary to popular Calvinist sentiment, "faith is NOT a condition of or prerequisite to salvation; instead, faith believes that Jesus Christ alone met all the conditions for salvation. Faith is the instrument through which a believer receives the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ and is justified" (Christian Confession of Faith).

Jesus Christ met the condition of a perfect righteousness that answers the demands of God's law and justice (Romans 10:5; Galatians 3:10).

Regarding the sole condition-meeting of Jesus Christ, the CCF states the following:

“1. When He became incarnate, Jesus Christ was made subject to the law of God and was obliged to obey all its precepts. He did this perfectly, to the minutest detail. [Psalm 40:8; Isa 50:5; Mat 3:15; 2Co 5:21; Gal 4:4; Heb 2:14-15; 4:15; 7:26; 1Pe 2:22-23; 1Jo 3:4-5]

2. The consummate act of obedience that Jesus Christ paid to the law was in suffering the ultimate penalty for the disobedience of His people that the law demanded. Thus, while upon the cross, Jesus Christ, as a perfect representative, substitute, and sacrifice for His people, became a curse for His people and suffered the unmitigated fury of God the Father, which was equivalent to suffering the very pains of hell. This was not for any guilt He had contracted Himself but for the sins of His people. Their guilt was imputed to Him, and He suffered the penalty their sins deserved. His finished work on the cross appeased God’s wrath in full toward all for whom He died and paid the ransom price in full for all for whom He died, guaranteeing the salvation of all for whom He died. [Gen 22:13; Exo 12:3-13; Lev 16:21-22; 17:11; Psa 22:1-18; 32:1; Isa 53:1-12; Dan 9:24-26; Zec 13:7; Mat 26:28; 27:35-50; Mar 15:24-37; Luk 23:33-46; 24:46; Joh 11:49-52; 19:16-30; Act 17:3; 20:28; Rom 3:24-25; 5:6-11; 1Co 1:30; 5:7; 6:20; 15:3; 2Co 5:21; Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13; 4:5; Eph 1:7; 2:13-17; Col 1:14,20-22; 2:13-14; 1Th 5:10; 1Ti 2:6; Tit 2:14; Heb 2:9-10,17; 9:12-14,26-28; 10:10-18; 13:12; 1Pe 1:18-19; 2:24; 3:18; 1Jo 1:7; 2:2; 3:5; 4:10; Rev 1:5; 5:9]

3. The perfect righteousness that Jesus Christ established is imputed to every one of God’s people in time. Because of this imputed righteousness, they are declared blameless before God and reconciled to God. Christ’s

righteousness imputed demands God's favor and fellowship toward them. [Job 29:14; Psa 32:2; 85:10-11; Isa 53:11; 61:10; Jer 23:5-6; Rom 3:21-22; 4:6-8; 5:9-11,17-19; 8:1,31-39; 1Co 1:30; 2Co 5:18-21; Eph 5:25-27; Col 1:21-22; Tit 3:6-7]" (CCF).

In *The History and Theology of Calvinism*, on the subject of the "Active Obedience of Christ" (p. 356), Curt Daniel names Johannes Piscator as a major proponent of the view that Christ only merited salvation by His death ("passive obedience"), but not by His life ("active obedience"). Boettner was referring to Arminians who deny that Christ's preceptive righteousness is imputed when he spoke of being "*raised up to the zero point*"; but there are some Calvinists (e.g., A.C. Clifford, Johannes Piscator) who are in basic agreement with the Arminians [1] (surprise, surprise) on this point.

The important question for the aforementioned Arminians and Calvinists is this: If only the "*penal half*" (cf. Galatians 3:10) of Christ's righteousness is established on behalf of and imputed to the believer, and NOT the "*preceptive half*" (cf. Romans 10:5; Galatians 3:12), then whose righteousness must be established in order to fill up that which is lacking? Paul's God-breathed words condemn these helpless heretics:

"For being ignorant of the righteousness of God, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, they did not submit to the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of Law for righteousness to everyone that believes. For Moses writes of the righteousness which is of the Law: The man doing these things shall live by them" (Romans 10:3-5).

[1] In his book *Atonement and Justification*, A.C. Clifford notes that Arminius "refused to commit himself on the passive-active obedience debate," citing volume one, page 632 of Arminius' works.

Back to Boettner:

“To doubt that any for whom Christ died will be saved, or that righteousness will eventually triumph, is to doubt the sufficiency of Jesus Christ for the work which He undertook in our behalf. On the cross Jesus declared that He had finished the work of redemption which the Father gave Him to do. But as Toplady remarks,

‘the person with power to accept or reject as he pleases must say: ‘No, thou didst not finish the work of redemption which was given thee to do; thou didst indeed a part of it, but I myself must add something to it or the whole of thy performance will stand for naught.’

Only those views which ascribe to God all the power in the salvation of sinners are consistently evangelical, for the word ‘evangelical’ means that it is God alone who saves” (p. 173).

The Toplady quote is a super swelling statement stripped of spine. For Toplady to prove that he has a real spine — and not just the *mere semblance* of one — he would have to actually apply Romans 10:1-4 to those persons who are (seemingly) being lambasted for adding to the work of Christ. But alas:

“Whether John Goodwin went to heaven or not (which is a question too high for sublunary decision), certain it is as I have already observed, that not one inhabitant of the celestial city ever carried a single particle of Arminianism with him into the gates of that Jerusalem. Of every Arminian now living, whose name is in the book of life, it may be truly said, that if grace do not go so far as to make him a Calvinist on earth, glory [i.e. grace made perfect] will certainly stamp him a Calvinist, in the kingdom of God, at farthest” (Works of Toplady, p. 361).

Augustus Toplady believed that those who perish believing a false gospel (cf. Galatians 1:8-9) will finally believe the true gospel in heaven. I am not equating true Christianity with Calvinism like Toplady appears to be doing, since genuine historical Calvinism is a false gospel of salvation conditioned on the sinner, and many Calvinists like Augustus Toplady spoke spiritual peace to the haters of God when there was no peace (cf. Jeremiah 6:14, 8:11; 2 John 9-11).

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

GROTESQUE MONSTROSITY

In Boettner's chapter on "*Efficacious Grace*" we encounter the grotesque subtitle, "*Common Grace*":

"Apart from this special grace which issues in the salvation of its objects, there is what we may call 'common grace,' or general influences of the Holy Spirit which to a greater or lesser degree are shared by all men. God causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain upon the just and the unjust" (pp. 178-179).

Why does Boettner enclose the phrase "*common grace*" in quotes? Is it because he is suppressing the knowledge of the truth that those "*who hold to 'common grace' must either believe that God shows grace at the expense of His justice, or that Jesus Christ's death in some way merited grace for everyone without exception*"?

Contrary to the lie Boettner writes above, Scripture denies that an unregenerate person can be under the conviction of the Holy Spirit or receive "*general influences,*" since the Holy Spirit only leads people to Jesus Christ and His righteousness as the sole ground of salvation:

"And when the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from the Father, that One will witness concerning Me" (John 15:26).

"But when that One comes, the Spirit of Truth, He will guide you into all Truth, for He will not speak from Himself, but whatever He hears, He will

speak; and He will announce the coming things to you. That One will glorify Me, for He will receive from Mine and will announce to you” (John 16:13-14).

“If you are reviled in [the] name of Christ, [you are] blessed, because the Spirit of God and of glory rests on you. Truly, according to them, He is blasphemed; but according to you, He is glorified” (1 Peter 4:14).

[For further expounding on what true Holy Spirit conviction entails see the article, “Holy Spirit Conviction.”]

Boettner alludes to Matthew 5:43-45, which is a text *commonly* perverted by Calvinists in an attempt to “prove” that rain and sunshine are expressions of God’s “common grace” or “benevolence” toward the non-elect (i.e., the reprobate wicked):

“You have heard that it was said, You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy; but I say to you, Love your enemies; bless those cursing you, do well to those hating you; and pray for those abusing and persecuting you, so that you may become sons of your Father in Heaven. Because He causes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and unjust” (Matthew 5:43-45).

Boettner believes this text reveals God’s “common grace” in causing the sun to shine and in sending rain on the evil and the good, the just and the unjust. But this is to commit *eisegesis* with a vengeance; this is to wrest the Scripture to one’s own destruction by reading into the text what is not there (cf. 2 Peter 3:15-17).

Let’s take a look at Matthew 5:43-45.

Matthew 5:43: "You have heard that it was said, You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy;"

Leviticus 19:18 teaches that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves. Psalm 139:22 teaches that we are to hate the wicked (our enemy) with perfect hatred.

Matthew 5:44: "but I say to you, love your enemies; bless those cursing you, do well to those hating you; and pray for those abusing and persecuting you,"

Psalm 139:20-22 teaches that God's enemies are our enemies — we hate those hating Him; we loathe those rising up against Him. Is this paradox? In no wise. May it never be. It is talking about two senses — two different considerations or relations. We LOVE those whom we count as ENEMIES. We LOVE them when we do well to them and pray for them. We HATE them when we count them as the enemies of God and, by extension, our enemies.

Matthew 5:45: "so that you may become sons of your Father in Heaven. Because He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and unjust."

Of primary importance is the interpretation of this passage in the true light of the gospel of Jesus Christ (Romans 1:16-17), rather than in the false light of the "gospel" of unregenerate man (Galatians 1:8-9).

In Matthew 5:43-45 Jesus commands us to love our enemies, NOT in the context of the universal benevolence of God, BUT in the context of the universal indiscriminateness of God in sending rain and sunshine on the just and the unjust. We are to be as indiscriminate in our well doing to the just and the unjust alike — although there is a preference to the household of faith (Galatians 6:10) — as God is indiscriminate in sending rain on the

just and the unjust. And so I think that the passage teaches that we are to show an indiscriminate general benevolence to our enemies in the way God shows an indiscriminate choice in His sending of sunshine and rain. We are to love the just and the unjust in the manner that God sends rain. In light of the gospel and the many passages that show God's hatred for the wicked reprobate (non-elect), Jesus is NOT teaching us that God demonstrates His love by sending rain, but that we are to demonstrate our love in a similar manner that God is sending the rain — and that is, indiscriminately.

Matthew 5:43-45 is cavalierly treated by those who read a general benevolence or favor in God toward the reprobate. Their impetuosity is on full display when they basically say,

“We express indiscriminate LOVE when we do well to them and pray for our enemies because God expresses indiscriminate LOVE when He sends sunshine and rain upon His enemies.”

This figment blatantly contradicts what God's intention and purpose is in everything that happens in the non-elects' lives, which is to demonstrate NOT His “general benevolence,” “common grace,” or “indiscriminate love” but His power and wrath in hardening them for destruction (cf. Romans 9). Taking Romans 9 and Matthew 5:43-45 together, we see the correct exemplary model:

Since God does not provide rain and sunshine (and other necessities of life) for the vessels of mercy ONLY, BUT ALSO provides these things for the vessels of wrath, we are not to love our spiritual brethren ONLY, BUT ALSO to love our spiritual enemies. God does not withhold rain so we should not withhold prayer. We are to pray for our brothers and sisters in Christ, AND also for our enemies *because* God sends rain and sunshine to those whom He loves, AND to those whom He hates.

God knows (while we do not know) which of our unregenerate enemies is among the elect and which one is among the non-elect. In time, God will regenerate and save all His elect, but He will actively harden and destroy all the non-elect — the indiscriminate provision of things like rain and sunshine, being an intended means of the non-elects' destruction.

“And according as you desire that men should do to you, you also do the same to them. And if you love those who love you, what thanks is there to you? For even sinners love those who love them. And if you do good to those who do good to you, what thanks is there to you? For even the sinners do the same. And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what thanks is there to you? For the sinners lend to sinners so that they may receive the equal things. But love the ones hostile to you, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing in return; and your reward will be much; and you will be sons of the Most High, for He is kind to the unthankful and evil ones. Therefore, be merciful, even as your Father also is merciful” (Luke 6:31-36).

Where does God display His mercy and kindness to the unthankful and evil ones? Not in the falling rain or in the shining sun, but in the propitiating cross:

“... but God commends His love to us in this, that we being yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Romans 5:8).

“But God, being rich in mercy, because of His great love with which He loved us, even we being dead in deviations, He made us alive together with Christ (by grace you are being saved), and raised us up together and seated us together in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus, that He might

demonstrate in the ages coming on, the exceeding great riches of His grace in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus” (Ephesians 2:4-7).

“In this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be a propitiation relating to our sins” (1 John 4:10).

The entirety of Romans 9 is an awesome description of the kindness of God shown toward the elect vessels of mercy, and the just and holy severity of God shown toward the non-elect vessels of wrath fitted out for destruction. The indiscriminate provision of rain is one of the many means God uses to display His power and demonstrate His wrath in His fitting out and hardening of the non-elect for destruction.

For the regenerate vessels of mercy, EVERYTHING that happens to them is worked out by God for good (Romans 8:28). They have been eternally blessed in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus (Ephesians 1:3). If they contract any of the various forms of cancer, *they are blessed*. In every trial, tribulation, sickness, and malady, *they are blessed*. If they are, perhaps, one of the minority with robust health, *they are blessed*. Believers are blessed in the “pitter-patter” rains, and they are blessed in the torrential rains that destroys their property and even their lives.

As for the unregenerate non-elect, they are cursed in EVERYTHING that befalls them, since they had not a Substitute and Representative to bear the curse on their behalf.

For us who are believers, our focus on things like “common grace” and God’s unmitigated hatred for the non-elect is NOT some sort of inordinate and morbid fascination, but of extreme essential gospel importance that we may truly know “the riches of His glory” (Romans 9:23). God desires to make known to His elect vessels that grace is found *exclusively* in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ, and that it is Christ’s work ALONE that

makes the vessels prepared for glory to differ from the vessels prepared for destruction (Romans 9:22-23).

“There is a vanity which is done on the earth: There are just ones to whom it happens according to the work of the wicked; and there are wicked men to whom it happens according to the work of the righteous. I said that this also is vanity” (Ecclesiastes 8:14).

“For all this I gave to heart, even to explain all this, that the righteous and the wise and their works are in the hand of God. Whether love or hatred, man does not know all that is before them. All happens alike to all; one event to the righteous, and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him who sacrifices, and to him who does not sacrifice. As is the good, so is the sinner; he who swears is as he that fears an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event to all” (Ecclesiastes 9:1-3).

“And my God will fill your every need according to His riches in glory in Christ Jesus” (Philippians 4:19).

“Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or danger, or sword? Even as it has been written, For Your sake we are killed all the day; we are counted as sheep of slaughter. But in all these things we more than conquer through Him loving us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor rulers, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord” (Romans 8:35-39).

God will fill or supply; our every need. But who ultimately decides what we need? Do we “need” famine, danger, or sword? Did John the Baptist “need” that beheading he received? It depends on how you define “need.” As far as Philippians 4:19 is concerned, it played a needful part in sending John to be with Christ, which is far better:

“... according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but as always in all boldness even now Christ will be magnified in my body, whether through life or through death. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this to me is fruit of my labor, and what I shall choose I do not know. For I am pressed together by the two: having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better” (Philippians 1:20-23).

John the Baptist was not ashamed; he magnified Christ in his body. Whether through life or through death, whether in rest or in tribulations, whether in cancer remitted or in cancer rebounded, may we continue to proclaim: To live is Christ, and to die is gain!

[It appears “easy enough” to admonish and encourage when one is not (at least not presently) experiencing any major trial, sickness, etc. And oh, how aware I am of that fact and I’m nearly brought to tears contemplating the sufferings of others as I admonish them with Scriptures like Philippians 1:20-23. Nevertheless, let us be bold and courageous in defending the honor of our King. Clearly He is more than capable of defending His own honor but this is a gracious privilege. Let us always remember and meditate upon the love of Christ and that to depart and be with Christ is far better.]

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

GRANDILOQUENT DOXOLOGY

Continuing unabated, is Boettner's grandiloquent doxology to the idol of "common grace":

"Among the most common blessings which are to be traced to this source [this "source" is "common grace" — CD] we may name health, material prosperity, general intelligence, talents for art, music, oratory, literature, architecture, commerce, inventions, etc. In many instances the non-elect receive these blessings in greater abundance than do the elect, for we often find that the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light" (p. 179).

Presumably, Boettner at least pays lip service to verses like John 3:36, Galatians 3:10, and Deuteronomy 28:14-68. Regarding the Deuteronomy passage: I only note the similar point of being "cursed." The cursed ones are void of a righteousness that equals God's righteousness revealed in the gospel of Jesus Christ. To be void of this aforesaid righteousness is to be void of a righteousness that answers the demands of God's law and justice. The aforementioned cursed ones are cursed whether their belly is empty or whether it is full, whether they are plagued like other men, or not so plagued:

"It shall happen at the filling of his belly, He shall cast on him the fury of His wrath, and He shall rain on him while he is eating" (Job 20:23).

"For I was jealous of the proud; I looked upon the peace of the wicked. For there are no pangs to their death; but their body is fat. They are not in the

misery of mortal man; and with men they are not touched. So pride enchains them; violence covers them like a robe. Their eyes go out with fatness; they have passed the imaginations of the heart. They scoff and speak in evil; from on high they speak oppression. They set their mouth in the heavens; and their tongues walk through the earth... Surely, You will set their feet in slippery places; You will make them fall into ruin. How they are destroyed in a moment, swept away with terrors! Like a dream when being aroused from dreaming, O Lord, in awaking You will despise their image... For, lo, those who are far from You shall be lost; You have cut off all who go whoring away from You. As for me, it is good for me to draw near to God; I have made my refuge in the Lord Jehovah, to declare all Your works" (Psalm 73:3-9, 18-20, 27-28).

Why does Boettner (and most who call themselves "Reformed" or "Calvinist") say that all these things are "common blessings" or "common grace"? I would surmise that they would say that since the unregenerate (elect and non-elect) do NOT deserve to have things like fruitful seasons, talents for music, material prosperity, etc., then it MUST be "grace" (in some sense or other). But who decides whether or not a person "deserves" something? What does any given person mean by the word "deserve"? If I say that Pharaoh (non-elect) in Romans 9 deserved power and prosperity at God's hand, what do I mean?

The advocates of "common grace" presume that God does not intend (at least not initially) to harden the non-elect with these providential provisions (NOT providential "blessings"). They are trying to find a so-called type of "grace" in things, rather than solely and exclusively in the work of Jesus Christ.

The non-elect DO deserve what Boettner erroneously calls "blessings" because God's desire and intention is to set them in slippery places and cast them down to destruction by means of all these providential provisions (cf. Psalm 73:18). All this is related to the unbiblical Calvinistic presumption

that Adam and Eve deserved to be struck down dead physically the moment they rebelled, or that Pharaoh (and every sinful son of Adam) deserved to be struck down by God the very moment of conception. And since God doesn't do this, they reason, then it HAS to be grace. A nefarious *non sequitur* of course. It doesn't HAVE to be "grace" since God plainly declares in Scripture that it was a demonstration of His power and wrath why a non-elect person such as Pharaoh was allowed to live all those years after infancy.

"Common grace is the source of all the order, refinement, culture, common virtue, etc., which we find in the world, and through it the moral power of the truth upon the heart and conscience is increased and the evil passions of men are restrained. It does not lead to salvation, but it keeps this earth from becoming a hell. It arrests the complete effectuation of sin, just as human insight arrests the fury of wild beasts. It prevents sin from being manifested in all its hideousness, and thus hinders the bursting forth of the flames from the smoking fire" (p. 179).

Earlier Boettner had equated (or at least overlapped) "common grace" with "general influences" of the Holy Spirit. This means Boettner believes that the "common virtue" of those not submitted to the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel, are recipients of the Holy Spirit's supposed "general influences" (cf. Romans 10:1-4). Clearly Boettner was devoid of the Holy Spirit (i.e., unregenerate) when he wrote these words, since he hasn't got a clue that God the Holy Spirit glorifies Jesus Christ in the hearts of His people and He does NOT glorify the sinner's self-righteous "morality" and "virtue" in the hearts of His people.

Regarding Boettner's assertions that due to "common grace," the "*evil passions of men are restrained*" and the earth is kept "*from becoming a hell.*" From these two quotes I see a completely unbiblical view or definition of what is commonly referred to as "total depravity." I suppose a "common grace" advocate would say that BOTH the unregenerate immoral

murderous pervert, and the unregenerate outwardly moral religious person are “totally depraved.” BUT it appears that these advocates of “common grace” think that it MUST TAKE some kind of “grace” to be outwardly moral and zealous in religious matters — otherwise, why would they say that apart from “common grace” the men’s evil passions are completely unrestrained and this world becomes a hell? Given their own asinine reasoning, this world would become a “hell” and yet would still require a smidgen of so-called “common grace” to keep these evil brutes alive, as they unleashed their hellish fury upon the earth. Ridiculous.

An excerpt from The Christian Confession of Faith (CCF) on the doctrine of “total depravity”:

“The truth of total depravity does not mean that all men are as outwardly immoral as they possibly could be. It means that every faculty of the soul of every natural (that is, unregenerate) descendant of Adam is completely polluted with hatred of the true and living God, and all of the natural man’s thoughts, words, and deeds (even his kindness, morality, and religion) are dead works, evil deeds, and fruit unto death. It means that every natural descendant of Adam owes a debt to God’s law and justice that he cannot pay” (CCF).

I believe I’ve waxed verbose enough on this topic of “common grace” (and the advocates thereof). For a much better and more concise explication of “common grace” and how it denies such doctrines as total depravity, please see Marc’s article, “Common Grace?”

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

PORTRAIT OF PRESERVATION

We now come to the XIV chapter of Boettner's book: *The Perseverance Of The Saints*. Boettner writes:

"The doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints is stated in the Westminster Confession in the following words:

'They whom God hath accepted in His Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by His Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved' [Chapter XVII, Section 1.]

Or in other words we believe that those who once become true Christians cannot totally fall away and be lost — that while they may fall into sin temporarily, they will eventually return and be saved.

This doctrine does not stand alone but is a necessary part of the Calvinistic system of theology. The doctrines of Election and Efficacious Grace logically imply the certain salvation of those who receive these blessings. If God has chosen men absolutely and unconditionally to eternal life, and if His Spirit effectively applies to them the benefits of redemption, the inescapable conclusion is that these persons shall be saved. And, historically, this doctrine has been held by all Calvinists, and denied by practically all Arminians" (p. 182).

The biblical doctrine of the perseverance of the saints has also been called the preservation of the saints since God is the One preserving them and causing them to persevere in faith:

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, He according to His great mercy having regenerated us to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and unfading, having been kept in Heaven for you the ones in the power of God being guarded through faith to a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time; in which you exult; yet a little while, if need be, grieving in manifold trials, so that the proving of your faith, much more precious than perishing gold, but having been proved through fire, may be found to praise and honor and glory at the revelation of Jesus Christ; whom having not seen, you love; in whom not yet seeing, but believing, you exult with joy unspeakable and being glorified, obtaining the end of your faith, the salvation of your souls” (1 Peter 1:3-9).

The Calvinist doctrine of “perseverance of the saints” MUST be differentiated and distinguished from the biblical doctrine of the same name. For the common fashionable Calvinist teaching is NOT a perseverance in true biblical faith that believes Jesus Christ met ALL of the conditions for salvation, but rather, a perseverance in unbelief regarding Christ’s exclusive role as Savior. One strikingly conspicuous instance of this persistent unbelief is the Calvinists’ stubborn adherence to the demonic doctrine of salvation conditioned on the sinner’s “spiritually-enabled” efforts:

“Admitting, however, that the Augustinian doctrine that Christ died specially for his own people does account for the general offer of the gospel, how can it be reconciled with those passages which, in one form or another, teach that He died for all men? In answer to this question, it may be remarked in the first place that Augustinians do not deny that Christ died for all men. What they deny is that He died equally, and with the same design,

for all men. He died for all, that He might arrest the immediate execution of the penalty of the law upon the whole of our apostate race; that He might secure for men the innumerable blessings attending their state on earth, which, in one important sense, is a state of probation; and that He might lay the foundation for the offer of pardon and reconciliation with God, on condition of faith and repentance. ... There is another class of passages with which it is said that the Augustinian doctrine cannot be reconciled; such, namely, as speak of those perishing for whom Christ died. In reference to these passages it may be remarked, first, that there is a sense, as before stated, in which Christ did die for all men. His death had the effect of justifying the offer of salvation to every man; and of course was designed to have that effect” (Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. 2, pp. 558, 560).

Paraphrasing the WCF, Boettner had said:

“Or in other words we believe that those who once become true Christians cannot totally fall away and be lost — that while they may fall into sin temporarily, they will eventually return and be saved” (p. 182).

The Bible clearly shows that true (regenerate) Christians can “fall away” to some degree, or “fall into” certain (even heinous) sins (e.g., David’s treatment of Bathsheba and Uriah). And the Bible just as clearly shows that it is impossible for a true Christian to sin certain sins, because there are certain sins that expose a person’s lostness. Examples of this:

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of saying there is no God (Psalm 14:1).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of praying to a god that cannot save (Isaiah 45:20).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of bringing forth corrupt fruit (Matthew 7:18).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of denying Christ before men (Matthew 10:33).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of following a stranger (John 10:5).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of being ignorant of God's righteousness (Romans 10:3).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of being unsubmitted to the righteousness of God (Romans 10:3).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of preaching a false gospel (Galatians 1:8-9).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of denying that Jesus is the Christ (1 John 2:22).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of denying the Son (1 John 2:23).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of abiding not in the doctrine of Christ (2 John 9).

Regenerate persons cannot sin the sin of speaking peace to one who brings a false gospel (2 John 11).

All of the above verses are DENIED by the typical (and don't forget the all-important, "fashionable") Calvinist. Your typical fashionable Calvinist believes that he himself is regenerate, while saying there is no such God that causes the non-elect to sin in order that He may justly punish them (cf. Psalm 14:1); he denies that such a God as this (the God of Scripture) exists. MANY of these Calvinists will NOT even say that those who worship the "god" of Open Theism are lost. They WILL say that the Open Theist "god" who struggles with his creation and is ignorant of the future is NOT the God of Isaiah (cf. Isaiah chapters 40-48), BUT, nevertheless, those who worship this "god" are their extremely muddled brothers who are blinded by their philosophical constructs and theological traditions. A salient case in point is Bruce A. Ware's preface in his book written, NOT against the flesh-and-blood "ISTS," but only against the bare-boned, "ISMS." Here's Ware:

"Readers will find this book unkind to open theism. I hope that in no respect and in no place is it unkind to open theists. It is the views of this movement and its advocates that I oppose, not the individuals who advocate them. Some people do not make this distinction, and when they do not, the church is harmed. If, for the sake of warm and affirming personal relations with brothers and sisters in Christ, we tolerate views that are contrary to Scripture and detrimental to the health of the church, we show great disregard and lack of love for the broader membership of the church and we become, by our passivity, negligence, and/or lack of courage, complicit

in the advocacy of these errant teachings” (God’s Lesser Glory: The diminished God of Open Theism, Bruce A. Ware).

The irony is that Ware IS COMPLICIT in speaking peace when there is no peace to haters of the true and living God who erect ignorant idols to worship (cf. 2 John 9-11). Yet another example of the Calvinist doctrine of “perseverance of the saints,” which teaches that many of the so-called “saints” persevere in speaking peace when there is no peace, just like the false prophets did in Jeremiah’s and Ezekiel’s day (Ezekiel 13: 9-15; Jeremiah 6:13-15, 23:17).

CHAPTER THIRTY

ANGEL OF LIGHT

Here's a quote from the subtitle, *"An outward profession of righteousness not always a proof that the person is a true Christian"*:

"Since Satan can so alter his appearance that he is mistaken for an angel of light (II Cor. 11:14), it is no marvel that sometimes his ministers also fashion themselves as doers of righteousness, with the most deceptive appearances of holiness, devotion, piety and zeal" (p. 190).

But is it really *"no marvel"* that Boettner and the popular Calvinists of the present day cannot name EVEN ONE of Satan's ministers who attempt to *"fashion themselves as doers of righteousness, with the most deceptive appearance of holiness, devotion, piety and zeal"*? Can ANY professing Calvinist or Reformed person name ONE professing Christian who is an unregenerate minister of Satan, masquerading as a true minister of righteousness? If they cannot name even ONE such "minister," then does that relegate 2 Corinthians 11:14 to the dustbin of irrelevance?

If tolerant Calvinists CAN name "EVEN ONE," then EXACTLY WHAT did these professors of righteousness and orthodoxy confess that breached the apparently orthodox wrapping, thus exposing the heterodox contents of the parcel?

Could this Satanic breach in the superficially-orthodox wrapping ever be called a "felicitous" or "blessed inconsistency"? If said "breach" cannot honestly be called a "happy inconsistency," then is this unorthodox breach that exposes the true contents of the parcel akin to not abiding in the doctrine of Christ, per 2 John 9? If it IS akin to 2 John 9, then are these

Calvinists guilty of what they falsely accuse us of, namely, of advocating some form of “doctrinal perfectionism”?

“Certainly an outward profession is not always a guarantee that the soul is saved. Like the Pharisees of old, they may only desire to ‘make a fair show in the flesh,’ and deceive many. Jesus warned His disciples, ‘there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect,’ Matt. 24:24; and He quoted the prophet Isaiah to the effect that, ‘This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men,’ Mark 7:6, 7. Paul warned against those who were ‘false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ,’ II Cor. 11:13” (p. 190).

In reading this Boettner quote, I am reminded of how responsible *The Westminster Confession of Faith* is for blanketing much of the theological landscape in the darkness of ignorance, and how those individuals, churches, and denominations who applaud and adhere to it, have been enveloped by a pernicious python. And yet, even in the grimmest and darkest of times, God has always preserved His gospel by reserving for Himself a remnant according to the election of grace who will never bow the knee to Baal (Romans 11:5-6).

The framers of the WCF (along with those who profess adherence to its heretical contents) have bowed the knee to Baal. They are those who desire to make a fair show in the flesh. They are those who honor God with their mouths, but their darkened hearts are far from Him. The true gospel is NOT taught and embraced in the “churches” that consider the WCF a bastion of orthodoxy.

The Westminster Confession of Faith denies that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone believing (Romans 1:16) by making exceptions for elect persons who are (allegedly) “incapable of being

outwardly called by the ministry of the Word” (X. 3). Making exceptions to the Mark 16:16 and Romans 1:16 rule is only ONE example — there are MANY more:

[The Wicked Westminster Confession](#)

More from Boettner:

“And to the Romans he wrote, ‘They are not all Israel, that are of Israel: neither, because they are Abraham’s seed are they all children,’ Rom. 9:6, 7. John mentions those who ‘call themselves apostles, and they are not,’ Rev. 2:2; and a little later he adds, ‘I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead,’ Rev. 3:1” (p. 190).

I think the following verse is relevant for Christians today:

“I know your works, and the affliction, and the poverty; but you are rich. And I know the evil speaking of those saying themselves to be Jews, and they are not, but are a synagogue of Satan” (Revelation 2:9).

Lorraine Boettner, the framers of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and those similarly-minded with them, say that they are Jews, and they are not, but are a synagogue of Satan.

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

BEATIFICATION OF THE HUMAN WILL

Boettner now presents the various objections that are commonly urged against the Reformed doctrine of predestination. In chapter XV he presents the first objection, that it is fatalism:

“Much misunderstanding arises through confusing the Christian Doctrine of Predestination with the heathen doctrine of Fatalism. There is, in reality, only one point of agreement between the two, which is, that both assume the absolute certainty of all future events” (p. 205).

As we have seen in MANY previous posts, there is a WORLD of difference between the “Christian Doctrine of Predestination” and the “Reformed Doctrine of Predestination.” One difference (among many) being the difference between a partially sovereign idol making future events certain by “letting go” of his sovereignty, and the True and Living God of the Bible making future events certain by actively causing and controlling His creatures.

In the “Reformed Doctrine of Predestination,” the Calvinistic idol “*efficaciously permits*” the sinful creature to make the future event certain. In this idolatrous scheme, it is clearly the creature and NOT the “creator” who is making the future event certain.

In the “Christian Doctrine of Predestination,” the True and Living God actively causes (not “permits”) the creature to perform specific acts (including specific acts of sin), thus making the future event certain.

Here is how one person objected several years ago to my explanation of, NOT the “Reformed Doctrine of Predestination,” BUT RATHER the “Christian Doctrine of Predestination” (this was in the context of preaching the gospel to her):

“What is the point of living if I am already predestined one way or the other?”

This person may not even know what “fatalism” is, but she was confusing the Biblical doctrine of predestination with it. By “*one way or the other?*” she was speaking of being predestined to heaven or to hell. Her objection implies that the END — whether that “end” be heaven or hell — will be effected regardless of the MEANS, so that no matter what she does, the same outcome will result.

Evidently, in her muddled mind, nothing (no effort on her part) matters since everything is predetermined by God anyway. So why do anything? Or, to repeat her objection:

“What is the point of living if I am already predestined one way or the other?”

Again, her objection implies that God predestines things in such a way that the same outcome (heaven or hell in this case) will result “no matter what she does,” or regardless of means. In Biblical predestination, it “matters” whether or not she believes the gospel, since the relationship between her believing and going to heaven and her not believing and going to hell, has been immutably predetermined by God. And of course, whether she believes or not, is also predetermined and actively controlled by God.

If Christ died for her, God will cause her to believe the gospel before she dies, and if Christ did not die for her, God will cause her to remain in disbelief of the gospel till her dying breath. The “*point*” of her living (as all

the sinful sons and daughters of Adam) is to glorify God “*one way or the other.*” Romans 9 speaks quite clearly to that in the case of Jacob and Esau, and in Moses and Pharaoh. The “*point*” of living for the vessels of mercy and for the vessels of wrath is that they may glorify God — “*one way or the other.*”

Back to Boettner’s beatification of Calvinism’s stout idol of free will that challenges the Lord by telling Him that He will NOT actively cause His creatures to sin, since He could not find fault with them if He did that (cf. Romans 9:18-19):

“According to the doctrine of Predestination the freedom and responsibility of man are fully preserved. In the midst of certainty God has ordained human liberty” (pp. 205-206).

According to the “Reformed Doctrine of Predestination,” the freedom of their “creator” (i.e., idol) is NOT preserved since it’s been taken away and given to the creature, in order that the creature may (supposedly) be responsible for his acts of sin. To adapt Boettner’s comments with those of the wicked Westminster Confession of Faith:

“According to the ‘Reformed Doctrine of Predestination’ violence is offered to the free will of the ‘creator’ and a portion of his sovereign liberty has been snatched away and given to the ‘creature’ in order that his ‘god-like responsibility’ may be established.”

But if these idolaters were being truly consistent with themselves, this kind of freedom would preclude their responsibility to God entirely. If they were truly free in the way they wish to be — that is, free from God’s sovereign and active control — then they would NOT be “responsible,” for they would be God!

“Freedom” or “free” is a relative term — we are “free” relative to something. But are we free relative to God our Maker? The Bible answers an unequivocal “NO,” while Boettner and most Calvinists answer an audacious “YES.”

These tumultuous teapots have taken it upon themselves to fight with the Potter because He made them “like this” (Romans 9:20). They desire to have a “hands off god” or a “god with no hands,” rather than the Biblical God whose hands raise up certain people in order that He might display His power and wrath in them by unconditionally and actively hardening them and causing them to sin that He may justly punish them.

“So, then, to whom He desires, He shows mercy. And to whom He desires, He hardens. You will then say to me, Why does He yet find fault? For who has resisted His will? Yes, rather, O man, who are you answering against God? Shall the thing formed say to the One forming it, Why did You make me like this? Or does not the potter have authority over the clay, out of the one lump to make one vessel to honor, and one to dishonor? But if God, desiring to demonstrate His wrath, and to make His power known, endured in much long-suffering vessels of wrath having been fitted out for destruction, and that He make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy which He before prepared for glory, whom He also called, not only us, of Jews, but also out of nations” (Romans 9:18-24).

“Woe to him who fights with the One who formed him! A potsherd among the potsherds of the earth! Shall the clay say to its former, What are you making? Or does your work say, He has no hands?” (Isaiah 45:9)

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

RESPONSIBLE BECAUSE NOT FREE

The next objection Boettner mentions against the Reformed doctrine of predestination is found in chapter XVI. The objection is this:

“That it is inconsistent with the free agency and moral responsibility of man” (p. 208).

In the Biblical doctrine of predestination, man has *absolutely no free agency relative to His Maker*. NONE. Man’s moral responsibility before God has NOTHING to do with whether he is “free” or not, but whether or not his Maker has determined to judge him for his sin. The clear Biblical teaching is that God actively causes the reprobate (non-elect) to hate His glory, persecute His people, and oppose His gospel, that He may justly punish them. Thus, man is NOT accountable to God because he IS FREE, but because he IS NOT FREE. If man WAS FREE, then he would NOT be accountable.

The basis for man’s accountability is God’s sovereignty — God is the sovereign Judge who justly holds men responsible for the sins He unconditionally and actively causes them to commit.

“You will then say to me, Why does He yet find fault? For who has resisted His will?” (Romans 9:19)

The typical Calvinist bases his accountability or culpability for his sin on whether or not he is “*partially sovereign*.” In fashionable Calvinism man is sovereign in his acts of sin (before and after regeneration), and his “god” is sovereign in the initial regenerating act and the fruits thereof. In this

scheme, “the man” is “partially sovereign” and “the god” is also “partially sovereign” — so, I guess in that sense the Reformed doctrine of predestination IS consistent with the Reformed doctrine of “*the free agency and moral responsibility of man,*” due to the so-called “creature” and so-called “creator” each possessing their own share of “sovereignty” (with the creature possessing THE LION’S SHARE insofar as the pervasiveness of sin in the world is concerned).

“It is, of course, admitted by all that a person’s acts must be without compulsion and in accordance with his own desires and inclinations, or he cannot be held responsible for them” (p. 208).

Really, Boettner? Is this ALL that’s on your list of requirements God has to meet in order to be considered just and righteous in your sight? Of course, it ISN’T since the Pharaoh in Romans 9 and the King in Isaiah 10, are NOT being compelled to sin by a less-than-omnipotent-god; rather, they are being ACTIVELY CAUSED TO SIN by an omnipotent God who desires to display His power and wrath in them.

Just as the woodsman actively and efficiently swings the axe, so God actively and efficiently swings the Pharaoh and the King. Both men acted according to their own desires and inclinations because God was actively controlling their desires and inclinations. What was that objection again?

“You will then say to me, Why does He yet find fault? For who has resisted His will?” (Romans 9:19)

Yep. That is correct, sir. That’s the age-old objection offered by those ocular degenerates who count the Potter as the clay, and who blur the distinction between the creature and the Creator (see Isaiah 29:16 and Romans 9:20-21).

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

IN LEAGUE WITH THE ASSYRIAN KING

Boettner writes:

“The true solution of this difficult question respecting the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man, is not to be found in the denial of either, but rather in such a reconciliation as gives full weight to each, yet which assigns a preeminence to the divine sovereignty corresponding to the infinite exaltation of the Creator above the sinful creature” (p. 208).

Ironically, Boettner DENIES the sovereignty of God by AFFIRMING the “freedom of man.” Let’s take a look at the following passage of Scripture to see the “*full weight*” of mans’ supposed “freedom.” Let us take to the Scripture to see if there be any truth to this alleged “*full weight of reconciliation*”:

“Woe to Assyria, the rod of My anger! And My fury is the staff in their hand. I will send him against an ungodly nation, and against the people of My wrath. I will command him to plunder, and to strip off spoil, and to trample them like the mud of the streets. Yet he does not purpose this, nor does his heart think so. For it is in his heart to destroy, and to cut off not a few nations. For he says, Are not my commanders all like kings? Is not Calno like Carchemish? Is Hamath not like Arpad? Is Samaria not like Damascus? As my hand has found the kingdoms of the idols (for their carved images excelled Jerusalem’s and Samaria’s); shall I not do to Jerusalem and her idols as I have done to Samaria and her idols? And it will be, when the Lord has broken off all His work on Mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will visit on the fruit of the proud heart of the king of Assyria, and on the glory of his lofty eyes. For he says, I have worked by the

strength of my hand and by my wisdom; for I am wise. And I take away the borders of peoples, and have robbed their treasures. And like a mighty one, I put down ones living in it. And my hand has found the riches of the people. Like a nest, I also have gathered all the earth, as forsaken eggs are gathered. And there was not one moving a wing, or opening a mouth, or one chirping. Shall the axe glorify itself over him chopping with it? Or shall the saw magnify itself over him moving it? As if a rod could wave those who lift it. As if a staff could raise what is not wood!" (Isaiah 10:5-15).

Isaiah 10:5-15 remarkably distinguishes the True and Living God from all idols. Specifically, this passage draws a sharp line of distinction between the God of the Bible who actively controls man — thus no presumed “*freedom of man*” — and the “god” of fashionable Calvinism, who passively “*leaves man to his own sinful devices.*” For Isaiah 10:5-15 to agree with such popular Calvinist notions as a “permission of sin” and a “passive decree,” the axe would have to be “efficaciously permitted” to swing all by itself. Boettner and his cadre of Calvinists are in league with the king of Assyria with their proud hearts and their lofty eyes, who magnify themselves over the One moving them (Isaiah 10:15).

Isaiah 10:15 clearly teaches that God IS sovereign, and man is NOT free. The idolaters object by saying that man is not an automaton, and is greater than an axe that is swung or a piece of clay that is molded (cf. Romans 9:20-21). It’s interesting how I’ve never heard them say that God is greater than a woodsman, or is greater than a potter.

Now, obviously, figures of speech are LESS THAN what they represent, NOT GREATER. And therefore man is GREATER THAN an axe and God is GREATER THAN a woodsman. But the analogy or figure of speech is to be taken as a whole, and in doing so we see a woodsman swinging (God) an axe (man). And thus God has GREATER control over man than a woodsman has over an axe. The reality of God’s sovereign control IS STRONGER than the figure, NOT WEAKER. Contrary to the view of most

Calvinists, Isaiah 10:15 teaches that God is MORE sovereign than the woodsman, not LESS sovereign than the woodsman.

Another thing I find interesting is when some idolaters object that man is not a “*mere automaton*.” And I say of course he isn’t since that would mean man is a spontaneous self-mover! There is much irony in this objection, since the predominant Calvinist position implies that man is functioning as a “partial” or “modified automaton” in his committal of specific sins, since these sins are said to be “*willingly permitted*” by God rather than actively caused by God.

[1] An important distinction must be made here. Most Calvinists would agree that natural man does NOT have the free will to choose good, to choose the true God, and to choose to believe the true gospel. They will even say that God must CAUSE a person to choose good, to choose the true God, and to choose to believe the true gospel. BUT when it comes to natural man’s ability to choose what kind of evil to commit, they will say that natural man DOES have free will and that God does NOT cause a person to sin. So while said Calvinists would strongly DENY that man is “a self-moving automaton” in choosing the good, their doctrine ardently AFFIRMS that man is “a self-moving automaton” in choosing the specific evil he will commit.

Boettner provides us with a nice illustration of how he understands “divine sovereignty and human freedom”:

“While the act remains that of the individual, it is nevertheless due more or less to the predisposing agency and efficacy of divine power exerted in lawful ways. This may be illustrated to a certain extent in the case of a man who wishes to construct a building. He decides on his plan. Then he hires the carpenters, masons, plumbers, etc., to do the work. These men are not forced to do the work. No compulsion of any kind is used. The owner

simply offers the necessary inducements by way of wages, working conditions, and so on, so that the men work freely and gladly. They do in detail just what he plans for them to do. His is the primary and theirs is the secondary will or cause for the construction of the building. We often direct the actions of our fellow men without infringing on their freedom or responsibility. In a similar way and to an infinitely greater degree God can direct our actions” (p. 209).

There you go. Hey Calvinists. What think ye of that illustration? Is it not damnably idolatrous in the extreme? Axes all by themselves are swinging. Saws apart from a sawyer are sawing. Clay pots by themselves are forming. It’s quite the understatement for me to say that Boettner’s illustration puts forth a vaunted view of the creature and a denigrating view of the Creator. Regarding the illustration Boettner had said:

“In a similar way and to an infinitely greater degree God can direct our actions” (p. 209).

So there’s Boettner’s view of *“the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man”* (or something). Behold! The Reformed doctrine of *“the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man”* in all its resplendent glory and marvelous magnificence! Witness the “glory” and “magnificence” of vaunting axes, of self-moving saws, of recalcitrant rods, of sovereign staffs! Hey. Wait a minute. Where’s the *“sovereignty of God”* in all of this autonomous prancing and dancing?

Isaiah with the PERTINENT question:

“Shall the axe glorify itself over him chopping with it?” (Isaiah 10:15)

Boettner giving the POMPOUS answer: *“Yes. It. Shall.”*

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

EXALT THYSELF AS THE EAGLE

Here's Boettner with an especially risible assertion:

"Hence the certainty of an action is consistent with the liberty of the agent in executing it; otherwise God could not foreknow such actions as certain" (p. 211).

Boettner says that God's foreknowledge of an action as certain *must* be consistent (compatible) with "*the liberty of the agent in executing it,*" or else God could have no foreknowledge of it as certain. Please note how Boettner *first insists* on human freedom in performing an action, and then says if it's contradicted by God's foreknowledge, then God's foreknowledge of said action *is impossible* (rather than human freedom *is false*). Since Boettner is unwilling to become an Open Theist, and unwilling to cast away the idol of human liberty, he will just assert by force (not by Scripture) that foreknowledge and human liberty are compatible. But they are clearly NOT compatible since the very basis of God's foreknowing an action is His eternal decree of that action; and His eternal decree of that action is fulfilled in time by His actively controlling and causing that action.

Boettner:

"CERTAINTY IS CONSISTENT WITH FREE AGENCY

Nor does it follow from the absolute certainty of a person's acts that he could not have acted otherwise. He could have acted otherwise if he had chosen to have done so. Oftentimes a man has power and opportunity to

do that which it is absolutely certain he will not do, and to refrain from doing that which it is absolutely certain he will do. That is, no external influence determines his actions. Our acts are in accordance with the decrees, but not necessarily so — we can do otherwise and often should. Judas and his accomplices were left to fulfill their purpose, and they did as their wicked inclinations prompted them. Hence Peter charged them with the crime, but he at the same time declared that they had acted according to the purpose of God,— ‘Him being: delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hands of lawless men did crucify and slay,’ Acts 2:23” (pp. 211-212).

If you'd have thought Boettner's hot-air balloon of buffoonery couldn't possibly lift itself up any higher, you'd be mistaken. How true it is that *“no one is able to serve two lords; for either he will hate the one, and he will love the other; or he will cleave to the one, and he will despise the other”* (cf. Matthew 6:24). Boettner is so captivated with his autonomous reflection in the mirror of presumption, that he makes a hateful mockery of God's eternal purpose to glorify Himself.

“Yea, from this day I am He, and no one delivers from My hand. I will work, and who will reverse it?” (Isaiah 43:13)

According to Boettner, just because God's work (decree) is *“certain”* doesn't mean that a person could not reverse the work (decree) of God by *“act[ing] otherwise.”* This implies that a person such as Pharaoh, Pontius Pilate, or Judas Iscariot could have hopped in Boettner's boisterous balloon and taken a ride up into the Heavens and tore the Almighty from His throne. But this would not be enough. For them to *“act otherwise,”* they must make God cease to exist — of course we know that in reality this could never happen, but it doesn't keep presumptuous delusional fools like Boettner from dreaming that it is a reality:

“The fool has said in his heart, There is no God!” (Psalm 14:1)

Boettner and Calvinists of like-mind say in their hearts, “There is no such God as the Bible teaches. There is no God that sends His Son to graciously and mercifully die for the vessels of mercy while unconditionally and actively causing the reprobate to hate His glory, persecute His people, and oppose His gospel, that He may justly punish them. There is no God, no Creator that *actually controls* that which He creates. There is no such God that has determined to glorify Himself in the hearts of every last one of His people. There is no such God that invincibly shines the knowledge of His redemptive glory in the face of Jesus Christ in the hearts of every single elect person without exception” (cf. 2 Corinthians 4:3-6).

“Though you rise high as the eagle, and though you set your nest between the stars, I will bring you down from there, declares Jehovah” (Obadiah 1:4).

Some Calvinists who believe that the damnable false gospel of universal atonement is the power of God to salvation and who believe that (perfect?) knowledge of the false christ of universal atonement is revealed to “baby Christians” as an immediate and inevitable result of regeneration (contra 2 Corinthians 4:6), ALSO believe that many Biblical texts are irrelevant for today. Obadiah 1:4 might be one of these irrelevant texts, but I will make an application anyway:

Lorraine Boettner with his minions of Calvinists who were before and after him, along with the Arminians and the Open-Theists and even the agnostics and atheists, are heading the charge against the true and living God who has mercy on whom He will and hardens whom He will (Romans 9:18).

On the wings of presumption they soar so high in the sky.

Brazenly exalted to the stars as if they were the Most High.

This King they would not have them to rule.

“This King does not exist!,” cry out these fools.

Suppressing the knowledge of His sovereign redemptive glory all around.

Though they set their nest between the stars, He will bring them down.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE

INSCRUTABLE OPERATION OF SOVEREIGN UNSOVEREIGNTY

More from Boettner:

“GOD CONTROLS THE MINDS OF MEN AND GIVES HIS PEOPLE THE WILL TO COME

God so governs the inward feelings, external environment, habits, desires, motives, etc., of men that they freely do what He purposes. This operation is inscrutable, but none the less real; and the mere fact that in our present state of knowledge we are not able fully to explain how this influence is exerted without destroying the free agency of man, certainly does not prove that it cannot be so exerted. We do have enough knowledge, however, to know that God’s sovereignty and man’s freedom are realities, and that they work together in perfect harmony” (p. 214).

God is SO sovereign that He isn’t sovereign. God SO controls the minds of men that He doesn’t control the minds of men. God SO “governs” that He doesn’t actually govern, but His creatures govern themselves. God SO exerts *“this inscrutable, governing, and controlling influence”* without actually *“destroying the free agency of man”* — and why’s that Boettner? Here, let me spell it out for you: Because according to your scheme God is NOT actually exerting any “controlling influence” at all, you nitwit!

Boettner continues:

“In Isaiah 10:5-15 we have a very remarkable illustration of the way in which divine sovereignty and human freedom work together in perfect harmony” (p. 223).

Besides me, who else needs help picking their jaw from off the floor? *Are you serious Boettner?* That passage illustrates human freedom? I’m flabbergasted. Wow. Of all the passages Boettner could have picked to violently wrest to his own destruction, he picks this one. The *“perfect harmony”* in Isaiah 10:5-15 is the harmony of the woodsman’s swinging arms and the axe’s corresponding motion. There is no harmony and there is no compatibility between the sovereign arms of the woodsman, and the freedom of the axe. Freedom of the axe you say? What freedom? *Exactly.* No freedom whatsoever. And thus, in Isaiah 10:5-15 we have a very remarkable illustration, NOT of how divine sovereignty and (presumed) human freedom work together, but how divine sovereignty, human actions, and human responsibility for their actions, work together.

I could have a little fun with these idolatrous Calvinists and point out that just as the woodsman’s swinging of the axe is compatible with the axe’s swinging, so is God’s actively causing the Assyrian king to sin compatible with the Assyrian king’s sinning (and the Assyrian king is not being coerced!).

CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

AUTHOR OF SIN

We now come to Chapter 17. In this chapter Boettner continues to list the various objections that are leveled against the Reformed Doctrine of Predestination. The next objection put forward, which is also the title of this chapter, is *“That it makes God the author of sin.”* Boettner writes:

“THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

The objection may be raised that if God has foreordained the entire course of events in this world He must be the Author of Sin. To begin with, we readily admit that the existence of sin in a universe which is under the control of a God who is infinite in His wisdom, power, holiness, and justice, is an inscrutable mystery which we in our present state of knowledge cannot fully explain” (p. 228).

Boettner attempts to conceal his implicit calumny of the wisdom, power, holiness, and justice of God with a cloak of faux epistemic humility. Did Boettner just contract a case of selective amnesia regarding the fact that God had an eternal purpose to accomplish in Christ Jesus (Ephesians 3:11)? How is God to go about accomplishing His eternal purpose apart from ordaining and actively causing the fall for His own glory?

“As yet we only see through a glass darkly. Sin can never be explained on the grounds of logic or reason, for it is essentially illogical and unreasonable” (p. 228).

It is true that Boettner’s sin of false humility is “essentially illogical and unreasonable.” But it does not follow that a logical and rational explanation cannot be given for Boettner’s sin. Does Boettner think that God is able to explain sin “on the grounds of logic or reason”? Is Boettner aware that the apostle Paul put forth a logical and rational reason for why God caused sin to enter into His creation? Or is Boettner just suppressing Paul’s God-breathed words by means of pseudo-pious humility and epistemic arrogance?

“And while it is not ours to explain how God in His secret counsel rules and overrules the sinful acts of men, it is ours to know that whatever God does He never deviates from His own perfect justice” (pp. 228-229).

It isn’t yours to explain God’s “secret providential workings”? Really? That’s funny. Since that’s exactly what you’ve been doing for the last 100 pages or so. Boettner SAYS it’s not “ours” to explain, and then hypocritically proceeds to give a “partial explanation”:

“A partial explanation of sin is found in the fact that while man is constantly commanded in Scripture not to commit it, he is, nevertheless, permitted to commit it if he chooses to do so. No compulsion is laid on the person; he is simply left to the free exercise of his own nature, and he alone is responsible. This, however, is never a bare permission, for with full knowledge of the nature of the person and of his tendency to sin, God places him or allows him to be in a certain environment, knowing perfectly well that the particular sin will be committed” (p. 229).

Once again, the word “compulsion” is much too weak to describe God’s active causation of sin in His creatures. Using the crucifixion of Jesus

Christ as an example, HOW did God place Judas Iscariot “in a certain environment” without CAUSING him to move into that environment? If Judas Iscariot is a “free agent” who is “*simply left to the free exercise of his own nature,*” then what is to keep him from choosing to NOT betray Christ? Wicked and pseudo-pious Calvinists like Loraine Boettner cannot coherently explain how God in His providence makes specific sins absolutely certain.

“THE FALL OF ADAM WAS INCLUDED IN THE DIVINE PLAN

Even the fall of Adam, and through him the fall of the race, was not by chance or accident, but was so ordained in the secret counsels of God. We are told that Christ was ‘foreknown indeed (as a sacrifice for sin) before the foundation of the world,’ I Peter 1:20. Paul speaks of ‘the eternal purpose’ which was purposed in Jesus Christ our Lord, Eph. 3:11. The writer of Hebrews refers to ‘the blood of an eternal covenant,’ 13:20. And since the plan of redemption is thus traced back into eternity, the plan to permit man to fall into the sin from which he was thus to be redeemed must also extend back into eternity; otherwise there would have been no occasion for redemption. In fact the plan for the whole course of the world’s events, including the fall, redemption, and all other events, was before God in its completeness before He ever brought the creation into existence; and He deliberately ordered it that this series of events, and not some other series, should become actual. And unless the fall was in the plan of God, what becomes of our redemption through Christ?” (p. 234).

Oh! So Boettner DOES remember that Ephesians 3:11 is in the Bible! Then what’s with Boettner’s nonsensical babbling about all this sin and evil stuff being an “inscrutable mystery”? I’m not exactly sure. It might be that since Scripture teaches that God deliberately ordained the fall, Boettner has to voice agreement with it. But when it comes to explaining HOW God’s

deliberate ordering came about, then Boettner arrogantly removes the “mystery card” from his breast pocket. This flashing of a mystery card is part of a card trick performed in order to deflect attention from his implicit teaching that it is man, and NOT God, who deliberately orders all sinful events, including the fall of Adam and the crucifixion of Christ. Boettner’s profession that God deliberately orders events that He does not cause is a total facade. In Boettner’s blackened brain, man is the ultimate metaphysical cause of his own sin, of his own fall in the garden of Eden. This is the devil’s lie: “You shall be as God” (Genesis 3:5).

CHAPTER THIRTY-SEVEN

A MOST FAVORABLE OPPORTUNITY TO ERASE JESUS CHRIST FROM HISTORY

Beneath the subtitle *“The Fall of Adam was included in the Divine plan”* we find these words:

“Yet God in no way compelled man to fall. He simply withheld that undeserved constraining grace with which Adam would infallibly not have fallen, which grace He was under no obligation to bestow” (Boettner, The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination, p. 235).

What’s with this concept of “constraining grace”? Well, it’s just another antichristian theory made up by those who hate the sovereign God of Scripture. Marc Carpenter elaborates on this fact:

“But we have Calvinist authors and seminarians who make up all kinds of theories in order to justify their view of their god who doesn’t cause everything while remaining sovereign, and none of these theories has any basis in the Bible. They just had to concoct these fables, these fictions, about God, in order to make all their preconceived notions fit into the Bible’s clear teaching of God’s sovereignty. And they really don’t do a very good job of it. They use a lot of seminary-type words and phrases to try to impress people and get people to think they have this special knowledge of God, so we’re supposed to just defer to them, because, after all, they’re smarter and more well-read and have gone to highly-esteemed seminaries. But if you look at what they’re really saying amidst all the rhetoric, you’ll see that their house is built on sand. They have no biblical basis for their fabrications.”

The phrase “constraining grace” is just unbiblical nonsense employed in an effort to deny God’s sovereign authority and prerogative to do what He

wants with His creatures. Also, even this concept of “grace” before the entrance of sin makes no sense.

Boettner writes:

“In respect to himself, Adam might have stood had he so chosen; but in respect to God it was certain that he would fall. He acted as freely as if there had been no decree, and yet as infallibly as if there had been no liberty” (p. 235).

How about this:

“Adam acted as freely as if there had been no [God]’ since he is merely a free-moving materialistic mass of not-so-fortuitous atoms.”

Or how about this:

“Adam acted as freely as if there had been no [God]’ since Adam himself is God.”

Or perhaps this:

“Adam acted as freely as if there had been no [Potter]’ since he is the piece of amorphous clay who says to its former, He has no hands” (cf. Isaiah 45:9).

And if you can hack it, here’s even more from Boettner:

“It may be well just at this point, to say something more about the nature of the fall. Adam was given a most favorable opportunity to secure eternal life and blessedness for himself and his posterity” (p. 236).

A short time ago I was discussing with Marc Carpenter this blasphemous statement from Boettner. Marc's cutting response went something like this:

"Boettner is saying that God had given Adam 'a most favorable opportunity' to erase Jesus Christ from history."

Some additional insidious implications to Adam being "*given a most favorable opportunity*" to erase Jesus Christ from history are:

(1) A "*most favorable opportunity to*" *usurp the throne of Christ and crown himself king by earning "eternal life and blessedness for himself and his posterity."*

(2) A "*most favorable opportunity*" *to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing (cf. Revelation 5:12).*

(3) A "*most favorable opportunity*" *for a mere creature to obtain the SAME GLORY as Jesus Christ and thus profane and cheapen the absolute uniqueness and exclusivity of the redemptive work of Jesus Christ for His people.*

Why do so many Calvinists like Boettner say it's so mysteriously perplexing how Adam fell? I truly wonder if comments like that do not reflect a secret desire on their part that Adam had passed the supposed "probationary period" and erased Jesus Christ from history by adorning himself with the glory that belongs SOLELY to Jesus Christ. They would attribute to Adam qualities of character that belong to Christ ALONE. They have not in mind the glory of God, but the glory of men.

CHAPTER THIRTY-EIGHT

WELCOME TO THE REFORMED FAITH

Here is what I've decided to post next from Boettner's *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*:

“The real difficulty which we face here, is to explain why a God of infinite holiness, power, and wisdom, would have brought into existence a creation in which moral evil was to prevail so extensively; and especially to explain why it should have been permitted to issue in the everlasting misery of so many of His creatures. This difficulty, however, bears not only against Calvinism, but against theism in general; and while other systems are found to be wholly inadequate in their explanation of sin, Calvinism can give a fairly adequate explanation in that it recognizes that God is ultimately responsible since He could have prevented it; and Calvinism further asserts that God has a definite purpose in the permission of every individual sin having ordained it ‘for His own glory’” (p. 251).

Even with the damnable Reformed doctrine of “sovereign permission” (i.e., “‘sovereign’ letting go of ‘sovereignty’) in view, Boettner STILL perceives a “*real difficulty*” with God ordaining sin for His own glory. Thus far we’ve seen Boettner’s numerous denials of God’s sovereign control and causation of sin pertaining to the Fall of Adam. Boettner certainly and clearly rejects the apostle Paul’s teaching that God’s ordination of sin stems from His own desire to “*demonstrate His wrath, and to make His power known*” in the vessels of wrath in order “*that He make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy.*” The rejection of the Biblical view of God’s sovereignty is a given among most Calvinists.

This rejection of God’s absolute sovereignty is an integral part of the rich Reformed heritage. To the Reformed mind it is a badge of honor to become Paul’s God-hating objector while attempting to exegete Romans 9:18-23.

This tremendous Reformed potsherdian privilege is NOT to be shunned, but to be savored; not to be blushed at, but to be brazenly boasted in. Oh, to be a mighty “free agent,” to be a powerful potsherd who fights with the Potter. Oh, to lie supine on the floor while simultaneously performing eisegetical contortions from one end of the room to the other in hopes that no one will notice that you are Paul’s objector. Oh my. How grand. Come, and welcome to the Reformed Faith.

CHAPTER THIRTY-NINE

AS DEEP AS A RAINDROP ON A FLAT SIDEWALK

Skipping some pages of Boettner's already asserted nonsense we stop at the objection put forth in Chapter XX: *That It Is Unfavorable To Good Morality*. Here's Boettner:

"THE MEANS AS WELL AS THE ENDS ARE FOREORDAINED

The objection is sometimes made that this system encourages men to be careless and indifferent about their moral conduct and their growth in grace, on the ground that their eternal welfare has already been secured. This objection is primarily directed against the doctrines of Election, and the Perseverance of the Saints" (p. 274).

There's no need to say much here — the "Arminian" objection is just plain stupid. In addition to what Boettner notes above, the argument is that since the elect (those for whom Christ died) have been ordained to eternal life, then it matters not whether they believe the gospel. Many Calvinists will DENY the gospel by admitting that in the case of elect infants, believing the gospel does NOT matter (cf. WCF, 10.3). But for true Christians who refuse to "qualify" passages like Mark 16:16, say it DOES "matter":

"The one believing into the Son has everlasting life; but the one disobeying the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him" (John 3:36).

“For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation to everyone believing, both to Jew first, and to Greek” (Romans 1:16).

“And hearing, the nations rejoiced and glorified the Word of the Lord. And as many as were appointed to eternal life believed” (Acts 13:48).

The asinine argument that many “Arminians” put forth is that since the elect of God have already been appointed to eternal life, then it matters not whether they hear, glorify, or believe the Word of the Lord. This “reasoning” is about as deep as a raindrop on a flat sidewalk.

CHAPTER FORTY

FAITH IS ASSURANCE

Chapter XXIV is entitled *Personal Assurance That One is Among The Elect*. Boettner concludes this chapter with the following:

“We cannot say that every true Christian has this assurance; for it can only properly arise from a knowledge of one’s own moral resources and strength, and the one who underestimates himself may innocently be without it. The Christian may at times become very discouraged because of weak faith, but this does not prove him to be among the non-elect” (p. 312).

Since [faith IS assurance](#) Boettner is saying that NOT every true Christian has faith. No surprise there — that’s in line with many Reformed Confessions, including [The Wicked Westminster Confession of Faith](#). Boettner accurately points to the source of this lack of assurance: The underestimation of one’s own established righteousness (Romans 10:1-4). In Boettner’s scheme, a more accurate estimation of one’s own established righteousness ought to result in assurance of one’s acceptance with God. What the apostle Paul called “ignorant zeal” (Romans 10:3), Boettner calls “weak faith.” This person’s ignorant zeal does NOT prove they are “among the non-elect,” but since Paul prayed for their salvation, it DOES prove they are presently unregenerate.

“When faith is strengthened and erroneous views of salvation are cleared up, it is the privilege and duty of every Christian to know himself saved, and to escape that fear of apostasy which must constantly haunt every consistent Arminian so long as he continues in this life. Hence, while assurance is desirable and easily obtainable for any one who has made

some progress in the Christian way, it cannot always be made the test of a true Christian” (p. 312).

It is NOT *“When faith is strengthened”* since this person has no faith. Rather, Boettner’s teaching is that a person knows himself “saved” when *ignorant zeal* is strengthened by means of a “proper knowledge” and “correct view” of one’s own righteousness (cf. Romans 10:3). Boettner’s teaching is that if a person would seek to establish their own righteousness in a *“more orthodox way,”* then assurance of acceptance with God *“is desirable and easily obtainable.”* Perhaps many self-righteous-navel-gazing Puritans would take exception to Boettner’s lofty view of mans’ own established righteousness (although this self-righteousness-establishing and assurance-gaining is solely due to the “gracious enabling” of the spirit of antichrist who worketh in the sons of disobedience).

“Through the Scriptures God repeatedly gives us the promises that those who come to Him in Christ shall in no wise be cast out, that whosoever will may take of the water of life without money and without price, and that he who asks shall receive. The grounds for our assurance, then, are both within us and without us. If, therefore, any true believer lacks the assurance that he is forever safe among God’s people, the fault is in himself and not in the plan of salvation, or in the Scriptures” (p. 312).

Boettner believes that it’s possible for a “true believer” to believe that being “forever safe” is conditioned on the work of the sinner. Those who base part of their assurance within them, are basing part of their assurance of acceptance before God within them. They are ADDING TO the atoning blood and imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ as the ONLY ground of acceptance with God. They are debtors to do the whole law (Galatians 5:3), since they are attempting to take of the water of life with the CONDITIONAL, NON-MERITORIOUS MONEY they say was freely and “graciously” given to them (cf. Romans 4:4, 11:6). And once they THINK they are in possession of the gift of Christ’s imputed righteousness (cf.

Romans 5:15-19, 6:23), they seek to maintain assurance of this (alleged) possession by the “*gracious means*” of establishing their own righteousness:

“For being ignorant of the righteousness of God, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, they did not submit to the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of Law for righteousness to everyone that believes” (Romans 10:3-4).

Boettner is a wicked madman who encourages people to obtain assurance of being submitted to the righteousness of God by seeking to establish their own righteousness. Since faith IS assurance, then assurance that one is submitted to the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel comes by believing that Christ is the end of law for righteousness; that Christ’s righteousness is the SOLE ground of acceptance with God. Assurance is based on the work of Christ ALONE.

Most of professing Christendom consents against the Apostles about salvation being conditioned on the work of Jesus Christ ALONE. They do NOT scruple about the necessity of some antichristian ADDITION to His saving work. Instead, they bicker over exactly WHAT ought they to ADD, HOW MUCH, and the precise nature of the “*gracious assistance*” needed to establish their own righteousness and to put God in their debt (cf. Romans 10:1-4; 11:6).

CHAPTER FORTY-ONE

WALK NOT IN THE COUNSEL OF THE WICKED

The second to last chapter (XXVII) of Boettner's book is called *The Practical Importance Of The Doctrine*. He writes:

“The doctrine of Predestination is a doctrine for genuine Christians. Considerable caution should be exercised in preaching it to the unconverted. It is almost impossible to convince a non-Christian of its truthfulness, and in fact the heart of the unregenerate man usually revolts against it. If it is stressed before the simpler truths of the Christian system are mastered, it will likely be misunderstood and in that case it may only drive the person into deeper despair. In preaching to the unconverted or to those who are just beginning the Christian life, our part consists mainly in presenting and stressing man's part in the work of salvation,— faith, repentance, moral reform, etc. These are the elementary steps so far as man's consciousness extends. At that early stage little need be said about the deeper truths which relate to God's part. As in the study of Mathematics we do not begin with algebra and calculus but with the simple problems of arithmetic, so here the better way is to first present the more elementary truths. Then after the person is saved and has traveled some distance in the Christian way he comes to see that in his salvation God's work was primary and his was only secondary, that he was saved through grace and not by his own works” (pp. 348-349).

Not one apostle, nor Jesus Himself, “*exercised considerable caution*” when presenting the broad BIBLICAL doctrine (NOT the Reformed doctrine) of predestination (e.g., providence, election, reprobation):

“But I said to you that you also have seen Me and did not believe. All that the Father gives to Me shall come to Me, and the one coming to Me I will in no way cast out. For I have come down out of Heaven, not that I should do My will, but the will of Him who sent Me. And this is the will of the Father sending Me, that of all that He has given Me, I shall not lose any of it, but shall raise it up in the last day...Then the Jews murmured about Him...Then Jesus answered and said to them, Do not murmur with one another. No one is able to come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him, and I will raise him up in the last day...But there are some of you who are not believing. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were, the ones not believing, and who was the one betraying Him. And He said, Because of this, I have told you that no one is able to come to Me except it is given to him from My Father. From this time many of His disciples went away into the things behind, and no longer walked with Him” (John 6:36-39, 41, 43-44, 64-66).

Oops. Jesus failed to follow Boettner’s sagacious guidance. And this was no hasty “slip-up” on the part of Jesus. Not at all. Jesus “throws Boettner’s caution to the wind” by taking His relentless hammer to the sensibilities of unregenerate men. Boettner’s shrewd “evangelistic” strategy is to get the sinner to first believe in the “essential doctrine” of election by works, and then only later to believe in the “optional doctrine” of the election of grace (cf. Romans 11:5-6). For Boettner, the sanest course of action is to encourage initial belief in the “essential doctrine” that salvation IS of the one willing or running, and then only later to “come into” (or “grow into”) the “optional doctrine” that salvation is actually of the God who shows mercy to whom He wills (cf. Romans 9:16-18).

To Boettner and those similarly minded with him:

Keep your self-righteous, prejudicial, God-hating advice to yourself (cf. Psalm 1:1-2).

CHAPTER FORTY-TWO

FASHIONABLE FOUNDATION OF A FALSE JESUS

We continue digging through this tunnel of diabolical dirt until we see the rays of completion light:

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IS TRULY BROAD AND TOLERANT

“While the Presbyterian Church is preeminently a doctrinal Church, she never demands the full acceptance of her standards by any applicant for admission to her fold. A credible profession of faith in Christ is her only condition of Church membership. She does demand that her ministers and elders shall be Calvinists; yet this is never demanded of lay members. As Calvinists we gladly recognize as our fellow Christians any who trust Christ for their salvation, regardless of how inconsistent their other beliefs may be. We do believe, however, that Calvinism is the only system which is wholly true” (p. 353).

As we’ve witnessed repeatedly throughout this commentary on select portions of Boettner’s book, the Arminian and Calvinists’ credible profession is faith in a “jesus” whom the Apostles did NOT preach (2 Corinthians 11:4;cf. John 10:4-5). These Arminians and Calvinists would profess to believe that “Jesus is the Christ” while maintaining a definition that is subversive of its biblical meaning. Their profession that “Jesus Christ is God and Savior” is completely undermined by their belief in a “god” who

cannot save; in a “god” who is unable to deliver (cf. 1 Samuel 12:21; Isaiah 45:20).

Certain professing Calvinists who are of Boettner’s mind may object:

“Hey! Don’t apply Isaiah 45:20 to me. I don’t believe in a ‘god’ who cannot save. That’s the Arminian ‘god.’ That’s not my God.”

Really? Let me remind you that those who are most explicit and blatant in expressing their belief in a “god” who cannot save are *“gladly [recognized] as [your] fellow Christians.”* However “heinous,” “inconsistent,” or “ignorant” their errors might be, they are nevertheless judged by you as true Christians, Mr. Calvinist.

Presumably you’d say your common foundation with the “Arminian” (i.e., universal atonement advocate) is the gospel of Christ crucified (cf. 1 Corinthians 1:23-24, 2:2). Despite what you might call *“extremely significant errors”* in their theology concerning the Person and Work of Christ, they must have some kind or degree of *“soundness in the fundamentals,”* some way of *“being right in the main,”* correct? Why else would you call them your *“spiritual brethren”*? Presuming that “Christ crucified” is an essential aspect of your professed “common gospel,” what would you say this “MAIN” consists of? What exactly *are* the “FUNDAMENTALS”? Clearly His PERSON and His WORK, right?

Whoah, hey, relax now — there’s no need for you to get all worked-up and fidgety in that chair. Please allow me to help you out. Let’s focus on Christ’s WORK on the cross. Would you say that BOTH you and the “Arminian” believed in the SAME CROSS UPON REGENERATION (you said they’re your brothers, remember)? “YES,” you say? That’s what I thought — BOTH you and the “Arminian” believe in a “cross” where the work of Christ does NOT make the only difference between salvation and damnation. The true cross of Scripture EQUALS efficacious atonement. EVERY SAVED

PERSON, from the newborn in Christ to the most mature believer, believes in the SAME CROSS. There is NO CROSS when some for whom Christ died are in hell. Your “cross” is an empty, meaningless cross. Your “cross” is a “cross” of NO EFFECT (cf. 1 Corinthians 1:17). It is just an idol of your vain imaginations. You believe that belief in a “cross” of NO EFFECT is the STARTING POINT in a believer’s spiritual life. You are dead in your sins:

“For the Word of the cross is foolishness to those being lost, but to us being saved, it is the power of God” (1 Corinthians 1:18).

CHAPTER FORTY-THREE

TRULY A SKANDALON TO CALVINIST CHAMELEONS

Boettner quoting Hamilton concerning certain kinds of non-Calvinists:

“...Prof. F. E. Hamilton has well said:

‘A blind, deaf and dumb man can, it is true, know something of the world about him through the senses remaining, but his knowledge will be very imperfect and probably inaccurate. In a similar way, a Christian who never knows or never accepts the deeper teachings of the Bible which Calvinism embodies, may be a Christian, but he will be a very imperfect Christian, and it should be the duty of those who know the whole truth to attempt to lead him into the only storehouse which contains the full riches of true Christianity’”(pp. 353-354).

So this is what Boettner and Hamilton think of their non-Calvinist brothers in Satan. They judge them as “imperfect” Christians who are “blind, deaf and dumb.” Why? Because they’ve failed to accept the non-essential “deeper teachings of the Bible.” In this review it has become evident that these condescending Calvinists pervert and suppress such Biblical doctrines as efficacious atonement and God’s sovereignty, but what is implied here is the aforementioned doctrines are classified as non-essential “deeper teachings.” The “less dumb” Calvinists are doing their own version of the “Presbyterian pat” **[1]** to their “dumber” non-Calvinist brethren.

[1] A figurative expression describing the “condescendingly friendly” little pat on the head some Presbyterians give to their Reformed Baptist brethren who differ with them on water baptism.

Many Calvinists call the simple gospel-centered doctrine of efficacious atonement a “*deeper teaching of the Bible*” due to the long, difficult, and breaking process of time they initially spent stumbling at the Stone-of-stumbling, and being offended at the Rock-of-offense. Perhaps many Calvinists would say it took around 20 years of stumbling at this Stone to finally “believe and acquiesce,” and to no longer stumble at it. But when these same Calvinists show their offense at the teaching that ALL who believe in this Stone will be saved and ALL who do not believe in this Stone will be shamed, then it becomes clear that these Calvinists have NOT yet believed on Him, and STILL continuing to stumble at the Stone-of-stumbling (cf. Romans 9:30-33).

As for the supposedly “deep teaching” of God’s sovereignty. It’s only “deep” because the Calvinist probably spent 20 years fighting against Paul over it (cf. Romans 9:19). And as we’ve so clearly seen, these Calvinists are STILL fighting against Paul over it.

“The Calvinist,’ says Dr. Craig,

‘does not differ from other Christians in kind, but only in degree, as more or less good specimens of a thing differ from more or less bad specimens of a thing.’

We are not all Calvinists as we travel the road to heaven, but we shall all be Calvinists when we get there. It is our firm conviction that every redeemed soul in heaven will be a thorough-going Calvinist” (p. 354).

Apparently, Dr. Samuel Craig wishes to further endear himself to his non-Calvinist brothers in Satan with such charming and winsome comments. Dr. Craig is dead wrong in his judgment concerning who is and is not a “Christian,” of course, but he is right about the concept of differences in “degree”: Calvinists like Boettner, and non-Calvinists who believe Christ died for everyone without exception, are children of the Devil in kind who differ only in degree. Some are “Satanic tadpoles” while others are “Satanic toads” who have sedulously progressed in knowledge while never acknowledging the truth (cf. 2 Corinthians 11:1-15; 2 Timothy 3:7).

The same Satanic spirit of antichrist runs through all the theologically popular and fashionable teachings of the world. Though this spirit takes various courses and assumes all kinds of shapes and colors, the chief and highest end is the same: To glorify the creature rather than the Creator.

CHAPTER FORTY-FOUR

THE SPIRIT OF GOD OR THE SPIRIT OF THE WORLD

Boettner bloviates:

“That Calvinism has many adversaries is not to be wondered at. As long as the fact remains that, ‘The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged’ (1 Corinthians 2:14), so long will this be a strange, foolish system to the natural man. As long as fallen human nature remains as it is, and as long as the decree stands that Christ Himself is to be ‘a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence’ to the natural man (1 Peter 2:8), these things will be an offense to many” (p. 358).

First, this is just bombastic bluster bereft of backbone since Boettner judges many of Calvinism’s “adversaries” NOT as “natural men” (i.e., unregenerate men), but as “gladly recognize[d]” “fellow Christians” “who trust Christ for their salvation” (p. 353). So, who are these “adversaries,” Boettner? Who are these “natural men” who find “these things” offensive? At the time Boettner wrote this, I doubt he could or would have named EVEN ONE.

Second, Calvinism is NOT “of the Spirit of God” as Boettner so confidently avers. The moment the Spirit of God regenerates His people He speaks the TRUTH about Christ and GLORIFIES Christ in His people’s hearts. He does NOT leave them ignorant about Christ or teach them falsehood about Christ like the spirit of Calvinism does:

“No one is able to come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him, and I will raise him up in the last day. It has been written in the Prophets, They shall all be taught of God. So then everyone who hears and learns from the Father comes to Me” (John 6:44-45).

“And when the Comforter comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from the Father, that One will witness concerning Me” (John 15:26).

“But when that One comes, the Spirit of Truth, He will guide you into all Truth, for He will not speak from Himself, but whatever He hears, He will speak; and He will announce the coming things to you. That One will glorify Me, for He will receive from Mine and will announce to you” (John 16:13-14).

“Brothers, truly my heart’s pleasure and supplication to God on behalf of Israel is for it to be saved. For I testify to them that they have zeal to God, but not according to knowledge. For being ignorant of the righteousness of God, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, they did not submit to the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of Law for righteousness to everyone that believes” (Romans 10:1-4).

“...according as it has been written, Eye has not seen, and ear has not heard, nor has it risen up into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for those that love Him. But God revealed them to us by His Spirit, for the Spirit searches all things, even the depths of God. For who among men knows the things of a man, except the spirit of a man within him? So also no one has known the things of God except the Spirit of God.

But we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit from God, so that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God. Which things we also speak, not in words taught in human wisdom, but in Words taught of the Holy Spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual things. But a natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he is not able to know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But the spiritual one discerns all things, but he is discerned by no one. For who has known the mind of the Lord? Who will teach Him? But we have the mind of Christ” (1 Corinthians 2:9-16).

“Because it is God who said, Out of darkness Light shall shine, who shone in our hearts to give the brightness of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (2 Corinthians 4:6).

Every one of these verses above are completely vitiated by Boettner and his virulent Calvinism. For they have a false spirit who initially reveals a false christ who died for everyone without exception to many of those whom he supposedly regenerates. Further, Calvinism’s advocacy of pernicious inclusivism blatantly denigrates Christ’s redemptive glory and denies the gospel as the power of God to salvation to everyone believing, when it asserts that “elect infants” and “some even of the adult heathen people” are regenerated and saved apart from belief in the gospel of Christ (Lorraine Boettner, *TRDoP*, pp. 117-120; *The Westminster Confession Of Faith*, 10.3 & 10.4).

CHAPTER FORTY-FIVE

EXCHANGE OLD DOCTRINES, RETAIN SAME IDOLS

Boettner:

“It may be proper at this point to say that the author of this book was not reared in a Calvinistic Church, and he well remembers how revolutionary these doctrines seemed when he first came in contact with them. During one Christmas vacation of his College course he happened to read the first volume of Charles Hodge’s ‘Systematic Theology,’ which contains a chapter on ‘The Decrees of God,’ and which stated these truths with such compelling force that he was never able to get away from them. Furthermore, he takes some pride in the fact that he has reached this position only after a rather severe mental and spiritual struggle, and he feels deeply sympathetic toward others who may be called upon to go through a somewhat similar experience. He knows the sacrifice required to withdraw from the church of his youth when he became convinced that that church taught a system which contained much error” (p. 362).

To progress from belief in a “*non-sovereign god*” to belief in a “*partially-sovereign god*” had an absolutely “revolutionary” impact on Boettner’s benighted brain. Boettner is STILL enslaved to those “by nature not being gods” (Galatians 4:8), and since these “no-gods” vary in their alleged “redemptive sovereignty,” they likewise vary in the severity of their impact on the idol factories that are busily manufacturing them. Boettner’s sympathies are with his fellow idolaters who have likewise struggled and suffered while forming and fashioning idols of various shapes and sizes that are conformable to the mold of their own unregenerate minds.

Calvinists like Boettner who believe in a *“partially-sovereign god”* are sometimes totally misrepresented or misunderstood by those worshipping a *“non-sovereign god”* to believe in the absolutely sovereign God of Scripture. When this happens the aforementioned Calvinists are quick to correct their fellow idolaters on that point.

CHAPTER FORTY-SIX

WHEREVER THE TRUE CHURCH IS, THE TRUE GOSPEL ALWAYS IS

We come to the final chapter (XXVIII) AND final post of this review of Loraine Boettner's heretically-saturated book, *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination: "Calvinism In History"*:

"It may occasion some surprise to discover that the doctrine of Predestination was not made a matter of special study until near the end of the fourth century. The earlier church fathers placed chief emphasis on good works such as faith, repentance, almsgiving, prayers, submission to baptism, etc., as the basis of salvation. They of course taught that salvation was through Christ; yet they assumed that man had full power to accept or reject the gospel. Some of their writings contain passages in which the sovereignty of God is recognized; yet along side of those are others which teach the absolute freedom of the human will. Since they could not reconcile the two they would have denied the doctrine of Predestination and perhaps also that of God's absolute Foreknowledge. They taught a kind of synergism in which there was a co-operation between grace and free will. It was hard for man to give up the idea that he could work out his own salvation. But at last, as a result of a long, slow process, he came to the great truth that salvation is a sovereign gift which has been bestowed irrespective of merit; that it was fixed in eternity; and that God is the author in all of its stages" (p. 365).

Boettner's recounting of the beginnings of the "post-Apostolic early church" consisted of zealous individuals whose ignorance of the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel of Jesus Christ necessarily led them to seek to establish a righteousness of their own (Romans 10:2-3). It involved persons

who were NOT submitted to the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel, and then *“as a result of a long, slow process,”* they came to understand the popularly held Augustino-Calvinist doctrine of salvation conditioned on the supposedly *“non-meritorious efforts”* of the sinner (contra Romans 4:4 and Romans 11:6).

Jesus Christ WILL build His assembly and the gates of hades will NOT prevail against her (Matthew 16:18). Where two or three are gathered together in Christ’s name, He IS in their midst (Matthew 18:20). God will NOT thrust away His people whom He foreknew:

“I say then, Did not God thrust away His people? Let it not be! For I also am an Israelite, out of Abraham’s seed, of the tribe of Benjamin. God did not thrust away His people whom He foreknew. Or do you not know what the Scripture said in Elijah, how he pleaded with God against Israel, saying, Lord, they killed Your prophets, and they dug down Your altars, and only I am left, and they seek my life (Romans 11:1-3).

He WILL preserve, protect, and deliver His people from this present evil age:

“...I reserved to Myself seven thousand men who did not bow a knee to Baal. So then, also in the present time a remnant according to election of grace has come into being” (Romans 11:4-5).

“Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for our sins, so that He might deliver us out of the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father” (Galatians 1:3-4).

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, He according to His great mercy having regenerated us to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and unfading, having been kept in Heaven for you the ones in the power of God being guarded through faith to a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time” (1 Peter 1:3-5).

“Little children, you are of God and have overcome them, because He in you is greater than he in the world. They are of the world; because of this they speak of the world, and the world hears them. We are of God; the one knowing God hears us. Whoever is not of God does not hear us. From this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error” (1 John 4:4-6).

Throughout “church history” every true believer without exception has had NO OTHER FOUNDATION, NO OTHER GROUND OF SALVATION than Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 3:11). Those “*earlier church fathers*” whom Boettner mentioned were the careless and foolish builders who laid a foundation OTHER THAN that of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ as the SOLE GROUND of salvation. Likewise, Calvinists who count universal atonement advocates (e.g., “Arminians”) as true Christians have laid down the sinner’s efforts as THE foundational difference between salvation and damnation, rather than the Work of Jesus Christ alone.

“For through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father. So, then, you are no longer strangers and tenants, but you are fellow citizens of the saints and of the family of God, being built up on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the cornerstone, in whom all the building being fitted together grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are being built together into a dwelling place of God in the Spirit” (Ephesians 2:18-22).

Just as Boettner's "*earlier church fathers*," so today do vast droves of false religionists presumptuously adorn their pestilent persons with the name of "Christian." Their profession of "Christ to follow" rings exceedingly hollow, seeing they have REJECTED the true Jesus Christ of Scripture as being the CORNERSTONE, and have put "another jesus" whom the apostles did NOT preach in His place (cf. 2 Corinthians 11:4). They begin their so-called "Christian life" with a false christ in the room and stead of the true Christ (in my estimate the tolerant Calvinists are the most conspicuous offenders of this aforementioned type of rejection).

At times true believers (like Elijah did before them) may find it rather exasperating and daunting to perceive the plethora of people, who while professing "Christian piety," are in fact paying homage to Baal:

"But what does the Divine answer say to him, I reserved to Myself seven thousand men who did not bow a knee to Baal. So then, also in the present time a remnant according to election of grace has come into being"
(Romans 11:4-5).

Boetter's post-Apostolic "*church fathers*" were sincere and zealous in their ignorance of whose righteousness is the only righteousness God accepts as a basis for salvation (cf. Romans 10:1-4). Some of these "fathers of the faith" seemed more than a little perplexed (vexed?) at the creature-Creator divide. But charity dictates that we attribute nothing but the purest of motives to those desiring to "*teach the absolute freedom of the human will*" (cf. Psalm 2:1-12).

To conclude this V-E-R-Y L-O-N-G (46)-part review of Loraine Boettner's "*Bloated Book of Blasphemy*":

What does the Calvinist think of the "heretically historical underpinnings" mentioned by Boettner? MANY (including Augustine) in the so-called

“earlier church” believed in salvation by the work of baptism (Boettner mentioned other human efforts “as the BASIS of salvation”). So there you go, *tolerant Calvinist heretics*:

THERE’S where your “ecclesiastical roots” are. THERE’S your “historical pedigree.” THERE’S your “claim to antiquity.” THERE’S your claim of “continuous existence back to the time of the Apos –.” NOPE. NOT back to the Apostles since the Apostles preached salvation conditioned SOLELY on the work of Jesus Christ, while YOU preach salvation conditioned on the so-called “*non-meritorious efforts*” of the sinner. Your soteriological views are those of Cain. Our soteriological views are those of Abel (cf. Hebrews 11:4, 12:24; 1 John 3:12).

The TRUTH (to which we hold) concerning salvation by the work of Jesus Christ ALONE is “ancient” (Romans 16:25; Ephesians 3:11; 2 Timothy 1:9; Titus 1:2). The LIE (to which you hold) concerning salvation conditioned on the sinner (whether “spiritually-enabled” or not) is nearly as ancient (cf. John 8:44; 1 John 3:8; Revelation 12:9).

As even a couple of your own thundering poets have said:

“The notes, signs, and assured tokens whereby the spotless bride of Christ is known from the horrible harlot, the false Kirk, we state, are neither antiquity, usurped title, lineal succession, appointed place, nor the numbers of men approving an error.”

“If the Church is founded on the doctrine of the apostles and prophets, by which believers are enjoined to place their salvation in Christ alone, then if that doctrine is destroyed, how can the Church continue to stand? The Church must necessarily fall whenever that sum of religion which alone can sustain it has given way. Again, if the true Church is the pillar and ground of

the truth, (1 Tim. 3: 15,) it is certain that there is no Church where lying and falsehood have usurped the ascendancy.”

The central doctrine of the gospel is the efficacious atonement of Jesus Christ. The true efficacious cross-work of Christ is the sum of true Christian religion. When the LIE of salvation conditioned on the sinner usurps the efficacious cross-work of Jesus Christ, there is no true assembly, but rather a Synagogue of Satan.

MOST who come in the name of “Christianity” (especially tolerant Calvinists) desire to look well in the flesh by affirming one of the many forms of salvation conditioned on the sinner’s efforts. These tolerant Calvinists heartily affirm their spiritual kinship and oneness with those who profane the precious propitiatory blood of Christ. Tolerant Calvinist heretics affirm “spiritual oneness” with scorners of efficacious atonement, not only because they too are scorners, but also because they are spineless cowards who would not “be persecuted for the cross of Christ” (Galatians 6:12).

BOTH the tolerant Calvinists and their spiritual brothers have been taught by the father of lies concerning which “christ” is revealed, and whose righteousness is the established ground of acceptance with God upon regeneration. They believe the false “christ” of a non-atonement is revealed to the elect sinner, rather than the true Christ of efficacious atonement (contrary to John 6:44-45, 8:44-45; Romans 10:1-4, and 2 Corinthians 4:3-6).

The tolerant Calvinist vitiation, repudiation, and shameless profanation of the cross of Jesus Christ, is one of the most grievous and blatant among all the abominations in professing Christendom.

We COULD dig deeper into this nice, cozy, warm, and damp hole-in-the-wall of professing Christendom and discover *additional* abominations residing therein (much like discovering *additional* active, lively, and less-than-amiable arachnids; cf. Ezekiel 8:6). BUT since this “hole-in-the-wall,” this “portal-of-blasphemy-infested-dirt,” is analogous to Boettner’s book, we need not proceed further.

If any “Arminians” (and *especially* any tolerant Calvinists) that were able to burrow with me through Boettner’s blasphemous “hole-in-the-wall” and witnessing the many abominations therein, I would seriously admonish you with the following:

“Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord are these” (Jeremiah 7:4).

