were very confirmed

Rather, the reason I considered myself Arminian was

thought was not a result of personal Bible study.

information about anything.)

answer to her was that he did not want that much

something. She suggested he call Bro. Need. His

he told his wife he needed some information about

school. (A speaker at a preachers’ meeting said that

question for me, for I was raised in the Arminian

Arminianism and Calvinism. That was a wonderful

take of asking what is the difference between

but I will do it anyway.

war! The Word of God is our only weapon (battle axe), and It alone must

light of God’s Word and do battle, viz., contend for the faith. We are at

service of the King.

The reason I followed the Arminian system of

Some time ago, one of my folks made the mis-

I know the following may cause distress in some,

man. His answer to her was that he did not want that much

about anything.)

The reason I followed the Arminian system of

thinking was not a result of personal Bible study.

other reasons I considered myself Arminian was

were very confirmed

A pilot speaks

By Bill Helbig

As a commercial pilot and captain for a major

airline, I depend on three things which are critical in

successfully moving 400,000 pounds of metal from point

A to point B; common sense, logic, and technical skills
developed over 27 years of Air Force flying and

civilian aviation. Unfortunately, in a post 9/11 environ-

ment, both government and business have little use

for the same triage that I depend upon when carrying

my passengers across thousands of

miles over ocean waters.

Israel-First Millennialists

Attempt to Control Timing

of Christ’s Second Coming

By Thomas Williamson

One of the characteristics of our age is man-
centered religion, an Arminian emphasis that places man

in control of his destiny, which necessarily downgrades

the Biblical doctrine of the sovereignty

of God.

Not a Movie—An

Event

--Matthew L. Chancey

Before the end of the year, filmmakers

are going to experience a major event in film-making

history. In November or December, AOL/

Time-Warner will release a movie that will significantly

raise the bar of excellence for historic films. In terms of

traditional values, true patriotism and Christian

themes, this film will make all categorical competitors

in movie history appear as mere pebbles

before a mountain.

Death of the Church Victorious is ready. See p. 15
overpriced, and I have had nothing but problems from them. My dealings with them have not been pleasant, and I am not through with the problems with them yet.)

Vines of all kinds have taken over a very large portion of the property here. So instead of walking for exercise, I have been trying to reclaim the property from the creeping vines.

The first trip was quite eventful. When Bettie moved to Linden last year after we were married, we used U-Haul. The truck was junk, so we went with Ryder this time. The Ryder truck drove well until we started through the mountains (I know, you west coast people do not consider east coast mountains much more than large hills). It overheated, stranding us in Washington PA for a couple of days while International tried to figure out the problem. They never did, so Ryder had the truck towed over the mountains, 210 miles. Also, the U-Haul trailer we were pulling had no brakes on it, so the trailer had to be reloaded into another before we went over the mountains. The second trip went well, other than the truck being under powered.

As mentioned in the last Examiner, Fay went home to Brazil just before Christmas, 2001. We went with her, and were able to stay there for five weeks. We also left Christina there with Bettie’s sister for another five months. The e-mail letters and pictures I sent back home to our folks are posted on the web site.

Carol’s mother is getting quite old, 92. She is living with us, so remember her in prayer, and us as we deal with an elderly lady.

The mountains are beautiful. We are at about the 800 ft level, with Skyline Drive, which we can see, at about 2,000 to 3,000 ft.

Trying to get back into the “groove” after 2 ½ years (since my heart problems, Oct. 1999) is difficult. A word of advice: my blood pressure was 75-80 on the bottom number before and after my heart problems. The Lord provided the funds for extensive chelation, and my blood pressure is now normally down around 60 or lower on the bottom number.

Christina, my 17 year old daughter, made it back from Brazil after her six month stay. She loved it down there, and is looking forward to going back. She made it

He who wants to get into WHO’S WHO must first learn what’s what...
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Arminians, and they mocked any theology contrary to Arminian. “Arminianism” is considered by them the religion of the common man, and “Calvinism” is considered as the religion of the “thinkers.” Thus, a “Calvinist” is in an “ivory tower,” out of touch with reality.

(Note: I am using the terms Arminian & Calvinism for lack of better terms. We will develop the root of these terms, and show that neither founded the schools of thought represented by the names they bear today.)

However, from what Bible I knew even back then, 30 years ago, I saw some serious inconsistencies in the Arminian idea. I am not saying that “Calvinism” is free of serious inconsistencies, but “Calvinism” has a firmer Scriptural foundation than does Arminianism.

My change from the Arminian (Scofield) religion to “Calvinism” (again, a poor term which I will use until I develop the better term later) was not a result of reading a lot of books that put forth that position. Rather, there were a couple of things that led me to depart from the Arminian/Scofield religion.

First, as I said, even with a very basic knowledge of Scripture, I saw a very serious hole in Arminianism — “Does the Bible support the idea that fallen man has a natural ability to seek after God?”

Second, the more I studied Scripture, along with some basic study aids (word study books), the larger the problem became. Being under Arminian church leaders, I kept my observations to myself, though I did write them down. Having never been exposed to the other side of the Arminian-Calvinism controversy, I believed that what I was seeing was new with me, so I did not discuss it with anyone. (If it’s new, it’s not true; if it’s true, it’s not new.)

After I became a pastor in 1983, Divine Providence started providing material — e.g., The London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689 — showing that the things in Scripture catching my attention were not new with me; they were actually considered the orthodox Christian faith until Darby. Scofield’s book really was the key turning point of replacing the Orthodox Christian faith, “Calvinism,” with what had been considered heresy only about 75 years previously. “Arminianism.” (We will develop this in another article.) Because I was then out from under Arminian leadership, I no longer felt obliged to follow and defend that system of thought.

What does the Bible say

Because of the seriousness of several controversies, I determined to use Scripture to settle some of the questions in my own mind. I started with prayer, admitting to the Lord that I am not inspired, and that I am easily led astray; I, accordingly, asked Him to remove any false ideas and replace them with the truth from His word.

The first major issue I had to address was the idea of a pre-trib rapture. That research resulted in Death of the Church Victorious (formerly, The Death of Victory), which is now ready. See p. 13. I had the basic study together when an evangelist friend read it. He urged me to develop it for publication. He also urged me to purge my personal library of my Arminian books, and start rebuilding it with more orthodox authors. I started rebuilding it with older authors who wrote before the conversion of Christianity to Arminianism, and now have few authors who wrote after 1915 or so. I do use Hastings a lot; I think his last date was 1921. There are other good men since, such as R.J. Rushdoony.

Other issues I had to address were: 1) the purpose and date of the Book of the Revelation; 2) Matthew 24, what does it really teach; 3) who is Israel since Christ, which developed from my study about “Christian Identity,” and a book, “Israel’s Identity/Israel’s Constitution”; 4) the truth about tongues; 5) the church’s and Christian’s responsibility to civil government, Romans 13, as well as some other issues. These studies were lengthy and serious studies, put together for my personal instruction; however, I do have them formatted to print out on 8 ½ x 11 pages. (Some complain that I overkill a subject, but in my mind, the issues at hand must be confronted from every angle, and every point addressed from Scripture.) Primarily, however, I have found that the older men confirm and develop what, to me, the Scriptures are clearly saying.

I never had a reason to make a serious study of the Arminian-Calvin issue. I had to depart the Arminian religion because of what I saw as overwhelming evidence from Scripture that that religion was not right. (And yes, I am convinced that Arminianism is a religion in conflict with the orthodox faith, maybe even bordering on heresy – I will defend that statement as we go.) Over the years as I studied Scripture, I came to understand that man has no natural desire to seek after God, which is the basic point of contention. Once that point is settled, the rest pretty well falls into line.

I was never required to look at the roots of the Arminian-Calvin issue. So the question, “What is the difference between Arminianism and Calvinism?” was a question I had never really considered. It called for some examination, as did the questions I was asked about “Christian Identity” and “tongues.”

Typical of my overkill, here is far too much information, but I do not know what to leave out. The documentation is irrefutable. I am convinced that an issue cannot be properly addressed nor understood without a background check, which the average Christian
The reader can make up his own mind. To present the arguments as neutral as possible, so Arminius and Mr. Calvin. The issue started as an issue between heresy and Biblical orthodoxy.

Though no author is ever neutral, I will attempt to present the arguments as neutral as possible, so the reader can make up his own mind.

Calvinistic or Reformed?

(LET ME SAY UP FRONT THAT I DO NOT BELIEVE BAPTIST are “reformed,” for they do not hold to infant baptism, a central doctrine of the “Reformed Faith.” I have a lengthy study on this issue. However, the following explains why I can be identified with the “Reformed Faith.”)

Luther’s Ninety-five Theses:

Of this Luther knew nothing until some time afterward. For him, the provocation lay in the extravagant claims of an old, tried hand at this kind of thing, the Dominican salesman of indulgences Johann Tetzel. With these claims in mind, Luther drew up the Ninety-five Theses, “for the purpose of eliciting truth,” and may have fastened them on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, on October 31, 1517, the eve of All Saints’ Day and of the great exposure of relics there. (Copied)

On October 31, 1517 a German monk and professor of theology by the name of Martin Luther nailed a piece of paper on the Wittenburg Church door, containing 95 errors of the Catholic Church. The errors centered around the church selling indulgences, or forgiveness of sins.

The church developed the doctrine of “Purgatory,” a place just short of heaven. Then Roman “preachers” went throughout the areas controlled by Rome with boxes. The message was that when the money went in the box, a soul was released from Purgatory. The purpose of the money was to build St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome.

Martin Luther challenged the Church and the pope, and revealed to the people the wickedness of the practice of selling indulgences. In fact, one point Luther’s theses made was, “If money in the box freed souls from Purgatory, then why did not the pope sell all he has and put it in the box?”

Historians mark Luther’s challenge against the Church as the beginning of the Modern Age. It is commonly called the Reformation. The Revolution which followed Luther’s stand changed the world. Great religious, economic, political, and social ideas swept through Europe, molding Europe and eventually the United States of America into the greatest civilizations in history. These ideas, many which we cherish to this day, were contained in seed form in the Bible and cultivated during the Reformation.

Luther’s 95 points were ultimately summed up by 4 great Scriptural truths:

1. Sola Scriptura (Scripture alone)
2. Sola Christus (Christ alone)
3. Sola gratia (grace alone)
4. Sola fide (faith alone)

If any day should be honorable among Non-Romanists, it should be Reformation Day, October 31. Instead, there are more people, particularly Protestants, honoring the Romanist high holy day, Hallowe’en, than even know about the Reformation. In fact, Hallowe’en is second in spending only after Christmas.

Though I do not believe the Baptists came out of the Reformation, I certainly hold to the four main points that the Reformation stood on. I claim to be a “Reformed Baptist,” not because I came from Rome nor because I hold to Rome’s infant baptism. I proudly claim that title because I hold firmly to the following four points. Moreover, I do not see how anyone who claims to hold to the inspiration of God’s word can deny being “Reformed.”

1. Scripture alone
2. Christ alone
3. Grace alone
4. Faith alone

First, Sola Scriptura, or Scripture alone.

Of course, this is where it all starts. If one cannot accept the Scripture as the final rule for all faith and action, we have no further argument with them.

2 Timothy 3:10 But thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, longsuffering, charity, patience, 11 Persecutions, afflictions, which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions, afflictions, I endured: but out of them all the Lord delivered me. 12 Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. 13 But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived. 14 But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them: 15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

So the reader will not think that the word of God only contains instruction in religion, Paul goes on to say,

17 That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.

All good works is pretty much an open ended statement. Every work, thought and action, is to be a good work, or it is a bad work.

Holy Scripture alone defines good work and bad work – God defines good, not man.

Holy Scripture alone tells us how to live.

Holy Scripture alone tells us how to please God and how to have eternal life.

Martin Luther went against the Church of Rome, which up to that time, pretty much held the Christian world in its grip. The individual members of the Church were held to the doctrines and traditions of the Church, and were not allowed to think for themselves. They had to accept what the Church taught regardless of the word of God.

Since Luther, the Protestant pressure on Rome has forced Rome to back off its strong stand on tradition and church teaching. This is especially true in non Roman countries. However, we found in Brazil that wherever good education is common, Rome will give out more of God’s Word accordingly — in other words, poverty and ignorance gives power to the Church of Rome. It is thus to Rome’s advantage to keep people in poverty and ignorance.

I find it hard to believe that folks do not believe that God has given us instructions for all faith and actions, especially among those who claim to be preachers or pastors. An article appeared in the Indianapolis Star, October 27, 2001, written by an Episcopal priest. In it, he compared Muslim fundamentalists to Christian fundamentalists. And a FANATIONAL fundamentalist is one who considers his “holy book” as “the ultimate source of knowledge.”

Parentheses:

Bettie’s son and son-in-law are, for a lack of a better term, Reformed Presbyterians. I am picking up sounds of contention between two camps within that movement. There seems to be a group that sees the Westminster Confession as the primary rule of all faith and action, or at least on the level of Scripture, quoting the Confession equal with Scripture. The other group sees the Word of God as the primary rule of all faith and action, subjecting the Confession to Scripture.

The sad thing is that both claim to be “Reformed,” yet one side seems to deny that their faith is Sola Scriptura, or based upon Scripture alone. Rather, it is based upon Scripture as understood in the Confession.

But I cannot say anything against the Confession side, for I know of Baptist churches who must understand Scripture according to their church’s constitution.
Second, Sola Christus, or Christ alone.

This is speaking of Christ alone for salvation. Acts 4:12 Then Peter filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, 9 If we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; 10 Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you. 11 This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. 12 Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. (Jn. 14:6, II Jn. 1:7-9.)

Though the name of Christ may be used in all the churches we know of today, if He is not presented as the only way to the Heavenly Father, the church is not part of the Christian religion. Here we see that many “Protestant” churches have left the Reformed Faith, for they have left Christ alone as their means to eternal life. Without Christ, they are not Christian, but pagan churches.

Sadly, I know of many churches that use a prayer as the key to heaven - “Say this prayer, and you will be saved.” They avoid the message of the substitutionary death of Christ and the absolute necessity of being saved. Romans 3:23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; 24 Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: (Rom. 3:19-31.)

Luther was against the selling of indulgences, or the promise of forgiveness of sins in exchange for money to build St. Peter’s Basilica. Paul makes it clear that justification is by faith alone, apart from any works of the law. But in 3:31, he is quick to add that justification will make the sinner desire to establish the law, or keep the law.

Ephesians 2:10 For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

Luther made a point that repentance is not noted by the coins in the box but by the change in life. Justification means change of life, or there is no justification. Though we are justified by faith and without faith it is impossible to please God, justification will change one’s outlook on life.

The blessings of Abraham are passed down by faith, not by the law. In other words, natural law does not make one a child of Abraham according to the promise, including the blessings. Rather spiritual law, faith in Christ, makes one the legal heir to Abraham’s blessing. (Gal. 3:1-13.)

I can identify with the “Reformed Faith” based upon these four points:

1. Scripture alone
2. Christ alone
3. Grace alone
4. Faith alone

Many refuse to identify with the “Reformed Faith,” yet hold to these points, and many try to identify with the “Reformed Faith,” yet deny some of these points. And thus they are not “Reformed,” but conformed to the ways of this world.

End Note:


The difficulty on this subject is that baptism from its very nature involves a profession of faith; it is the way in which by the ordinance of Christ, He is to be confessed before men; but infants are incapable of making such a confession; therefore they are not the proper subjects of baptism. Or, to state the matter in another form: the sacraments belong to the members of the Church; but the Church is the company of believers; infants cannot exercise faith, therefore they are not members of the Church, and consequently ought not to be baptized. (Though being honest and admitting that infant baptism is unscriptural, he spends forty pages justifying infant baptism. Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology in three volumes, III.546, 547. Reprint by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1977. Please note that this pastor considers Hodge one of the greatest theologians of all time. However, here he clearly shot himself in the foot. Don’t we all at one point or another? Even those promoting infant baptism admitted that the reason for keeping the practice was to appease those coming out of Rome. See Paedobaptism and the word of God by this author.)

While on the subject of the Church of Rome, the reader may find the following interesting.

Mandatory Clerical Celibacy

The former Roman Catholic priest, L.H. Lehmann, after saying that the primary purposes for which the custom of celibacy has been retained are: (1) To maintain the principle of centralized power, and (2) To retain property for the church that otherwise would go to the priest’s family, says:

“It is not for spiritual reasons that the Roman Catholic Church has for so many centuries denied legitimate marriage to its priests. Those in power have always known that it is only the legality of the marriage relationship that can be denied them, and that the custom of clerical concubinage with resultant generations of illegitimate offspring, has always taken its place. Loss of centralized power and property titles, disruption of its authoritarian system of government, would have been the result if these generations of priests’ children in the past had been legalized. Clerical concubinage has thus been tolerated in preference to this loss of undisputed power centered in Rome.”

“The children of a priest in the past had the right to call him ‘Father’ only in the spiritual sense of the word. The illegitimate sons of popes, cardinals and bishops, however, were often enabled to rise to high positions in the church and state. Several popes were themselves sons and grandsons of other popes and high church dignitaries. My researches among the collection of papal bulls reveals that concubinage among the clergy of Europe was so prevalent that it was necessary to regulate the practice by law - lest clerical concubinage itself should ever become
Most Baptists identify with Spurgeon, yet many of those refuse the basic doctrines for which Spurgeon stood. In fact, there are well-known men and publications that “edit” Spurgeon to make him say things to support their theories. The “Millennial Malady” that causes the followers to be less than honest is not new.

Brethren writers, especially Darby, edited the writings of past saints — including the Reformers — and hymns to support their theories. The apparent reason was to make the millennial system appear orthodox when it clearly was not. Darby readily admitted that his new truths changed the orthodox understanding of multitudes of Scriptures as he intentionally went against the orthodox Christian doctrines of his day. He changed meanings of words, passages of Scripture and even the Scripture itself by issuing new translations to support his prophetic opinions. Among other things, he boasted that his unique prophetic views changed the entire book of Psalms from its historic understanding of the past eighteen hundred years. For example, Darby defined “sovereign grace” as a God-given ability to remain heavenly minded, detached from earthly things.

He translated, studied and taught all Scripture in light of the opinions he propagated around the world. Despite opposition from established churches, Darby’s ideas — gleaned from others and developed into his own system — overwhelmed the church at large. The pre-trib rapture idea, united with Lacunza’s renewed millennial hope and presented by Irving and Darby, has become to many the shibboleth that separates. Meanwhile, the basic tenets of the Christian faith — such as the Verbal Inspiration of Scripture, Virgin Birth, Vicarious Atonement, Victorious Resurrection — have fallen into the realm of the unimportant. A reason, according to Dave MacPherson, for the antagonism against those who do not hold to pre-trib is “its tremendous fund-raising potential.”

1 Darby tells of his hard work in changing the words of the Reformers and of then existing hymns. Letters of J.N. Darby, I.413, III.45.
2 Collected Writings of J.N. Darby, II.493, 494.
3 Letters, I.55, 380, 382, 402 — he convinced American Christians that the Old Testament is not for today, 534, II.32, 48, 65, 420, &c.
4 Ibid., I.243ff., II.561. His views were not unique with him. Though Edward’s and Lacunza’s system had been public domain for several years, it was, apparently, not generally known.
5 Writings, II.381, 425.
6 Plot, 109.
7 (Ovid Need, Death of the Church Victorious, p. 202. Sovereign Grace Publishers, PO Box 4998, Lafayette, IN 47903.)

Arminius vs. Calvin

Romans 11:33 ¶ O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

This is one of the more difficult studies I have put together, for there is so much on this subject that I do not know where to start. I want the reader to understand the roots of the conflict, but I don’t want him to be bored with too many historic details. I also want the reader to understand the theology involved, but I do not want to overwhelm him with Scripture.

I will start the best I can from the beginning.

The “Arminius vs. Calvin” controversy is over what B.B. Warfield (twice President of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1902-1903, 1913-1914) called, “THE OLD PELAGIAN IDOL FREE-WILL.”

Introduction

Adam started with free access to the mind of God — he was able to walk in the garden and speak with Him person to person. However, the entrance of sin into the garden set in motion a process that eventually would lead to the first and primary victims of their own church. Numerous Roman Catholic historians have acknowledged that the law of celibacy for priests and the vows of chastity for monks are historical failures.

What we are most concerned to criticize is not the sins of individual men, but the system as imposed by the Roman Church which leads to and tolerates such abuses! When will the Roman Catholic people throughout the world open their eyes and see that the boasted holiness of their church and of their priests is a pure fiction?

(From The Gospel Catholic, PO Box 31688, Raleigh, NC 27622 [919-782-6140] Vol. 18, No. 2, June 2002.)
Arminius, cont from p. 5

the modern Arminianism vs Calvinism discussion. We CANNOT understand the mind and workings of God other than what is clearly revealed in Scripture. Nor can we reduce the eternal God to our level without making a god after our own vain imagination.

In order to understand God, one must be greater than God, an impossible feat for the creature.

Sin has weakened and clouded the mind, and has corrupted our nature. The result is that we are now unable to grasp the deeper mysteries of human responsibility and Divine Sovereignty. How can Divine Grace, bestowed in Divine Sovereignty, be reconciled with human responsibility?

The basic controversy is over Divine Sovereignty and human responsibility.

This great controversy did not start with James Arminius (1560-1609). The “conflict” between sovereignty and responsibility was confronted at the very foundation of the church, taking place about the years 410-415. At that time, the religion, since known as Arminianism, was dealt with as a wicked heresy, and the founders and followers of that system of thought were considered heretics, and excommunicated. Moreover, if any known follower of the heresy tried to unite with the church, he had to renounce that faith.

Note: In 1603, Arminius was asked to fill a professor of divinity vacancy at the University of Leyden, Amsterdam, which he did. His opponents charged him with Pelagianism and Ariusianism, charges which stuck with him for the rest of his life. (McClintock & Strong’s Cyclopedia CD, by AGES Software, s.v. Arminius, James.)

Before 410, a man named Pelagius offered his theories, and they were seriously corrupting the orthodox doctrines of the church; Pelagius’ influence brought Augustine (354-430) into the fray. Augustine’s Scriptural arguments against Pelagius effectively killed the teaching by the time of Augustine’s death in 430.

PELAGIUS, 354-430

Pelagius (early fifth century, c. 354-430) was an English monk of culture and education. He was naturally a devout and very moral individual, which lead him to develop unorthodox views on dignity and self-sufficiency of man, on original sin and divine grace. (Much like those of our day, this pastor included, who are saved out of a good moral life. I know that without the enlightening grace of God, I would have believed salvation, i.e., a good moral life, was simply a result of self-determination. Those of us who came from a moral background have a difficult time identifying with the delivering power of grace experienced by those saved out of a life of debauchery.)

At Rome, Pelagius became connected with Celestius, a lawyer of noble descent. Together they developed a doctrine that became known as Pelagianism. Faith to these men was hardly more than a theoretical belief; the main thing in religion was moral action, keeping the Commandments of God by one’s own strength, and they were more concerned with the ethical side of religion than with the dogmatic doctrine side.

My personal experience in Arminian circles conforms far too closely with the above points: 1) faith is reduced to a belief in a historical fact of Christ and His work, James 2:19; 2) the average Arminian church has reduced Christianity to a list of dos and don’ts, e.g., some time ago, the Christian school where Christina went (Bettie home schools her now) had a basketball game at another church – that church had a lengthy list of don’ts that had to be followed in order to enter their gym, very few of which were based in God’s Word; and 3) the vast majority of Christians I know do not want dogmatic doctrine, a malady I have found especially prevalent among Arminian churches, but not unknown among Calvinistic churches. They want something that will move the emotions, and emotions are used to fill the pews and altars. The use of emotions is a natural result of a religion that says the choice is up to the fallen sinner — build the emotions, and the sinner will make the right choice.

Because Pelagius grew up a very moral person, he did not experience the abundance of God’s saving grace needed to bring up a sinner from the mud. (Isaiah 51:1 Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the LORD: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged.) Because he never experienced the unbreakable hold of outward sin, he felt anyone could, with enough will-power and determination, live a life above sin. Reading about him, one gets the impression that he was trying to justify his own thinking that he himself did not need God’s converting work in his life.

Illustration: I know a man who was raised in a very godly and moral home. He himself explained his faith to me. His ideal of faith was revealed when he told me of his ideas about baptizing his children. If they are baptized as an infant, then the children are in salvation, unless they show otherwise by their lives. As I spoke with him about the Lord, it was clear his idea of conversion was the same. He was from a moral home, and he had the moral actions to prove his salvation, so he saw no need to question his relationship with the Lord. He has since denied the Lord, divorced his wife, leaving her with 5 children, and the children are up for foster homes.

Pelagianism summed up (according to E.S. Moyer: Who Was Who in Church History, Moody Press, 1974, s.v. Pelagius):

1. Original Sin: Man has no original sin inherited from Adam. Sin is a matter of will and not of nature.

In other words, man is not born totally corrupt with no natural ability to seek God — not only was this the key issue with Pelagius, but it was the key issue with James Arminius, and it is the key issue today with the followers of Arminius. Once this issue is settled, then the rest will pretty much fall in place.

Pelagius denied that human nature had been totally corrupted by sin. He maintained that the only ill effects was Adam’s bad example for all of mankind. He denied that Adam fell as the head of mankind. He held that the first sin was an isolated act of disobedience to the divine command with no consequences, either to his body or to his soul. Thus, each person has the same choice as did Adam. “Man is born without virtue and without vice, but with the capacity for either.” This theory has man operating in a vacuum, absolutely independent of everything without or within.

Thus the Arminian idea that man has within himself a natural desire and ability “both to will and to do” God’s good pleasure, salvation, denies that human nature has been totally corrupted by sin — that is, Pelagianism.

Origin of the Soul:

1. The Traducian or Generation-theory teaches that the soul originates with the body from the act of procreation, and therefore through human agency. It is countenanced by several passages of Scripture, such as Gen. v. 3; Ps. li. 5; Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22; Eph. ii. 3; it is decidedly suitable to the doctrine of original sin; and hence, since Tertullian, it has been adopted by most Western theologians in support and explanation of that doctrine.

2. The Creation-theory ascribes each individual soul to a direct creative act of God, and supposes it to be united with the body either at the moment of its generation, or afterwards. This view is held by several Eastern theologians and by Jerome, who appeals to the unceasing creative activity of God (John v. 17). It required the assumption that the Soul, which must proceed pure from the hand of the Creator, becomes sinful by its connection with the naturally generated body. Pelagius and his followers were creationists.

3. The theory of Pre-existence, which was originated by Plato and more fully developed by Origen, supposes that the soul, even before the origin of the body, existed and sinned in another world, and has been banished in the body as in a prison, to expiate that personal Adamic guilt, and by an ascetic process to be restored to its original state. This is one of the Origenistic heresies, which were condemned under Justinian. Even Gregory of Nyssa, although, like Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria, he supposed the soul to be created before the body, compares Origen’s theory to the heathen myths and fables. Origen himself allowed that the Bible does not directly teach the preexistence of the soul, but maintained that several passages, such as the strife between Esau and Jacob in the womb, and the leaping of John the Baptist in the womb of Elizabeth at the salutation of Mary, imply it. The only
truth in this theory is that every human soul has from eternity existed in the thought and purpose of God. (Schaff, p. 624. Ages Software, DVD. For a more complete study into this area, see McClintock & Strong’s Cyclopaedia [MSC], s.v. Pelagianism. AGES Software.)

The idea that the soul is a direct creative act of God means that the soul has God’s unfallen nature rather than man’s fallen nature. The soul is thus innocent of Adam’s sin, with no sin nature to pass down. (See The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, “Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings, First Series,” vol. 5. B.B. Warfield’s “Introductory Essay on Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy,” p. 20. Schaff, p. 623. Both on Ages, DVD.)

The Traducian or Generation-theory is the one that works best in accord with the Reformed Faith that all men are born fallen, with neither the desire nor the power to choose God. However, Semi-Pelagianism, Arminianism, will support the idea that every soul has a natural ability to choose God. The Creation-theory about Adam’s sin demands that the “all” of Romans 5:12, be understood as the majority of mankind. Of course, if Adam’s headship over the entire human race is denied, then so must Christ’s headship be denied over the new race, 1 Corinthians 15:22, 45.

If Adam’s sin is not imputed to the entire human race, then Christ’s righteousness cannot be imputed to the new human race.

(Eph. 1:4, According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world makes the time of the creation of the soul even more confusing.)

2. Free Will: The doctrine of “free will” has been and continues to be a “bone of contention.” In man’s limited understanding, he cannot put together man’s “free will” and God’s sovereignty, so he feels he must sacrifice one or the other.

[“the question of the influence of depravity and apostasy from God on the actions of the human will,”] ... did not arise till the time of the Pelagian controversy, and then it was found that there existed a diversity of opinion concerning it. The Alexandrian school, e.g. Origen and Clement, strongly affirmed man’s entire freedom of will, his full power to believe or not to believe, to obey God or not to obey him. The fathers of that school asserted that the first movement of man towards holiness was wholly the spontaneous self-caused action of his own will; although they acknowledged that he afterwards needed the help of the Divine Spirit to bring his own effort to a satisfactory issue. They taught that the soul has an inherent power to begin the work of renewal; that God concurs with and helps this willingness on the part of man; that the beginning of all right-action was wholly of man, although its completion depended on divine help; that original sin did not dwell in the pneuma, the soul, the pre-existent spiritual nature which came down from the angelic sphere to inhabit the body assigned to it, but that it had its seat only in the sw-ma and the yuch>, the body and the sensuous nature; and that the pneuma, though living, so to speak, in contact with sin, was not necessarily defiled by it, but, on the contrary, had the inherent power of warring against it, and of finally overcoming it. Hence it followed that there was no guilt in this corruption, since guilt could only be predicated of the pneuma, being only possible when the pneuma transgressed God’s law. While corruption therefore descends from Adam, lodging in the bodily and physical nature, guilt, properly speaking, does not descend, because it is only the result of the action of the individual pneuma; and where the pneuma does transgress, and thereby incur guilt, its doing so is of its own free choice, and not because of any connection with Adam or with his transgression. This doctrine, fully de-

---

**SEMI-PELAGIANISM**

Now known as **Arminianism**

Augustine so discredited Pelagianism that it ceased to be a threat to the church. However, the new system developed which taught that man with his own natural powers is able to take the first step toward his conversion, and this first step obtains or merits the Spirit’s assistance (in both conversion and in sanctification, Schaff, vol. III, p. 642). John Cassian (c. 360-435, *Who*, s.v., Johannes Cassianus) formulated a middle ground between Augustine and Pelagius, and his system was called **SEMI-PELAGIANISM** (SP), taking elements from both sides. (He succeeded in separating himself from Pelagius, and he was accepted as a theologian by the church of Rome. His doctrine was not much different than Rome’s.) He acknowledged that Adam’s sin extended to his posterity, and that human nature was corrupted by original sin. But on the other hand, he held to a system of universal grace for all men alike, leaving the final *conversion* decision up to man’s *free will*. That is, man, though fallen, has the ability to make the first move towards his *conversion*, and after man makes the first move, the Holy Spirit steps in and gives the grace to believe — that is to say, *It is mine to be willing to believe, and it is the part of God’s grace to assist me in believing unto salvation.*

But Pelagianism did not so die as not to leave a legacy behind it. “Reminders of Pelagianism” soon showed themselves in Southern Gaul, where a body of monastic leaders attempted to find a middle ground on which they could stand, by allowing the Augustinian doctrine of assisting grace, but retaining the Pelagian conception of our self-determination to good. We first hear of them in 428, through letters from two laymen, Prosper and Hilary, to Augustine, as men who accepted original sin and the necessity of grace, but asserted that men began their turning to God, and God helped their beginning. They taught that all men are sinners, and that they derive their sin from Adam; that they can by no means save themselves, but need God’s assisting grace; and that this grace is gratuitous in the sense that men cannot really deserve it, and yet that it is not irresistible, nor given always without the occasion of its gift having been determined by men’s attitude towards God; so that, though not given on account of the merits of men, it is given according to those merits, actual and foreseen.
The leader of this new movement was John Cassian, a pupil of Chrysostom (to whom he attributed all that was good in his life and will), and the fountain-head of Gallic monasticism; and its chief champion at a somewhat later day is Faustus of Rhegium (Riez). *(The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, “Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings, First Series,”* vol. 5. B.B. Warfield’s “Introductory Essay on Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy,” p. 25. Ages, DVD.)

Cassian’s, and later, Arminian’s, system is a half-way house, containing elements of error and of truth, which makes it so dangerous. It has enough Bible truth to cause the followers of Arminians to say they believe the Bible, yet enough error to make salvation man’s responsibility. (See Jonah 2:9.)

Man, said Cassian, is not dead in trespasses and sins, but he is only sick, and is capable of helping himself—he can desire the help of a physician, and either accept or refuse that help when offered, but he must cooperate with the grace of God in his salvation. (Schaff, vol. III, p. 644.)

Examples of SP, or Arminianism: The Prodigal Son, Zacchaeus, the Penitent Thief and Cornelius speak of man being cured by any of them, them being the Trinity and the objects of redemption being all mankind. (In other words, the work of Christ was done based upon the promise of the Father that a multitude, more than could be numbered, would be given, by the Father, the faith to come to Him. Jn. 6:37.)

In other words, despite the work done by Christ, there was no guarantee to the less free and responsible for his acts, Gen. 50:19, 20; Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; and it makes no attempt to reconcile the two. We may not be able to harmonize them, but that does not necessarily mean that they are inherently contradictory. (Louis Berkhof, *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, Eerdmans, p. 87.)

Though Augustine died in 430, and Cassian died after 432, the controversy continued, with Prosper Aquitanus, taking up the Augustinian argument. But the Semi-Pelagian doctrine was the more popular, making great progress in France. (Schaff, p. 645.)

**MANY SERMONS TODAY ARE BASED UPON SEMI-PELAGIANISM. They are designed to cause the sinner to become emotional and make the first step.** Certainly, the Scriptures says “Whosoever will may come;” the disagreement is where does the sinner’s first will come from—God or man?

Arminianism, which is SEMI-PELAGIANISM, says that first will comes from fallen man—that is, man is not entirely corrupt and in total bondage to sin; rather, he is only diseased or crippled, and thus he is still capable, of his own volition, to make the first move toward God and godliness. (Ibid., p. 642.)

leaves God at the mercy of fallen man—that is, God cannot work unless fallen man decides to let Him work.

Because SP appealed so well to man’s desire to be able to do something for his own salvation, and because it appeared to “explain” the mystery of God in man’s terms, it has remained within the “walls” of the church, and never produced a separate sect. (Ibid.)

On the other hand, Augustinianism (defined as Calvinism) says that the first will must always come from God.

Pelagianism was externally vanquished by about the year 430. It was regarded as such a heresy that no Pelagian could be admitted to the church without an expressed recantation. (Ibid., p. 604.) Yet there were many in the church (Roman at the time) who could not agree with either Pelagius or Augustine’s doctrines of the bondage of man and the absolute election of grace, and they preferred a middle ground. (Ibid., p. 642.)

The current Arminianism vs. Calvinism is the old Pelagianism vs. Augustinianism controversy revived. And just as “Calvinism” was developed to oppose the encroaching Arminianism, so was “Augustinianism” developed to oppose the encroaching “Pelagianism,” only Augustine himself developed the system to be used against Pelagius, where Calvin did not develop “Calvinism.”

The Pelagius/Augustine conflict took place around 410-430. And the controversy was pretty much settled on the Augustine side until a man named Arminius came into history in the early 1600s.

**Arminianism**

Arminianism was named after a Dutch seminary professor, James Arminius. In the early 1600s, both public opinion and the state’s religious doctrine (the Churches of Holland) consisted of what was later called, Calvinism.

Arminianism vs. Calvinism

The leader of this new movement was John Cassian, a pupil of Chrysostom (to whom he attributed all that was good in his life and will), and the fountain-head of Gallic monasticism; and its chief champion at a somewhat later day is Faustus of Rhegium (Riez). *(The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, “Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings, First Series,”* vol. 5. B.B. Warfield’s “Introductory Essay on Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy,” p. 25. Ages, DVD.)

Cassian’s, and later, Arminian’s, system is a half-way house, containing elements of error and of truth, which makes it so dangerous. It has enough Bible truth to cause the followers of Arminians to say they believe the Bible, yet enough error to make salvation man’s responsibility. (See Jonah 2:9.)

Man, said Cassian, is not dead in trespasses and sins, but he is only sick, and is capable of helping himself—he can desire the help of a physician, and either accept or refuse that help when offered, but he must cooperate with the grace of God in his salvation. (Schaff, vol. III, p. 644.)

Examples of SP, or Arminianism: The Prodigal Son, Zacchaeus, the Penitent Thief and Cornelius speak of man being cured by any of them, them being the Trinity and the objects of redemption being all mankind. (In other words, the work of Christ was done based upon the promise of the Father that a multitude, more than could be numbered, would be given, by the Father, the faith to come to Him. Jn. 6:37.)

In other words, despite the work done by Christ, there was no guarantee to the less free and responsible for his acts, Gen. 50:19, 20; Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; and it makes no attempt to reconcile the two. We may not be able to harmonize them, but that does not necessarily mean that they are inherently contradictory. (Louis Berkhof, *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, Eerdmans, p. 87.)

Though Augustine died in 430, and Cassian died after 432, the controversy continued, with Prosper Aquitanus, taking up the Augustinian argument. But the Semi-Pelagian doctrine was the more popular, making great progress in France. (Schaff, p. 645.)

**MANY SERMONS TODAY ARE BASED UPON SEMI-PELAGIANISM. They are designed to cause the sinner to become emotional and make the first step.** Certainly, the Scriptures says “Whosoever will may come;” the disagreement is where does the sinner’s first will come from—God or man?

Arminianism, which is SEMI-PELAGIANISM, says that first will comes from fallen man—that is, man is not entirely corrupt and in total bondage to sin; rather, he is only diseased or crippled, and thus he is still capable, of his own volition, to make the first move toward God and godliness. (Ibid., p. 642.)

leaves God at the mercy of fallen man—that is, God cannot work unless fallen man decides to let Him work.

Because SP appealed so well to man’s desire to be able to do something for his own salvation, and because it appeared to “explain” the mystery of God in man’s terms, it has remained within the “walls” of the church, and never produced a separate sect. (Ibid.)

On the other hand, Augustinianism (defined as Calvinism) says that the first will must always come from God.

Pelagianism was externally vanquished by about the year 430. It was regarded as such a heresy that no Pelagian could be admitted to the church without an expressed recantation. (Ibid., p. 604.) Yet there were many in the church (Roman at the time) who could not agree with either Pelagius or Augustine’s doctrines of the bondage of man and the absolute election of grace, and they preferred a middle ground. (Ibid., p. 642.)

The current Arminianism vs. Calvinism is the old Pelagianism vs. Augustinianism controversy revived. And just as “Calvinism” was developed to oppose the encroaching Arminianism, so was “Augustinianism” developed to oppose the encroaching “Pelagianism,” only Augustine himself developed the system to be used against Pelagius, where Calvin did not develop “Calvinism.”

The Pelagius/Augustine conflict took place around 410-430. And the controversy was pretty much settled on the Augustine side until a man named Arminius came into history in the early 1600s.

**Arminianism**

Arminianism was named after a Dutch seminary professor, James Arminius. In the early 1600s, both public opinion and the state’s religious doctrine (the Churches of Holland) consisted of what was later called, Calvinism.

Arminianism died in 1609. A year later, 1610, his followers drew up a “Remonstrance”—that is, they drew up a protest against the State of Holland’s doctrinal position. The Churches of Holland held to the Heidelberg Catechism and to the Belgic Confession of Faith. The followers of James Arminius demanded that the Catechism and the Confession be changed to conform to the doctrinal views contained in their Remonstrance.

The followers of Arminius objected to the doctrines upheld by the Catechism and the Confession used by the Churches of Holland. The doctrines that the followers of Arminius were so much against consisted of 6 points:

1) Divine sovereignty. (Extra point not in the “5 Points.”)
2) Human inability.
3) Unconditional election, or predestination.
4) Particular redemption
5) Irresistible grace.
6) Perseverance of the saints.

The articles of the Remonstrance they drew up in protest can be summed up in five points:

I. God elects or reprobates on the basis of foreseen faith or unbelief.
II. Christ died for all men and for every man, although only believers are saved.
III. Man is so depraved that divine grace is necessary unto faith or any good deed.
IV. This grace may be resisted.

V. Whether all who are truly regenerate will certainly persevere in the faith is a point which needs further investigation.

(Roger Nicole, *Bakers Dictionary of Theology*, s.v., Arminianism.)

As for the last point, the perseverance of the saints, Arminians have agreed to disagree agreeably. Most of the Baptists I know are followers of Arminius. They hold to the first four points, yet hold dogmatically to the “perseverance of the saints.” And by claiming that one point, they try to say they are partly Calvinistic. Just holding to the Bible doctrine of the “security of the believer” does not make one a “Calvinist.”

The followers of Arminius had a problem with basically two points:

First, they held that Divine Sovereignty is not compatible with human freedom, nor with human responsibility.

A few Scriptures supporting Divine Sovereignty: Job 9:12, Psalms 33:10, 33:11, 115:3, 135:6, Daniel 4:17, 25, 26, 32, 35, 5:2, Isaiah 14:24-27, 40:13 (all of ch. 40), 46:10, Acts 4:28, Romans 11:36 (all of ch. 9 & 11), Ephesians 1:11, Romans 9 & 11. There are too many passages to list; the Word of God can be opened about anywhere, and Divine Sovereignty will leap from the pages.

Second, ability limits obligation—that is, if the natural man does not have the ability to come to Christ, then his obligation is limited. Therefore, they reasoned, since all men everywhere are commanded to repent and trust Christ, then it only stands to reason that the natural man has the ability to obey that command, for the Lord would not command anything of which man is not capable.


Because the followers of Arminius were unable to reconcile divine sovereignty with human freedom and responsibility, they drew two conclusions:

**Conclusion #1** Since the Bible regards faith as a free act that all men are called upon and are responsible to do, faith cannot be caused by God. Rather, they said, man can exercise faith independently of God, e.g., Romans 4:5.

**Conclusion #2** Since the Bible views faith as an obligation on the part of all who hear the gospel, then the natural ability to believe the gospel must be universal, or common with all men.

(See “Pelagius vs. Augustine” chart in this issue.)

Thus, the followers of Arminius had to view Scripture from their preconceived opinions in order to develop their basic 5 points of doctrine (conclusions that he cannot reject the gospel.

3) It is God’s foreseeing who will of their own accord believe that motivates God’s election of those who shall be saved.

4) Christ’s death did not ensure the salvation of anyone; it did not secure the gift of faith to anyone, for there is no such gift. Rather, what Christ’s death did was to create a possibility of salvation for anyone who would choose to believe.

5) It is, therefore, up to believers to keep themselves in the state of grace, and they do this by keeping up their faith. Those who fail to keep their faith fall away and are lost. But this is the point they could not agree on, so they left it open to individual understanding.

Arminianism made man’s salvation dependent upon man himself—the man must have the faith, and then he must keep the faith, rather than God working faith in him.


In other words, if faith is from man, as Arminianism claims (man has it within himself to exercise faith unto salvation), then man can lose his faith, and thus lose his salvation.

The followers of Arminius released their “Remonstrance” in 1610, and were insistent that the Churches of Holland change their doctrine to be in accord to their five points.

Keep in mind that the Arminians five points did not originate in the Word of God. Rather, they originated in the followers of Arminius inability to reconcile the Sovereignty of God with the idea of man’s free will, and the requirements they saw God place upon man because of what Scripture says about free will. Their five points were a result of reducing the Sovereign God of the Universe to the level of man’s understanding, something even the great Apostle Paul could not do, Romans 11:33. They needed a god they could understand, and insisted that all Christians bow to their god.

In response to the Arminians insistence in a change in orthodox church doctrine, the church called a Church Synod, or meeting, to discuss doctrine. The meeting was held in Dort, Holland, on November 13, 1618. It consisted of 84 members, including delegates from Germany, Palatinate, Switzerland, and England. There were 154 sessions held during the 7 months, as they met to consider the matters. The final meeting was held May 9, 1619.
The Synod declared that the Word of God alone could be used, and must be accepted as the rule of all faith and practice, something Arminians’ followers failed to do. Using Scripture alone, they could find no support for the Arminians’ five points, so they unanimously rejected the five points as **heretical**. (Which seems strange to us, for they have become a large part of modern Christian doctrine.) They felt, however, that a rejection was not enough, so they set about to answer the points from Scripture.

They held that the Bible sets forth a system of doctrine quite different from what was held by the Arminians, and they answered each of the five points from the Word of God.

The five points put forth by the Arminians was known as Arminianism. Though the Synod’s five points in response to the Arminians’ were put together 50 years after Calvin, they named the system, Calvinism, after the great French reformer, John Calvin (1509-1565). However, John Calvin had nothing to do with forming the system — the system came out of the Council of Dort, 1619. (I personally believe the “reformed faith” is a better term than is “Calvinism.” Thus I am a “reformed” pastor. See my short message on the Reformation in this *Examiner.*)

The Synod viewed salvation as a **work of grace from beginning to end.** It absolutely rejected any idea that the sinner could save himself or contribute to his own salvation in any way. Adam’s fall had completely ruined the race. All men were by nature spiritually dead, and their wills were now in bondage to sin and Satan. The ability to believe the gospel was in itself a gift from God, bestowed only upon those whom He had chosen to be the objects of His unmerited favor, and His grace bestowed only for His own good pleasure and glory. It was not man, but God who determined which sinners would be shown mercy and saved.

A chart in this issue shows the five points of Arminianism, which were rejected by the Synod, and the five points put together by the Synod to answer Arminianism, known today as Calvinism.

We must warn against reducing “Calvinism” to just these five points. The only reason for the five points was because they were put together to answer Arminianism’s five points.

**Questions to be answered:**

- **First,** are sinners wholly helpless in their sin? (This is the main point to deal with.)

- **Second,** is God to be thought of as saving sinners by His free, unconditional, unstoppable and irresistible grace, and for His own good pleasure? (Romans 9:19 *Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?* Acts 4:28.)

- **Third,** is God the author of not only justification, but also of the faith that is required for justification?

- **Fourth,** is Christianity a religion of utter reliance on God for salvation and all things necessary to it, or of self-reliance and self-effort?

The differences between the two faiths are obvious, and they are important. I cannot address the question, “Are Arminians saved?”

**Conclusion.**

Let us close this short study with a quote by Christopher Ness (1621-1705, Online Bible, ME, 1.01.) Mr. Ness was an English Nonconformist preacher and author. Because of his strong Calvinist faith, he was excommunicated no less than four times from churches in Ireland. He finally had to flee to London in 1684, where he preached in hiding from the officers of the crown. He died on December 26, 1705, at the age of 84.

**Concerning Arminianism:**

“Lest this overflowing deluge of Arminianism should bring destruction upon us, there is great need that some servants of Christ should run to stop the further spreading of this plague and leprosy. Thus Moses stood in the gap, and prevented the destruction of Israel —(Ps 105:23). Also (Nu 16:48), “He stood between the dead and the living; and the plague was stayed.” And the neglect of this duty the Lord complains of, that He found none of His servants to stand in the gap, etc. “O Israel, thy prophets are like the foxes in the deserts. Ye have not gone up into the gaps, neither made up the hedge for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. ... With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, ... by promising him life” (Eze 13:4, 5, 22). While I was considering these things, the Lord stirred up my spirit to do as is done in common conflagrations, when everyone runs with the best bucket he can get, wherewith to quench the devouring flames, and to stop them, that they may not lay waste all before them.” (Septem. 30th, 1700.)

Furthermore:

And the Arminians do call the justice of God to the level of man’s understanding, a feat that none the less free and responsible for his acts, Gen. 50:19, 20; Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; and it makes no attempt to reconcile the two. We may not be able to harmonize them, but that does not necessarily mean that they are inherently contradictory. (Louis Berkhof, *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, Eerdums, p. 87.)

Pelagius’ answer was that each person is created with perfect freedom to do good works. In other words, the moral condition of man is like the moral condition of Adam before the fall. Every child is born with the same ability and power with which Adam was created, and operates the same in heathens, Jews and Christians, except that in Christians it is aided by grace. (Schaff, p. 609.)

Note that though the unsaved might have “virtuous good works,” those good works are still sin before God, Romans 14:23.

Pelagius held that every infant comes into the world in the same condition as Adam was before the fall, his soul being created by God. Thus, man’s will being free, each person has the power within himself to believe the gospel, as well as to keep the law perfectly. Without free will, Pelagius held, God would have no willing service from Adam nor from Adam’s children; man is not free unless he has self-determination, with good and evil, life and death given into his hand. This theory concerning free will is the basis of Pelagianism and Arminianism. (Warfield, *Fathers*, p. 15.)

Pelagius held that.

“At first the light of nature was so strong that men by it alone could live in holiness. And it was only when men’s manners became so corrupt and tarnished nature began to be insufficient for holy living, that was restored to nature after its bluish had been impaired.” And so again, after the habit of sinning once more prevailed among men, and “the law became unequal to
Pelagius argued that Adam’s sin was simply an example for his children not to follow, and that Adam’s sin had no lasting consequence and physical death would have taken place regardless [see Rom. 5:12]; thus, he argued that Christ set the example for man to follow. And the natural man had within himself the power to do what he should, and should not attempt to do what he had not the natural power to perform. And if Divine Grace were given to man enabling him to choose good, then the delicate balance between the free will to do good or evil would be upset, and the integrity of his free will would be destroyed by God’s intervention with His grace. (The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, “Augustin: Anti-Pelagian Writings, First Series,” vol. 5. B.B. Warfield’s “Introductory Essay on Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy,” pp. 18, 19.)

Note that the BASIS OF THE STATIST EDUCATION and humanism is that the child is a blank slate, and with the proper education, he will make the right decisions; the child can thus be rescued from his self-destruction with enough education, not needing the Christian conversion of the Spirit of God. His problem is a lack of education, rather than his problem being sin. [As we mentioned last month, the Character Training programs see man’s problems as a lack of proper education.]. Hence, Arminianism and humanism go hand in hand. Arminian “Christianity” is, accordingly, a root cause of the moral decline of our day, for Arminianism holds that there is a natural, inborn ability in each child to choose good, so with the proper instruction, that child can choose the good and proper way that is pleasing to God.

Augustine maintained that human nature had been so completely corrupted by the fall that no one in himself has the ability to even desire to obey God, let alone keep His laws and believe the gospel. Faith is not an act of free will, as Pelagius taught, but was an act of God’s free grace which He gives only to those He chooses. [See Eph. 2:8, 9.]

How many books are written and religious services formulated for the purpose of persuading people to make the right decision — that is, choose God or Christ? The Arminian belief is that each person has a natural ability to choose good and God over evil. Notice that one of the key stops on the “Roman road to salvation” is Romans 3:10, but the very next verse is ignored: there is none that seeketh after God.

In other words, fallen man has no desire nor ability to seek after God — God must seek man. [I have asked Arminians about that verse, but they have no answer for it. See all of Psalms 14 and 53. 1 John 5:20, the Son of God must first give us an understanding, so that we may know Him that is camal mind is enmity against God, nor can it be made subject to the law of God, Romans 8:7.]

Fallen man is in bondage to sin from which he cannot free himself, nor raise himself by his own strength and resolution of his own will. Only the regenerating act of grace, received by humility and faith, can set him free to practice the goodness required of him by the Word of God. Only after being born again from above can the new man co-operate with the grace of God and grow in his Christian life.

Grace, Pelagius held, is available to all mankind, but the heathen are judged and damned because they do not use their free will and claim that grace; Christians, said Pelagius, on the other hand, are worthy of reward, God’s grace, because they use their free will to keep His commandments. (Schoff, p. 613.)

Note: If human nature is uncorrupted, and thus has the natural ability to please God, as maintained by Pelagius (that is, every man has within himself the power to do good apart from the first cause, which is God’s grace given before conversion), then there is no need for Christ. Man needs no Redeemer to create in him a new will and a new life. He simply needs an improver, for the work of salvation rests essentially in himself.

Accordingly, if Arminianism is true and man does indeed have within himself the ability and power to choose God and Christ, then there is no need for the Redeemer — man has within himself the power to please God without being born again, or converted. Arminianism leaves little or no room for the idea of redemption, atonement, regeneration and the new creation, for it denies the totally corrupt nature of fallen man.

Free Will is probably the major divide between Pelagianism/Semi-Pelagianism (or Arminianism) and Augustinianism/Calvinism. However, upon even a cursory examination of Scripture, we find that FREE WILL is impossible for fallen man, though Adam did have free will. Fallen man is now controlled by lust, for even his good works, apart from faith, are a result of his lust:

Romans 14:23 And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

Faith must be defined in the terms of faith in Christ Jesus.

Here we must also ask: Was the fall divine purpose, or was it divine permission?

This is the election of grace, or predestination. It is related to grace itself, as cause to effect, as preparation to execution. It is the ultimate, un-fathomable ground of salvation. It is distinguished from foreknowledge, as will from intelligence; it always implies intelligence, but is not always implied in it. God determines and knows beforehand what He will do; the fall of man, and the individual sins of men, He knows perfectly even from eternity, but He does not determine or will them, He only permits them... (Schoff, p. 639.)

Election may be defined as God’s eternal purpose to save some of the human race in and by Jesus Christ. (See Berkhof, p. 91.)

The objection is sometimes raised that this doctrine exposes God to the charge of injustice. But this is hardly correct. We can speak of injustice only when one party has a claim on another. If God owed forgiveness of sin and eternal life to all men, it would be an injustice if He saved only a limited number of them. But the situation is quite different where all have forfeited the blessings of God. No one has a right to call God to account for electing some and passing by others. He would have been perfectly just, if He had not saved any. Matt. 20:14, 15 ; Rom. 9:14, 15. (Ibid., 92.)

According to A.H. Strong:

I. ELECTION.

Election is that eternal act of God. It is by which in his sovereign pleasure and on account of no foreseen merit in them, he chooses certain out of the number of sinful men to be the recipients of the special grace of his Spirit and so to be made voluntary partakers of Christ’s salvation. In Romans 8:28-30, quoted above, “foreknew” = elected — that is, made certain individuals, in the future, the objects of his love and care; “fore-ordained” describes God’s designation of these same individuals to receive the special gift of salvation. In other words, “foreknowledge” is of persons and “foreordination” is of blessings to be bestowed upon them. Hooker, Eccl. Pol., appendix to book v, (vol. 2:751) — “’whom he did foreknow’ (know before as his own, with determination to be forever merciful to them) ‘he also predestinated to be conformed to the image of his son’ — predestinated, not to opportunity of conformation, but to conformation itself.” So, for substance, Calvin, Ruckert, DeWette, Stuart, Jowett, Vaughan. On 1 Peter 1:1, 2 see Com. of Plumptre. The Arminian interpretation of “whom he foreknew” (Romans 8:29) would require the phrase “as conformed to the image of his Son” to be conjoined with it. Paul, however, makes conformation to Christ to
be the result, not the foreordained condition, of God’s foreordination; see Commentaries of Hodge and Lange.

God did not decree the fall of man; rather, he decreed not to hinder sin, which makes future sinful acts absolutely certain. Nevertheless, he regulates and controls the results of sin, Psalms 76:10, Acts 14:16. (Ibid., p. 85ff.)

The election of grace is conditioned by no foreseen merit, but is absolutely free. God does not predestinate His children on account of their faith, for their faith is itself a gift of grace; but He predestinates them to faith and to holiness. Thus also the imputation of teaching that a man may be elect, and yet live a godless life, is precluded. Sanctification is the infallible effect of election. Those who are thus predestinately as vessels of mercy, may fall for a while, like David and Peter, but cannot finally fall from grace… (Schaff, p. 639.)

Election, hence, must include perseverance. Accordingly, those who fall away, though baptized professing believers, show they were never among the elect. We cannot certainly know in this life who are the elect, so we must call all to repentance and offer to all salvation, though the call will only be effectual in some. Romans 9 is probably the strongest passage in Scripture concerning election. On the other hand, we have I Timothy 2:4 telling us that the Lord wills that all men be saved. (I Timothy was written to Christians, so could it be that God wills that all of the elect be saved?) Admittedly, there is no human answer to the dilemma, and the truth lies somewhere between the two extremes of Calvinism and Arminianism:

Human understanding cannot fathom the depths of divine wisdom. We must trust in the righteousness of God. Every one of the damned suffers only the righteous punishment of his sins; while no saint can boast himself in his merits, since it is only of pure grace that he is saved. (Ibid., p. 646. See Semi-Pelagianism, [SP].)

3. Infant Baptism: Infant baptism is unnecessary since there is no original sin. (Note that the basis of infant baptism, therefore, was to wash away original sin. However, the Word of God is extremely clear: It is the blood of Christ that washes away sin, not the infant baptism, or denies infant baptism wash away original sin? If so, then why is the work of Christ and conversion needed, which I suppose is Rome’s position?)

Canon #2. Whoever rejects infant baptism, or denies original sin in children, so that the baptismal formula, “for the remission of sins,” would have to be taken not in a strict, but in a loose sense, let him be anathema. Canon #3. Whoever says, that in the kingdom of heaven, or elsewhere, there is a certain middle place, where children dying without baptism live happy (beat vivant), while yet without baptism they cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, i.e., into eternal life, let him be anathema.

Thus infant baptism is a hold-over from Rome; an unsustainable doctrine that made it through the Reformation. (I have a thorough study about the matter.) However, canon #3 is missing in many manuscripts, so is of doubtful authenticity. (Schaff, p. 626.)

4. Salvation: While salvation is possible without the law and the Gospel, or divine grace, these greatly help to attain salvation. Christ helps by His good example.

Pelagian’s heresy spread in North Africa, and got so bad that Augustine felt he had to oppose it. By the time of Augustine’s death in 430, Pelagianism was essentially defeated. Through Augustine’s efforts, Pelagianism never became a viable doctrine in the church. However, Semi-Pelagianism has become a major doctrine under James Arminius, i.e., Arminianism. (Who Was Who in Church History. See Schaff, vol. III, ch IV.)

The person and work of the Redeemer presupposes on the one hand man’s culpability (legally accountable) of redemption, and on the other his need of redemption.

The Greeks, particularly the Alexandrian fathers, emphasized human freedom, while holding to the necessity of divine grace. The Greek church held that it took the cooperation of the human will and divine grace working together in conversion. (Warfield, pp. 12ff.)

The Latin fathers emphasized the hold of hereditary sin, and man’s total inability to deal with that sin without divine grace, all without denying human freedom and individual accountability. The Latin fathers based their belief upon their personal experiences of their own out of which the Spirit of God lifted them. Thus, the Latin church gave God all the glory, and made freedom itself a work of God’s grace.

Pelagianism represented the principle which ascribes the chief cause of conversion to man, and reduces grace to a mere external auxiliary – that is, an external aid to help man do what is right. [However, grace is totally God-given; it is Him working in particular people to give them both the will and power to do His will even in salvation, Phil. 2:13.] It was not until Augustine’s death that a compromised system, a cross between the Greeks and Pelagian, took over the Western church, called Semi-Pelagianism.

Pelagius was an upright monk, who without inward conflicts won for himself, in a way of tranquil development, a legal piety which knew neither the depths of sin nor the heights of grace.

Augustine, on the other hand, passed through sharp convulsions and bitter conflicts, until he was overtaken by the unmerited grace of God, and created anew to a life of faith and love. Augustine stands second only to Paul in his logical powers and his influence upon the Reformers. The Pelagius-Augustine controversy took place around 410, and Pelagianism/Arminianism was identified as a heresy for over a thousand years.

Pelagianism emphasized personal freedom because that seemed right. Augustine emphasized Divine Sovereignty because Scripture taught Divine Sovereignty.

Both Pelagius and Augustine went to extremes—Pelagius’ human freedom in the work of conversion elevated man to the dignity of a self-redeemer; Augustine degraded man to an irrational machine. The truth must reconcile both factors and give full weight to both the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man, yet assign a preeminence to the divine agency that exalts the Creator and Redeemer above the sinful creature.

Though Augustine’s solution to the problem is not altogether satisfactory and his zeal against Pelagius inclined him to go to the opposite extreme, yet at all points he had Scripture, especially Paul’s epistles, on his side. And thus he dealt Pelagianism a death blow. However, the heresy did not stay dead. Its modern resurrection can be seen in James Arminius, and has now infiltrated every corner of Christian thought.

The Pelagian-Augustine controversy boils down to this question: IS REDEMPTION CHIEFLY THE WORK OF GOD OR OF MAN? Does man need to be born anew from above, or merely improved. Can man save himself? If man has the power of good
within himself, as claimed by Pelagian, why is Christ needed? The soul of Pelagian’s system is human freedom. The soul of Augustine’s system is divine grace.

The Calvinist Who Shot Back

Charl van Wyk is touring the United States. The Director of Africa Christian Action mission and presenter of the weekly radio program Salt and Light, van Wyk is also the chairman of Victims against Crime and author of “Shooting Back - The Right and Duty of Self-Defense.”

Van Wyk is the man who shot back at terrorists during the St. James massacre on July 25, 1993. That courageous action saved many lives as terrorists attempted to destroy a Christian congregation gathered for worship in South Africa. Terrorists struck down eleven and wounded another three before van Wyck drew his .38 revolver and evened the odds. Fear of armed Calvinites is credited with making Reformed churches in South Africa less tempting targets of criminal and revolutionary activity.

From p. 1, A Pilot Speaks

Common sense and logic dictates that pilots have a way of defending themselves from future terrorist activities. Prior to 9/11 pilots were trained to agree to the demands of hijackers. History has now irrevocably changed our approach. The policy has changed to one of defending ourselves at all costs. But of course pilots have nothing to defend the cockpit from attack. How could such a scenario exist where only the bad guys have weapons?

In having a better understanding of the ongoing debate over the arming of pilots we need to first look at history. History shows us that captains of vessels over thousands of years have had at their disposal the ultimate device for maintaining order, either a sword, a strong man, or a gun. The idea of persons in authority having the ultimate hammer in asserting their authority is not a new one. It’s Biblical too. “Spare the rod and spoil the child.” (See Pro. 13:24.) How can a parent exercise his authority without the means to do so? The civil authorities are God’s ministers who “wield the sword for those who do wrong”. (Rom. 13:4.) Without the sword, just how much authority can the civil authorities have? Some say, “come let us reason together.” This is a godless approach in dealing with the fallout from sin. Authority exists out of necessity. (Gen. 9:4.) Without it, we would have ensuing chaos. Imagine New York City without armed police officers. Interestingly enough, airline pilots were still allowed to carry firearms until 1987 when a crazed Fed Ex employee attacked the cockpit with an axe. Since then the airlines, not the FAA have denied pilots the ultimate means to exercise their authority.

In the aftermath of 9/11, one would think that pilots, after having been killed by their captors in four different aircraft, would now be armed. But the government’s strategy in dealing with future hijacking is to rely solely on passengers for in-flight security. The airlines and the government would prefer chaos and confusion in airplane cabins over deliberate and overwhelming action by the cockpit crew members in neutralizing any would-be intruder. Passenger vigilantism is not acceptable. The paying public did not pay to do that. The current policy which disarms cockpit crew members removes thousands of years of history and removes any true authority a captain might have in a repeat situation of 9/11.

Arming pilots can also be compared to other technical requirements for flying an airplane. If pilots can shoot (no pun intended) an approach down to 400 RVR, (400 feet of runway visibility), why can’t a pilot be trusted to shoot a terrorist intent on using an airplane as a missile?? Shooting a gun involves aim, don’t breathe, fire. Shooting an approach down to practically zero visibility involves a great deal of complex and when done incorrectly, 200 plus lives could be snuffed out in an instant. A mistake with one’s hands at 170 mph, descending toward the ground at 600 feet per minute at a few hundred feet above the ground while still in “the soup” can easily result in certain disaster. But if a pilot misses when shooting a gun, he merely fires again until he hits the intended target. Having an “accident” with a gun has far less repercussions than having an accident with 400,000 lbs of metal.

Contrary to popular opinion, stray bullets fired either by accident or in the heat of the battle, cannot bring an airplane down. There already exists a huge 3 foot square hole in the side of every pressurized airplane which must remain partially open in flight to prevent the aircraft from “overpressurizing”. This hole is in varying degrees closed by what is called an outflow valve. It is through the opening of the hole where compressed air created by the aircraft’s engines escapes after circulating throughout the cabin. During ground operations the outflow valve is completely open. As the aircraft climbs to a higher altitude the valve increasingly closes but still remains partially open. Even if the aircraft sustained a dozen holes due to gunfire, the outflow valve would merely close a bit more than usual under this scenario.

Fortunately, most commercial pilots have a military background. Consequently, they have been trained in the use of firearms. Most have qualified for the small arms expert award since such an accomplishment is usually achievable by individuals with good eye-hand coordination. Since pilots are conservative by nature, they gravitate toward conservative ideals and practices, including owning firearms. Thus, most pilots have been around firearms for many years and have plenty of training and experience. Many pilots, myself included, have concealed permits issued by states which have this type of provision. If the civil authorities consider people like us as trustworthy and capable, shouldn’t the same line of reasoning apply in our role as captains of airplanes??

The employment of tasers has also been a recent part of the ongoing “debate” surrounding the arming of pilots. Again, due to a lack of information or disinformation, most people think that this is a great alternative to deadly force. These same people are dead wrong. Tasers or “stun guns” cannot provide the ultimate authority. They have many limitations including their inability to penetrate heavy clothing such as leather jackets or objects that hijackers might place in front of their bodies. If the device hits a button or zipper, these too will render the device useless. The devices are only good for one or two shots as well.

As if this were not enough, the traveling public has also been given a false sense of security when informed about the new reinforced cockpit doors. Despite having additional locks and bars to strengthen cockpit doors, on several occasions during flight, the cockpit is as vulnerable now as it was prior to 9/11. Part of the experience of being a commercial pilot is fulfilling human needs such as eating and using the bathroom. Pilots, especially on international flights and longer domestic flights need to eat and drink to adequately maintain proper levels of hydration and sugar level. The need to use the bathroom is a natural consequence of doing so. Consequently, the cockpit door requires opening on several occasions while cruising at 37,000 feet over nothing but ocean water, hundreds of miles from anywhere. Unless the airplanes are redesigned which requires lots of money that the airlines don’t have right now, there will continue to be opportune times during a flight where hijackers will have direct access to the cockpit through a wide open doorway. Without guns, pilots will remain virtually defenseless during this period of vulnerability.

As many already know, security tests have demonstrated that 70% of knives are getting through security along with 30% of firearms. The current security system is likened to layers of swiss cheese piled on top of each other. Each layer of cheese has holes. The theory is that eventually all the holes will be filled by some other slice of swiss cheese that lays atop of it. Obviously the theory is proving quite inadequate. Since there still exists numerous holes in the current approach to combating would-be terrorists, to leave the pilots totally defenseless seems absurd. The only measure remaining when the swiss cheese approach has failed is to shoot down the aircraft with an F16. At the end of the day, pilots need something which will give them a last line of defense when all else has failed. Nearly every pas-
senger I have ever spoken with prefers an armed pi-
lot to an F16. As we mark the first anniversary of 9/ 
11 the dubious government policy of shooting down 
a commercial airplane full of passengers continues to 
be the preferred solution to any attempted hijacking. 
This is unacceptable and must be changed.

Bill Helbig

(Born in Evanston Illinois in 1952. Spent most of my 
younger years in Elk Grove Village, a northwest suburb of 
Chicago. Attended Southern Illinois University from 1970- 
1974. Married current wife of 28 years, Janet Whitaker 
during last year of college. Graduated with BS in Criminal 
Justice and commissioned a second Lieutenant from Air 
Laughlin AFB, TX. Air Force pilot from 1976-1998. During 
the following years flew T37s, T38s, and WC135s; an 
aircraft commander and instructor pilot. Upon completion 
of pilot training, stationed at McClellan AFB and Mather 
AFB in Sacramento, California. After 10 years of active 
duty, hired by American Airlines in 1985 and continued 
AFB in Sacramento, California. After 10 years of active 
duty, hired by American Airlines in 1985 and continued 
at Great Lakes Naval Training Center near Chicago, Il. 
Finished Air Force Reserves as a liaison to Civil Air Patrol 
Team as an augmentee at Travis Air Force Base on 12 
hour shifts. Assigned to Scott AFB near St Louis, Mo. as 
staff officer at Air Mobility Command HQ in 1995.

From p. 1, Israel First

This tendency shows up in modern notions of 
 salvation. Man, not God, is believed to determine who 
is saved. There are those who believe they can add 
names to the book of life, by having sinners pray a 
quickie prayer, getting them to “walk the aisle,” or 
make some sort of “decision.”

Then there are those who carry this thinking to its 
next level, claiming control over their own health 
and wealth with the “Prosperity Theology.” Believers are 
encouraged to “name it and claim it,” and tell God 
what color of Cadillac they want. God is no longer 
sovereign - He is now merely a heavenly butler who 
must stoop and bow to man’s selfish demands.

Finally, this rejection of God’s sovereignty and 
control over man’s destiny has been carried to its logi-
cal conclusion, by those who now believe they have 
the power to hasten the timing of Christ’s return, in 
order to satisfy their desire for a quick escape hatch 
from Planet Earth, without having to go to the bother 
of dying first.

Evangelical churches are filled with people who, 
for various motives, want Christ to hurry up and “rap-
ture” them out of this life. There are the elderly who 
are suffering from arthritis, rheumatism, lumbago and 
other assorted aches and pains, and who long for 
their transformed resurrection body without having 
to go through the unpleasant process of dying.

Then there are those who are struggling with 
irresolvable family problems, and those who have run 
debts they cannot repay. There are also many who 
have decided that the current tense world situation 
must inevitably lead to Armaged-
don, and that there is no longer 
any power in Christianity to over-
come such adversities.

All of these folks share the 
same sentiment - “Stop 
the world, I want to get off.” An un-
official part of the evangelical 
pastor’s job description is to 
provide regular ritual assurances, 
based on the alleged “signs of the 
times” and the ongoing turmoil 
in the Middle East, that “it won’t 
be long now” until Christ returns 
to rescue every Christian from his 
peculiar dilemma or source of 
 anxiety. 

For some, this is not enough. 
The promised Rapture that was 
supposed to happen in 1988, or 
in 2000, and in almost every intervening year, has not 
come. People feel that the game of life has gone into a 
very unwelcome overtime, and they are casting 
about for ways to get it over with and hasten Christ’s 
Coming.

They have been taught that “Christ cannot come 
until the Jewish Temple is rebuilt in Jerusalem.” There 
is no shred of Biblical evidence for this teaching, but 
people have heard it so often that they blindly accept 
it as a fundamental principle of their faith. Their mo-
tive for supporting this project is not to increase the 
market share of Judaism over the next 100 years; rather, it is to pave the way for Christ to return, or 
even to force Him to return.

Evangelist Jack Van Impe, in his “Intelligence Briefing” for October, 1996, stated that “According to Revelation 11:1-2 and 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4, the Jewish Temple must be rebuilt before the return of Jesus Christ.”

Prophecy teacher Hal Lindsey, in his 1970 book “The Late Great Planet Earth,” taught the same thing: “There remains but one more event to completely set the stage for Israel’s part in the last great act of her historical drama. This is to rebuild the ancient Temple of worship upon its old site ... Obstacle or no obstacle, it is certain that the Temple will be rebuilt. Prophecy demands it.” (p. 55-56)

In 1994, Lindsey in his book “Planet Earth - 2000 AD” went on to say, “Folk, the footsteps of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, can already be heard as He approaches the doors of heaven to return. The Temple is the last sign that needs to fall into place before events irreversibly speed toward the return of Christ.”

The web site “secondcoming.freeservers.com” states, “How and when the Third Temple will be built is not known, BUT IT IS CLEAR THAT GOD HAS DECLARED THAT IT WILL BE BUILT 3 ½ TO 7 YEARS BEFORE THE END OF THIS AGE.” The logical corollary of this is, if you are sick and tired of waiting for Christ to return, then don’t just stand there, do something to get the Temple built!

The New York Times Magazine, in an article en-
titled “Jerusalem Endgames” on October 3, 1999, reported on “Christians who want to see the Jewish Temple 
rebuilt - and destroyed - to bring on Armaged-
don.”

The FBI report en-
titled “Project Megiddo,” dated October 1999, 
warns that “the primary concern is that extreme 
millennial cults will engage 
in proactive violence de-
designed to hasten the 
Second Coming of Christ. 
Perhaps the most likely 
scenario involves an at-
tack on the Al-Aqsa Mosque or the Dome of 
the Rock. Some millennial cults hold that these 
structures must be destroyed so that the Jewish Temple 
can be rebuilt, which they see as a prerequisite for 
the return of the Messiah.”

False rumors are generated and passed on, to 
ergize and excite the gullible faithful. Samuele 
Bacchiocchi, commenting on a rumor about marble 
blocks being imported from Indiana to build the 
Jerusalem Temple, states that “the entire story has 
been flatly denied, both by the Israeli government 
and by industry sources in Indiana. Such a fanciful fabri-
cation reflects the unusual interest of some dispensationalists in helping God to fulfill what they 
believe to be a crucial End-time prophecy.”

Then there is the favorite urban legend about a 
red heifer in Mississippi, which is imagined to be a 
sign of the Rapture, even though the Bible says noth-
ing about this. The New York Times on December 
27, 1998 reported that “The Rev. Clyde Lott, Can-
ton, Miss., a Pentecostal minister, interprets passages 
27, 1998 reported that “The Rev. Clyde Lott, Can-
ton, Miss., a Pentecostal minister, interprets passages 
sign of the Rapture, even though the Bible says noth-
ing about this. The New York Times on December 
27, 1998 reported that “The Rev. Clyde Lott, Can-
ton, Miss., a Pentecostal minister, interprets passages 
sign of the Rapture, even though the Bible says noth-
ing about this. The New York Times on December 
27, 1998 reported that “The Rev. Clyde Lott, Can-
ton, Miss., a Pentecostal minister, interprets passages 
sign of the Rapture, even though the Bible says noth-

The Jewish Telegraph Agency, reporting on Sep-
tember 2, 1999 on “Mississippi preacher devotes life 
to birthing red heifer in Israel,” states that “The cows, 
the first of what Lott hopes will be 50,000 sent to the 
Jewish state, are part of his plan to fulfill a biblical 
prophecy that a red heifer be born in Israel to bring 
about the ‘Second Coming’ of Jesus. The return of 
Jesus is part of the Christian apocalyptic vision of the 
end of time, which includes the slaughter of those who 
don’t accept the Christian messiah as their savior.”
Lott’s activities, involving war in the Middle East in order to get Christ to return, have been extensively and favorably reported on by evangelical Christian publications. The assumption is that Lott is doing God’s work, by helping Jews to put their trust in the ashes of a dead bull rather than in the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the Cross.

Grace Halsell, in her 1999 book “Forcing God’s Hand — Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture and Destruction of Planet Earth,” has extensively documented the fact that fundamentalist Christians in America are raising millions of dollars to be given to Jewish terrorists so they can blow up the Muslim holy sites in Jerusalem and build a Jewish temple. The motive is to trigger World War III, so Christ will have to return.

Recently, Yizhar Be’er, director of the Keshev Center for the Protection of Democracy in Israel, warned of “total apocalypse” as a result of “these Temple Mount lovers [who] want ideologically and practically to build the 3rd Jewish Temple where the mosques now stand,” and he complained that these extremists, many of them with convictions for violent activities, are receiving financial backing from fundamentalist Christians.

Today there are many evangelical Christians who, based on their rejection of God’s sovereignty, their selfish, man-centered Arminian theology, and their impatience for Christ’s return, are actively trying to have the entire planet blown to kingdom come, so they can have their way. They want their “pre-trib Rapture,” and they want it now. If the Palestinians appear to stand in the way of the Temple, then they must be expelled at all costs.

Those whose main ideological and theological thrust is “Armageddon Now” appear to want their “pre-trib Rapture,” and they want it now. If the Palestinians appear to stand in the way of the Temple, then they must be expelled at all costs.

Death of the Church Victorious is now ready. I have corrected the printer’s proof copy, and have returned the corrected files to Sovereign Grace Publishers.
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The paperback will be ready the end of July, and the hardback should be ready in September. 473 pages, counting the 15 pages of index.
We can offer both paper and hard copy at a 30% discount, plus $5.00 shipping. It can be ordered from The Biblical Examiner, PO Box 81, Bentonville VA 22610 Or you can order it from Christian Literature World (PO Box 4908, Lafayette IN 47903) also with a 30% discount. I don’t know what they will charge for postage, but it will probably be $5.00.
After it is listed in “Books in print,” it can be obtained through your local bookstore and web sites such as amazon.com. I don’t know what the cost will be through them.
The reason you are reading about this film today, several months before its scheduled release, is not because Hollywood expects it to compete against the likes of “Spiderman,” “Lord of the Rings,” or “Star Wars.” Instead, through a series of Providential circumstances I was most fortunate and blessed to meet the director and producer and be one of the handful of individuals allowed to view the director’s cut of the film. But before I give you the details, the events that led to this movie review warrant some background.

In 1992, my best friend and I drove to our local movie theater in Enterprise, Alabama, to watch a film that was not heavily publicized, but nonetheless exciting for us. The movie was “Gettysburg,” and it focused on that bloodiest of battles in American military history. As a Civil War reenactor, I was captivated by the sight of 5,000 Confederate soldiers marching up Cemetery Ridge during Pickett’s charge and the brave Alabamians who charged up Little Round Top time after time against Lawrence Chamberlain’s 20th Maine. The movie won several accolades, and its soundtrack is still the best seller of all time.

Nine years later, I had taken up residence in the beautiful Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. I was married with children and working as a political and business consultant. During my stay in Virginia, I befriended Howard Phillips, a long-time Washington insider and Conservative stalwart. One of the first things I found out about Howard Phillips was that he knew everyone in Washington, D.C. The second thing I found out about Howard was that he knew a lot of people outside of Washington, D.C., as well—including Ron Maxwell, the director and producer of “Gettysburg.”

From conversations with Howard, I discovered that Mr. Maxwell was in the process of raising the funds to produce the prequel (story before the beginning, ed.) to “Gettysburg,” focusing on the legacy of Stonewall Jackson. (We live on Stonewall Jackson Hwy outside of Front Royal, Bro Need.) The movie would be filmed entirely in Virginia and Maryland, and reenactors would again be needed. I could not resist. My wife and I, along with two of our sons, volunteered and spent several days during the summer of 2001 as extras for the movie Gods and Generals.

During the fall of 2001, I moved my family back to Enterprise, AL, and proceeded to begin a new life in the Deep South. Then, one evening in the early spring, I received a call from Mr. Phillips. Howard told me he had a project he wanted me to consider. The project would consist of my assisting with the promotion of “Gods and Generals” to the Christian home schooling community. This would entail my flying out to Los Angeles to view the 6½ hour director’s cut of the movie. Three days later, I was on a plane to Los Angeles.

When I returned to Alabama three days later, I felt greatly privileged, for I had not witnessed a mere motion picture, but possibly one of the greatest films on America’s past that had ever been produced.

First of all, the cinematography in the film is exquisite. The mythic beauty of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia and Maryland are shown for the world to enjoy, and they provide the perfect backdrop for the story. While other American producers are filming movies in Eastern Europe and other locations much cheaper than the U.S.A., people watching this film will see the same mountains, ride through the same valleys, and gaze upon the crystal rivers that Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee struggled to defend.

The film also contains a first-class cast. Robert Duvall plays the immortal Robert E. Lee. Jeff Daniels returns to portray the die-hard Joshua Chamberlain, and Stephen Lang adds accolades to his career by portraying the legendary Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson. Lang, out of all the actors, makes the film worth seeing. His representation is sincere and flawless. Lang obviously put his heart and soul into his character and merits the praise of more than this humble film critic.

There are numerous improvements in this film over its predecessor. The Cause of the South is presented in the raw, free from caveats and political correctness and strictly from the view of those engaged in the struggle. The film also focuses a considerable amount of time on the lives and actions of southern blacks. Slaves in this film are not presented as two-dimensional characters. You don’t see any happy, banjo-picking “darkies,” but you also don’t see the equally fictitious Kunta Kinte prepared for his daily whipping. Instead, the character of the southern black is beautifully portrayed in all his complexities. Some blacks are slaves and earnestly desire their freedom. Others are fiercely loyal to their masters. Still others are content with their lot in life, but desire something better for their children. And finally, you have southern black freemen, who work for wages and fight alongside their white countrymen to defend their homes. In other words, Afro-Americans in “Gods and Generals” are treated as complex human beings—not mindless serfs designed to promote a revisionist historical agenda. Hats off to Ron Maxwell for his historical integrity in writing the screenplay.

Another improvement over “Gettysburg” was the use of digital computer animation to fill the battlefield with historically accurate numbers of troops. In the past, forming and costuming a cast of thousands was a logistical nightmare and financially prohibitive. But thanks to today’s technology, moviegoers will see Civil War battlefields containing tens of thousands of troops marshaled in Napoleonic style. They will see the beauty of the parade formations and battle lines. They will gaze at the courage of young boys and old men who leave the farm and storefront to face the gruesome onslaught of grape-shot and canister fire. They will see the horrid results of battlefield tactics that predated the technological advancement of modern weapons.

Viewers will also feast on the poetry of the men who sang in battle and performed deeds that characterized those of knights living at the time when chivalry was in full bloom. They will see Robert E. Lee unselfishly turn down an offer to command all Union Forces at the beginning of the War in order to fulfill his duty to his native state—his “county.” Moviegoers will listen as Col. Chamberlain recites Latin war poetry as he watches the Irish Brigade charge valiantly against the Confederate works at Fredericksburg. Viewers will envy the tender relationship between Stonewall Jackson and his wife and weep bitterly at the untimely but brave death of this Christian soldier following his greatest military triumph at Chancellorsville.

Because of the particular focus upon Generals Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson, “Gods and Generals” will seem for many Southerners (black and white) like the Phoenix of their Lost Cause rising from the ashes to live again in their memories and sing the praises of their brave ancestors. For all other Americans, regardless of their personal ancestry, “Gods and Generals” will show our present generation the mettle and quality of the men and women who came before us and, consequently, stand as an exhortation for our nation to imitate their testimonies and become great again.

Matthew L. Chancey is Bettie’s son-in-law, married to her oldest daughter, Jennie. <sensibility.com>
FIVE POINTS OF “ARMINIANISM”

1. **Free Will or Human Ability**

   Although human nature was seriously affected by the fall, man has not been left in a state of total spiritual helplessness. God graciously enables every sinner to repent and believe but He does so in such a manner as not to interfere with man’s freedom. Each sinner possesses a free will, and his eternal destiny depends on how he uses it. Man’s freedom consists of his ability to choose good over evil in spiritual matters; his will is not enslaved to his sinful nature. The sinner has the power to either cooperate with God’s Spirit and be regenerated or resist God’s grace and perish. The lost sinner needs the Spirit’s assistance, but He does not have to be regenerated by the Spirit before he can believe, for faith is man’s act and precedes the new birth. Faith is the sinner’s gift to God; it is man’s contribution to salvation.

2. **Conditional Election**

   God’s choice of certain individuals unto salvation before the foundation of the world was based upon His foreseeing that they would respond to His call. He selected only those whom He knew would of themselves freely believe the gospel. Election therefore was determined by or conditioned upon what man would do. The faith which God foresaw and upon which He based His choice was not given to the sinner by God (it was not created by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit) but resulted solely from man’s will. It was left entirely up to man as to who would believe and therefore as to who would be elected unto salvation. God chose those whom He knew would, of their own free will, choose Christ. Thus the sinner’s choice of Christ, not God’s choice of the sinner, is the ultimate cause of salvation.

3. **Universal Redemption or General Atonement**

   Christ’s redeeming work made it possible for everyone to be saved but did not actually secure the salvation of anyone. Although Christ died for all men and for every man, only those who believe in Him are saved. His death enabled God to pardon sinners on the condition that they believe, but it did not actually put away anyone’s sins. Christ’s redemption becomes effective only if man chooses to accept it.

4. **The Holy Spirit Can Be Effectually Resisted**

   The Spirit calls inwardly all those who are called outwardly by the gospel invitation; He does all that He can to bring every sinner to salvation. But inasmuch as man is free, he can successfully resist the Spirit’s call. The Spirit cannot regenerate the sinner until he believes; faith (which is man’s contribution) precedes and makes possible the new birth. Thus, man’s free will limits the Spirit in the application of Christ’s saving work. The Holy Spirit can only draw to Christ those who allow Him to have His way with them. Until a sinner responds, the Spirit cannot give life. God’s grace, therefore, is not invincible; it can be, and often is, resisted and thwarted by man.

5. **Falling from Grace**

   Those who believe and are truly saved can lose their salvation by failing to keep up their faith, etc.

   All Arminians have not been agreed on this point; some have held that believers are eternally secure in Christ—that once a sinner is regenerated, he can never be lost.

According to Arminianism:

   Salvation is accomplished through the combined efforts of God (who takes the initiative) and man (who must respond)—man’s response being the determining factor. God has provided salvation for everyone, but His provision becomes effective only for those who, of their own free will, “choose” to cooperate with Him and accept His offer of grace. At the crucial point, man’s will plays a decisive role; thus man, not God, determines who will be the recipients of the gift of salvation.

According to Calvinism:

   Salvation is accomplished by the almighty power of the Triune God. The Father chose a people, the Son died for them, the Holy Spirit makes Christ’s death effective by bringing the elect to faith and repentance, thereby causing them to willingly obey the gospel. The entire process (election, redemption, regeneration) is the work of God and is by grace alone. Thus God, not man, determines who will be the recipients of the gift of salvation.

(Holding to the doctrine of “Eternal Security” does not make one a “Calvinist.” Thus, the general Baptist doctrine of our day is basically “Arminian.” Where did each view originate?)
Money is a medium of exchange. An ethical exchange must be value given for value received. If money is to represent value, it must represent a cost. (This is the deficiency of paper money; it represents no value. Paper money is government-sponsored counterfeiting. It is government offering paper or credit of no value to represent value. It has always been a means of government assuming power at no loss to itself. Just as spending counterfeit money that you produce on your color copier would give you spending power at no cost, governments get tremendous power by creating costless money. Even though paper money is a fraudulent money, it is made legal tender and citizens are forced to accept it as representative of cost.) Thus, when we exchange our labor or goods for a given amount of money, we call this exchange their cost. Likewise, when we give money away, it represents a cost or value that we surrender.

Giving money to Christian work thus costs us something, and this is a cost God commands us to assume. Greek dualism has caused us to assume a false dichotomy between the spiritual and the physical realms. But God created man with a soul in a physical body and environment. We will also receive new bodies at the resurrection and will serve God in a new heaven and a new (physical) earth. We must not deprecate either the physical or the spiritual realities of our creaturehood.

Emphasis on the spiritual aspect of our new birth should not cause us to lose sight of our physical, earthly context and its requirements. Work is one of those requirements. Work was a requirement of our first parents even before the Fall. Money is a medium of exchange which represents the value of our work. When we give tithes and offerings, we are, in effect, transferring our work in one area to work in God’s service.

A proper emphasis on our physical context and duty, however, should not make us confident that this is the essence or measurement of God’s work. We cannot buy God’s kingdom, nor can we orchestrate it by our work. Obedience must not become presumption.

If we believe that God is Sovereign over His creation, and that its spiritual and physical aspects find ultimate meaning and resolution in Him, we will focus on our duty as He describes it in His revelation. The old hymn rightly teaches us to “trust and obey.” The first reaction of faith ought to be obedience to the Sovereign in Whom we profess faith. The great and basic error of so much modern theology is that it places the theologian or academic in the position of explaining away God’s own words. Otto Scott once correctly noted that C.I. Scofield’s error began when, “He tried to edit God.”

Tithes and Offerings

God requires tithes and offerings. Those antinomians who oppose the teaching of tithes in favor of Spirit-led free-will giving must assume the duty of explaining why either the Spirit’s or the believer’s will would demand less than God required. That requirement began with the basic tithe which was ten percent (Lev. 27:30-33). The rejoining tithe and the poor tithe may have increased the overall tithe to as much as fifteen percent. Only what was given above that amount was a free-will offering. The tithe itself was an obligation before God.

The tithe went to the Levites who used it for various social functions, including education. The poor tithe went directly to the needy. A tenth of the basic tithe went to the priests for ecclesiastical purposes (Num. 18:26-28). Thus, much of what are now functions of civil government were administered by a separate non-profit religious organization, the Levites. We cannot reconstitute the Levites, but we can see that the basic government of the Hebrew theocracy was the self-government of the faithful covenant man with private-sector funding supplying most social needs. God warned the Hebrews of the high price they would pay for a monarchy (1 Sam 8: 14-17). Today, we still pay for letting the state assume responsibility for social functions. If the high price of state taxation then causes Christians to stop giving tithes and offerings, Christian work will be most affected. This is the sad state in which the church finds itself today. God does not want our “tips” nor does He offer us “tithe-credits” for what we pay the state. What we lose to the state in taxes does not lessen our responsibility to God.

God commanded that His work be funded by tithes and offerings. Obeying God’s command to labor in His kingdom cannot be confused with legalism or attempting to orchestrate the kingdom. It is a matter of obedience. It is, moreover, not legitimate to seek to fund the kingdom through free enterprise endeavors alone. It is legitimate to encourage God’s people to succeed financially. It is legitimate to dedicate a business or investment to funding God’s work. These can generate tithes and offerings to God’s work. However, it is not legitimate to think that a few such enterprises will fund God’s kingdom. It is not the profits from a few that God wants; it is the tithes from all that He has commanded.

Accumulating Capital

Many people are familiar with the Asian method of accumulating family capital. A large extended family will live together in humble surroundings, pool their resources, and quickly accumulate a large amount of capital. Their work is transferred to money and quickly represents a financial and social power. (This method is not exclusive to Asians, but was common amongst various ethnic immigrant groups who came to this country and wanted to get ahead. It is still a viable model of capitalization.) Additionally, part of the legislative clout of the homosexual lobby is their generous giving tendencies; this gives them a lobbying power far in excess of their numbers. The power accumulated by these groups could be dwarfed by the power that would be represented by tithing Christians.

Money represents power. That is a good and moral thing. Money represents power because it represents value which depends on the input of labor. We realize, of course, that money is not enough for God’s work because human labor alone is not enough. However, to the extent we deprecate money, we devalue labor, man’s first calling.

A great deal of effort is expended trying to encourage “free-will” giving. Often the slick emotional appeal takes precedence over the reasoned need. Most successful are emergency appeals for defensive fights against evil. The tithe and offering went to work-oriented ministries by those committed to their necessity. Like the bulk of any person’s vocation, Christian work is predominately mundane and fatiguing (see Gen. 3:17-19). This is all the more reason God’s servants must be supported.

It is common to hear people say that they feel their labors are unproductive for God. Directly, this may be true, but tithes and offerings are, if properly dispensed, a transfer of labor to the Lord’s work through the labor-representing medium of money. Do you want to do more for the Lord? Tithe! Do you want to do yet more? Give Him your offerings!
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Americans, the real enemy
FBI May Spy on Christians

Most Americans will read this next article and think, “Oh, that’s fine that Mr. Ashcroft made it easy for the FBI to freely snoop on ‘radical Muslim’ religious organizations.”

What the article does not address is whether the elements within the FBI who have an open propensity towards occult religion, and AGAINST CHRISTIAN religion, have been rooted out by Mr. Ashcroft.

In 1999, the FBI issued a report which specifically targeted Christians as potential terrorists! The “Project Megiddo” report said (in essence) that Christians who believe the Constitution gives them certain “inalienable rights” — and particularly Christians who own firearms — are “extremists” who may spontaneously turn into “terrorists” without warning. Mr. Ashcroft has not denounced the report, so this anti-Christian sentiment must persist within the FBI.

The article also does not point out that this same new policy — giving the FBI free rein to spy on Muslims — likewise permits the monitoring of Christians as well. Thanks, Mr. Ashcroft.


(The links in this report have not been updated so some may no longer work.)

FBI Given More Latitude
New Surveillance Rules Remove Evidence Hurdle

By Susan Schmidt and Dan Eggen Washington Post Staff Writers Thursday, May 30, 2002; Page A01

New Justice Department guidelines to be unveiled today will give FBI agents latitude to monitor Internet sites, libraries and religious institutions without first having to offer evidence of potential criminal activity, officials said yesterday.

SCAN THIS NEWS, 1.04.2002

I’m sending this out for one simple reason: In spite of what you have been led to believe through reports of the government’s “show trial” against the software wizards.

A memo leaked this week to technology writers and宾馆 managers states in essence: if the government wants and can prove you are using Linux, the government can make you pay via “trolling”

In a Dec. 26 memo leaked this week to technology writers, the FBI said it plans to give agents latitude to monitor Internet sites, libraries and religious institutions.

The FBI is “looking for a ‘target’ completely without your knowledge which would be necessary in order for the FBI’s ‘Magic Lantern’ program to function.”

http://www.windows-sucks.com/content/ms-hidden-files.shtml

Microsoft has recently secured a patent for a “Digital Rights Management Operating System” which, arguably grants Microsoft complete control over all content generated on all computers!

http://cryptome.org/ms-drm-os.htm

This DRM system effectively grants Microsoft control over Internet content.

The next generation of Microsoft products will be what is referred to as “thin client,” meaning that you will not in any way “own” the software but will lease or rent it on a per-use or timed basis.

The bottom line is that Microsoft is working aggressively to take away our freedom to use the Internet and our computers as we wish.

I strongly urge everyone to buy and install a copy of Linux and begin using the alternative to the Windows operating system. A friend gave me a copy for Christmas and I am making the switch.

Scott

Microsoft memo to staff: Clobber Linux

http://www.usatoday.com/money/tech/2002-01-04-01

“Online Bible Millennium Edition 1.12.”

Contains well over 600 megs of material, including, but certainly not limited to:

- 660,000 cross references * Over 5000 topics * Bible Dictionary
- Bible key to s My numbers * Greek and Hebrew lexicon * A.T. Robertson Word Pictures in the Greek New Testament * Ten English versions including KJV, RSV, ASV * Home School Material * full color maps * COMMENTARIES — Family NT Bible Notes, People’s NT Notes, Calvin (whole Bible, added to 1.11). The Four Fold Gospel, notes on gospels, Eclectic Notes (Ex, Mt, Ro complete), Complete & Concise Matthew Henry, Smith’s Bible Dict, Poole, Barnes’ NT Notes, 1599 Geneva Bible notes (which alone makes this CD well worth the cost), John Gill’s 10,000,000 word exposition (i.e., comments on every Bible verse, & his 1,000,000 word “Body of Divinity”), JFB, Spurgeon’s “Treasury of David” (& his “Morning & Evening”) * Marginal Readings (Foot Notes) * Word search in the commentaries. * Lots more

$35, post paid. Audio CD available for an additional $47 (post paid) with Alexander Scourby reading the 1769. AV. Because of the cost involved with Scourby’s reading. I will only order this CD as I receive the money, so allow a couple weeks to get the program.

More information or order from: Ovid Need, The Biblical Examiner, PO Box 81, Bentonville VA 22610

Homeschooler, From p. 20

respondents could give more than one reason. - Source: U.S. Depart of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Parent Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program- 1999)

Can give child better education at home 48.9%
Religious reasons 38.4%
Poor learning environment at school 25.6%
Family reasons 16.8%
To develop character/ Morality 15.1%
Object to what school teaches 12.1%
School does not challenge child 11.6%
Other problems with available schools 11.5%
Student behavior problems at school 9.0%
Child has special needs/disability 8.2%
Transportation/convenience 2.7%
Child not old enough to enter school 1.8%
Want private school but cannot afford it 1.7%
Parent’s career 1.5%
Could not get into desired school 1.5%
Public schools or school districts sometimes offer support for homeschoolers by providing parents with a curriculum, books and materials, places to meet, and the opportunity for home schooled children to attend classes and participate in extracurricular activities at the school. Research has found only a small percentage of homeschoolers enrolled in these classes and using these textbooks or libraries when they were made available by the public schools and that many homeschoolers did not want public support.

TYPES OF SUPPORT: % AVAILABLE

% USED
Curriculum 12.4 8.1
Books/Materials 12.6 10.6
Place for parents to meet or get information 8.9 6.4
Extracurricular activities 21.5 6.4
Chance to attend some classes 16.5 2.8
I would like to thank the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement - NCES 2001-033 for supplying much of the statistical information. I would also like to thank NCES for information from their work.

Faith Christian Ministries now has new Character-based Home School program. Check it out.

<http://www.faithchristianmin.org/>

Bro Cates’ schedule:
HOME SCHOOLING IN THE UNITED STATES

In the spring of 1999, an estimated 850,000 students nationwide were being home schooled. This amounted to 1.7 percent of the U.S. students, ages 5 to 17, with a grade equivalent of kindergarten through grade 12. Four out of five homeschoolers were home schooled totally and one out of five homeschoolers were enrolled in public or private schools part time.

There has been continued growth in the parent-led home school movement and it parallels a simultaneous decline in the enrollment in other forms of education. About 1.5 to 1.9 million students in grades K-12 were home schooled during 2000-2001.

The key reasons for home educating their children are varied. These reasons included being able to give their children a better education at home, for religious reasons and because of a poor learning environment at school. Also some have gone this way because of special needs that their children have that are not being met by other means of education - both public and private.

Patricia Lines of the U.S. Department of Education concluded that home education families “…have not turned their backs on the broader social contract as understood at the time of the Founding of America. They are…asserting their historic individual rights so that they may form more meaningful bonds with family and community. In doing so, they are not abdicating from the American agreement. To the contrary, they are affirming it.”

Home educators and their families are not dependent on public, tax-funded resources. In fact, they seem to be saving taxpayers at least $61 million per year. Neither do they, in general, have a strong desire for access to tax-funded resources.

Home educators’ children are learning well. They do not need or want regulation and will strongly oppose it. The parents will not likely be coaxed into more regulation by the lure of offered services.

They want to be understood and treated as people and educators with a serious purpose and integrity.

Dr. Howard Richman and his colleagues have found that the home educated score on the average at the 86th percentile in reading and the 73rd percentile in math. The national average is 50th percentile. Repeatedly, across the nation, the home educated score as well as or better than those in conventional schools.

Dr. Larry Shyers observed children in free play and group interaction activities. Conventionally schooled children had significantly more problem behaviors than did the home educated. This is probably because the primary models of behavior for the home educated are their parents. Home educated children are more mature and better socialized than those sent to school according to Thomas Smedley’s personal interaction and communications approach to understanding socialization. Dr. Gary Knowles, of the University of Michigan, explored adults who were home educated. None were unemployed and none were on welfare, 94% said home education prepared them to be independent persons, 79% said it helped them interact with individuals from different levels or society, and they strongly supported the home education method.

A greater percentage of homeschoolers compared to non homeschoolers were white, non-Hispanic. At the same time, a smaller percentage of homeschoolers were black. These figures are changing rapidly though since 1999.

The household income of homeschoolers in 1999 was no different than non homeschoolers. However, parents of homeschoolers had higher levels of educational attainment than did the parents of non homeschoolers.

A much greater percentage of homeschoolers than non homeschoolers came from families with three or more children. 62 percent of home schooled students were part of families with three or more children compared to 44 percent of non homeschoolers. Homeschoolers were just as likely to be an only child as non homeschoolers and were less likely than non homeschoolers to have just one sibling.

In order to home school, parents may need to dedicate a significant amount of time to schooling their children. Because of the time required, HOME SCHOOLING usually involves two parents, one who home schools. Rudner in 1999 found that 97 percent of HOME SCHOOLING parents were married couples.

The household income of HOME SCHOOLING families was higher than the median household income of families with children nationwide. NHES in 1999 reported that the household income of homeschoolers reported in ranges from less than $25,000 to over $75,000, is the same as the household income of non homeschoolers. The same percentage of home schooled and non home schooled students lived in households with annual incomes of $50,000 or less.

Parents’ highest educational attainment was clearly associated with HOME SCHOOLING. Parents of homeschoolers had higher levels of educational attainment than did parents of non homeschoolers. 37 percent of parents of non homeschoolers did not complete any schooling beyond highschool compared to 19 percent of parents of homeschoolers. Conversely, 25 percent of parents of homeschoolers attained bachelor’s degrees as their highest degree, compared to 16 percent of parents of non homeschoolers. Urbanicity refers to the classification of households as urban or rural. The percentage of homeschoolers living in a city was about 9 percentage points lower than the percentage for non homeschoolers. There were non statistically significant differences between the percentages of homeschoolers and non homeschoolers living in towns or rural areas.

DETAILS ON PARENTS’ REASONS FOR HOME SCHOOLING: percentages will not add to 100 percent because

We Need Your Help

The PO now charges 70 cents per address change. We normally have 40 or so address changes per mailing (and many of those are wrong because of PO foul-ups. Please notify us of your address change. Also, the PO does not notify us of 911 changes. I understand the carriers don’t get paid to do that, so they don’t. When your address changes with the 911, we lose your mailing address.

Obviously, we had to change printers when we moved, and the new one does not use a size that can be folded for a “letter” mailing permit. So the Examiner must now be mailed as “flats.” The cost for “flats” is significantly more than letter size.

Cont. on p. 19