



Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146, CARDWELL QLD 4849, Australia

Ph: 07-4066 0146 Fax: 07-4066 0226 (International 61-7 instead of 07)

“Blessed be the LORD God of *Israel*; For He hath visited and redeemed *His* people, And hath raised up an horn of salvation for *us* in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began; That *we* should be saved from *our* enemies and from the hand of all that hate *us*; to perform the mercy promised to *our* fathers and to remember his holy covenant; The oath which he swore to *our* father Abraham, That he would grant unto *us*, that *we* being delivered out of the hand of *our* enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of *our* lives.” Luke 1:68-75; the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavian people are *ISRAEL!*

#206

Newsletter

May AD2003

CHOOSING A SPOUSE BY FAITH

- - Not feelings - -

By John W. Thompson

Three fathers, in teamwork with their sons or daughters, may approach the life-transforming choice of a spouse in one of three contrasting ways. “Pat Pragmatic,” the first father, believes that the Scriptures don’t really address the issue of choosing a spouse, at least not adequately. So Pat thinks about this matter practically, figuring his son or daughter will meet many potential mates in the classroom or the youth group or the work place, will date around to find one who is compatible, and then will marry. Yes, Pat admits that his children will likely sustain some spiritual and emotional injuries in the process, but he thinks that the betrothal approach to marriage just isn’t sensible for today’s culture - it’s unrealistically ideal. After all, you can’t buck the whole world, can you?

At the other end of the spectrum is “Mark Mystic.” Mark says he believes that the Bible is the completed revelation of God to man. Yet he doesn’t always act like it. In personal issues like this, Mark claims that God will give him direct, supernatural guidance through inner impressions. So, as he applies the courtship and betrothal principles, he looks at the matter almost mystically, presuming that God will provide him (or perhaps his son or daughter) a special inward prompting when the right spouse comes along. How Mark will distinguish that supernatural feeling from a strong desire to marry, he’s not really sure. But he certainly hopes that special feeling comes before the kids reach age forty!

In the middle of this spectrum is “Sam Scripture.” Sam is convinced of the sufficiency of Scripture for “*everything* pertaining to life and godliness,” as Peter so hopefully declares in 2 Peter 1:3-4. And with the Apostle Paul, he is certain that the Scripture makes a “man of God *adequate*, equipped for every good work” (2 Tim 3:17), including the good work of choosing a spouse. So Sam has explored the scriptural pattern of getting spouses (or is that ‘spice’ - mouse-mice, spouse-spice??) for his children; and he is carefully applying the principles of betrothal with faith in a sovereign God, confident that “God will withhold no good thing from those who walk uprightly” (Ps 84:1). Whereas Pat Pragmatic holds to something LESS than the sufficiency of Scripture, and Mark Mystic believes in something more than the sufficiency of Scripture, Sam rests assuredly on the completed revelation of God’s Word alone - “*Sola Scriptura*” as the great Reformers called it.

Now the “pragmatic” view of choosing a spouse will most naturally lead to the modern dating scene as Pat discovered above. This approach to marriage we have already shown in an earlier article to be fraught with grave error and danger. It is Mark’s “mystical” view of choosing a spouse

that we hope to remedy in this present article. For it is this “feeling orientation” to the doctrine of guidance which underlies much deception and desire-driven living among evangelical Christians today, particularly in the area of romance.

To “test” your own view of choosing a spouse, try taking the following quiz:

QUIZ ON CHOOSING A SPOUSE

(True of False)

T/F/ 1. In all the world, there is either NO person or only ONE person who is eligible to be my spouse.

T/F/ 2. If God wants me to remain single and I marry anyone at all, then I am outside God’s will.

T/F 3. If God has a particular spouse chosen and I marry someone else, then I am outside God’s will.

T/F 4. If the spouse God has selected for me marries someone else, then I cannot enjoy God’s perfect will no matter what I do.

T/F 5. If either a man or a woman marries outside of God’s will, there is nothing they can do to reverse the decision and return to the center of His will. They are permanently stranded in the barren terrain of God’s “second best.”

Did you answer “**True**” to most of the quiz questions? Actually, the correct answer for all five questions is “**False**.” Surprised? Then read on!

Christians today, more than at any other time in church history, have embraced a fallacy that extensively shapes and directs our lives. It is an error in the doctrine

IN THIS ISSUE:

Choosing a Spouse by Faith,	1
Facts About Mandatory Seat Belt Laws	7
The Christian Home School & the Covenant.. ..	9
Election, Don Elmore,	11
Searching for True Love (video)	2
Drugs Never Cure Disease (video)	3
Tapes of The Month	4
If God Could Save Everyone, Would He? (book) ..	5
New Tapes	6
Discovering Australia’s Christian Heritage	7

The views and opinions expressed in the articles herein or herewith are those of the authors and not necessarily those of CIM. They are written by fallible men. You must ask Jesus to guide your studies!

of guidance, or how to know the will of God. We all want to make right decisions, because those decisions will then turn around and make us, either for good or for ill. So the central question before us is, "How does God guide us? How do we know His will for us?"

WHAT "GOD'S WILL" MEANS

But first, what does "God's will" mean? In Christian conversation we use the phrase in three different ways. For example, in talking to a grieving friend who has lost a close relative in a tragic accident, we might say, "The Bible says everything is part of God's will, and though we may not understand why these things occur, we can be comforted in knowing that a wise and loving God is in control." Here we are referring to God's "sovereign will."

In another situation, we might be speaking to a Christian friend considering marriage to an unbeliever whom we would warn, "If you marry her, you will be disobeying God's will." Now we are speaking about God's "moral will."

Finally, to an acquaintance considering several job offers, we might ask, "Have you discovered God's will about which job He wants you to accept?" Here we are talking about God's "individual will." What do we mean in each of these three instances?

By God's "sovereign will" (called "providence" by the Reformers), we mean His secret **plan** which determines everything that happens in the universe (Eph. 1:11). In eternity past God formulated a perfect plan for all of history. The world was created by His will, kings rule by His will, and our salvation is the result of God working all things after the counsel of His sovereign will. He even determines each toss of the dice in a Monopoly game (Prov. 16:33). No one or no thing can resist or frustrate His sovereign will which will surely come to pass. And yet, though God determines all things, He does so without being the author of sin, without violating the will of man, and without destroying the reality of decision making. Each one of us is held responsible for every decision we make.

Our second usage, God's "moral will," refers to His moral precepts, principles, and practices revealed in the Bible that teach how men ought to believe and live (Deut. 29:29). The Bible reveals 100 percent of God's moral will. It is for this reason the Apostle Paul states in Romans 2:18 that even the unbelieving Jews knew God's will (right from wrong) because they had the Scriptures. The fact remains however, that there are many things which the moral will of God does not declare - specific situations where you must make choices. You have to decide where you will live (we covered this in last month's newsletter, CIM), what church to join, which person to marry, what job to take, and a host of smaller decisions every day. How are these specific decisions to be made?

Many Christians today claim that these specific decisions are to be guided by God's "individual will" - God's ideal, detailed life-plan uniquely designed for each person (Prov. 16:9). It is popularly taught that God's individual will encompasses every decision we make and is progressively revealed by the indwelling Holy Spirit to the heart of the individual believer through various means such as circumstances, personal desires, and inner feelings. This individualized aspect of God's will is variously called God's "perfect" will, God's "specific" will, God's "ideal" will, or the "center of God's

will." And to abide within God's "moral" will but miss God's "perfect" will results in what some authors have called "God's second best." In marriage, this means choosing the right spouse or else living with God's second best. You can change cars, houses, schools, or churches if you discover you've missed God's will, but the choice of a spouse is irreversible for a committed Christian.

TESTING THE CONCEPT OF GOD'S "INDIVIDUAL WILL"

With one's entire future at stake, a wise Christian parent or young person will surely want to "test" this doctrine of guidance, apply what is true and avoid what is not (1 Thess. 5:21). Like the noble-minded Bereans, we ought to "examine the Scriptures daily to see whether these things are so" (Acts 17:11). Is it really true (biblical) that God leads Christians through circumstances and feelings into His "individual will" for them, something more specific and detailed than the Word of God itself?

Four arguments have been offered in support of the concept that God has an "individual will" for each person: reason, experience, biblical example, and biblical teaching. First, it is claimed that because God is a God of order (1 Cor. 14:40) and because God knows the future perfectly (Matt 11:21f.), then it is only reasonable that God would use these abilities to formulate and reveal an individual life plan for each of us. What great king has no design for his people? What wise shepherd has no path for his sheep? What loving father has no specific direction for his sons and daughters? It's only reasonable to say that God has an individual plan for each of His precious children.

But is that actually the case? Does an effective king seek to legislate every activity of his people? No, he establishes basic laws to promote righteousness and determines penalties for noncompliance. He doesn't desire a nation of slaves or robots, but a people who act responsibly within the limits of the law. Likewise, the wise shepherd sets boundaries for his sheep, but allows freedom of movement within those boundaries. He establishes limits for the safety of the sheep, but doesn't use his staff to point out every tuft of grass for each animal to eat. And does the loving father guide every detail of his child's life? The truly caring father teaches his child the basic principles of life, right from wrong, wise from foolish. He then seeks to train the child to make wise decisions on the basis of principles learned in his youth. Yes, God does guide His people like a King, a Shepherd, and a Father. But reason supports that God guides us through His moral will given in the Bible, teaching His children to wisely use their freedom in the application of His principles to the decisions of life.

Wait a minute, you think. What about the experiences of dedicated believers throughout church history, men like Martin Luther, John Wesley, David Livingstone, and Hudson Taylor. Those men attributed their spiritual successes to knowing God's individual will for their lives and doing it. But is that the correct explanation? Are there any other factors that might account for their successes? It seems equally possible that those great men and women of God were successful because of their obedience to God's

new video
SEARCHING FOR TRUE LOVE
by *Joshua Harris*, author of the book: **I Kissed Dating Good-bye**. We all want love that's real - love that's not going to let us down. But when it comes to romance, most feel like we're wandering without a road map. Very few know what love is or how to find it. In three parts - 1. **LOVE**: a heart-piercing message about practicing love as God defines it, sincere and selfless. 2. **PURITY**: A practical message on how to live a life-style of purity in an age of compromise. 3. **TRUST**: An inspiring and humorous message about placing your hope in God and waiting on His timing for romance. (late teen-young adults)
CI-357 LOAN ONLY SUG.DON. \$6



moral will in the Bible. In fact, spiritual success is actually promised by God to the one who obeys what God has revealed in His Word: "...*be careful to do according to all the law which Moses My servant commanded you; do not turn from it to the right or to the left, so that you may have success wherever you go* ... , *be careful to do according to all that is written in it, for then you will make your way prosperous, and then you will have success*"(Josh 1:7-8). Blessing, God says, comes as the result of knowing and obeying the moral will of God revealed in the Bible (cf. John 13:17, 2 Tim. 3:16f.).

If God's individual will can't be proved from reason or experience, surely we can argue it from the many biblical examples. After all, didn't the Apostle Paul claim that God guided him *specifically* in his Macedonian vision of Acts 16? And in other instances, the Lord led Ananias to Paul in Acts 9 and Peter to Cornelius in Acts 10. In fact, God's individual will is evident in the lives of Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, Elijah, Josiah, Ruth, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and many others.

But examples in Scripture must be handled with great care. Many events are recorded in the Bible primarily because they were unique occurrences in the outworking of God's salvation in history. So what must be determined in each case is whether the example was intended to illustrate *normative* Christian behaviour. Should one expect a light and a voice from heaven to accompany a call to a particular vocation, as Paul experienced in Acts 9? Was this normative? God spoke to Balaam through a donkey in Numbers 22. Should each believer keep one in his backyard just in case? Yes, the Bible has many examples of men and women who received supernatural guidance from God through visions, angelic messengers, physical miracles, and even an audible voice from God. But in fact, this was not even the norm for believers in Bible times. Even for the Apostle Paul, most of his decisions were based solely on God's precepts and principles. And the average believer in Bible times who did not hold a unique office such as apostle, prophet, judge, or king NEVER received any supernatural revelation.

Well, if the biblical examples do not prove "God's individual will" for Christians, then what about the specific Scripture passages where the believers are instructed to know and do God's will for their lives? Apart from the non-normative biblical examples just discussed, there are only about a dozen Scriptures that even hint at an individual will of God for Christians to follow. And with each of these Scripture passages, the problem is poor interpretation that does not take into account either the context or the word meanings. In every case, it can be shown that the biblical writer is referring not to an individual will but rather to the moral will of God. For example, Isaiah 30:20-21 ("... your ears will hear a word behind you") is often quoted to describe the inward work of the Holy Spirit giving specific guidance of God's individual will. Yet if the additions and capitalizations (which are not in the original) are left out, it becomes clear from the context that the voice behind them was not an "inner voice of the Holy Spirit" but rather the voice of a prophet coming out of hiding (vv 8-11) to teach repentant Israel (v.19) the "way" of God's Law.

After testing arguments for "God's individual will" - reason, experience, biblical example and biblical teaching - this third use of God's will is found to have no valid support

from Scripture, even though it is commonly (and confusingly) taught in modern churches. Though seldom believed before this present century, it has become so accepted today that most Christians don't know how to think "outside the box." This is particularly crucial for such a life-transforming decision as choosing a spouse. So let's do some final testing of the trappings associated with "God's individual will."

The individual will of God has been compared to a personalized road map that shows the one, specific, detailed route you should take through life, including all the decisions you will ever make. It is taught that God does not show us our whole journey all at once but gives us "road signs" along the way as we need them, four of which are circumstances, results, inner impressions, and personal desires. Yet in actuality Scripture reveals that these are four ways God does NOT guide us. Let's evaluate them one by one.

CIRCUMSTANCES DO NOT GUIDE US

First, as believers in the sovereignty of God, we know that no circumstance develops by chance because God is the sovereign Ruler over all things, including the circumstances that surround the decisions we make. It is reasoned, therefore, that just as we read our Bible because God wrote it, so also we should "read" our circumstances because God providentially controls them to reveal His individual will to us. "Open and closed doors" are said to be two of the most obvious circumstances through which God reveals His individual will. Paul was directed

to stay in Ephesus by an open door (1 Cor. 16:8-9). And he regularly prayed that God would open other doors for him (Col. 4:3).

"Putting out a fleece" is yet another circumstantial sign. This is the practice of asking God to speak directly through a providential sign agreed upon beforehand. It comes from the story of Gideon in Judges 6:36-40 where Gideon asked God to answer "yes" or "no" concerning his battle against the Midianites through the use of a fleece of wool or sheepskin. This same method of discerning God's individual will was used by Abraham's servant who asked God to use a circumstantial sign to reveal the right bride for Isaac. Even before he finished praying, Rebekah appeared and immediately fulfilled the sign by providing water not only for the servant but for his caravan of camels as well (Gen. 24).

But are these examples *normative* for believers today - or even for believers in Bible days? Does God in fact, reveal His specific, individual will in advance to us for everyday decisions through circumstances, such as open or closed doors and fleeces? And how can we be sure we are interpreting the circumstances correctly, since Scripture gives no guidelines for this. Contrary to popular belief, the Bible actually does not support the "road sign" of circumstances. The Bible teaches that God's *sovereign* will (also known as God's Plan) is purposely hidden from man, and that His *moral* will is already revealed in its entirety in the Bible: "The secret things [His sovereign will/plan] belong to the Lord our God, but the things revealed [His moral will] belong to us and to our sons forever, that we may observe all the words of this law" (Deut. 29:29). Circumstances, then, are not designed to "give hints" about God's future sovereign will or about His moral will either.

New Video CI-343 LOAN ONLY!

Drugs Never Cure Disease!, Lorraine Day, M.D. (third in this series) *reveals the astonishing fact that germs DON'T cause disease - even though ALL conventional medicine, with all its massive use of "therapeutic" drugs is based on the INCORRECT premise that germs do cause disease. If you're going down the wrong road, all the money, brilliant scientists and hard work will just bring you in to the wrong destination faster and more expensively!*

sug. don. Loan \$6



In fact, Solomon made it clear in Ecclesiastes 1 that trying to interpret our circumstances makes life seem futile: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity," he declared. It often appears that God favors the wicked and resists the righteous, says Asaph in Psalm 73. Apart from the Bible's teaching that God is at work in history, the raw data of circumstances is often mysterious and conflicting. It shouldn't be surprising, therefore, to read in John 9:2-3 that those who attempted to interpret circumstances failed in their efforts. Similarly, the Lord had to correct a wrong interpretation of the circumstances in Luke 13:1-3 when He explained that a group of Galileans killed by Pilate were not greater sinners than others (cf. also vv 4-5). Such events were determined by the sovereign will of God; they were not circumstantial "signs" to be interpreted for daily guidance.

God has His wise and sovereign reasons for each event in history, but He does not regularly give man a running commentary of His reasons, just as Solomon observed in Ecclesiastes 11:5-6, "Just as you do not know the path of the wind ,, so you do not know the activity of God who makes all things. Sow your seed in the morning, and do not be idle in the evening, for you do not know whether morning or evening sowing will succeed, or whether both of them alike will be good." We just "do not know" the activity of God because we cannot and should not interpret the divinely controlled circumstances around us. It's like the farm boy who ran to tell his father that he had to leave the farm because he'd just been "called to the ministry." The clouds had floated by in the shape of a P and a C, which he interpreted to mean "preach Christ." His dad, however, deciphered the sign differently, and told him to get back to work since God was telling him to "plant corn," "pick cotton," "punch cows," and "pluck chickens."

Probably the classic interpreters of circumstances were Job's "comforters" - Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar. After sitting silently with the afflicted Job for seven days, they thought they were wise enough to interpret his circumstances for the next nine chapters. You know what? They were wrong nine chapters out of nine! Only God really knew what was going on. And when did God finally reveal to Job the divine interpretation of his troubles? He never did! God just wanted Job to trust Him for the present as well as the future. And that is how God wants us to live too - by faith, not by interpreting circumstances.

NEITHER DOORS NOR FLEECES

But doesn't Scripture speak of open and closed doors? If these are not circumstantial "road signs" from the Lord, then what are they? How does one distinguish between an open door and one that's only ajar? And who opened the door anyway? How do you differentiate between a closed door and a test of faith?

The phrase "open door" in Scripture is a figure of speech for access to something or an opportunity to do something. For instance, in Acts 14:27, Paul and Barnabas reported how God "had opened a door of faith to the Gentiles [Israel nations in dispersion, CIM]," meaning that the nations had been given an opportunity to hear the gospel and believe. But the question is, does an "open door" constitute individual direction from God that must be obeyed, or is an "open door" simply an opportunity that may be taken or bypassed depending upon the judgment of the believer?

Paul seems to answer that question by his remark in 1

Cor. 16:8-9. Verse 9 reveals two very important reasons for Paul to stay in Ephesus a while longer. On the positive side, "a wide door for effective service" had opened for him; on the negative side, there were "many adversaries" trying to close that door. In short, Paul decided to remain in Ephesus to utilize the opportunity and to neutralize the opposition. He didn't look upon this door as a "road sign" commanding him to stay in Ephesus but rather as an opportunity to spread God's message and combat God's enemies.

Again in Colossians 4:3, Paul wasn't praying for a circumstantial sign, but rather for an opportunity to preach the gospel, "a door for the word." Lest there be any question that an "open door" in Scripture is not a "road sign" to be obeyed but rather an opportunity to be evaluated, look at 2 Cor. 2:12-13. Here is an "open door" from which the Apostle Paul walked away! When Titus did not meet him in Troas as planned, Paul became so concerned that he left Troas, open door and all, and went looking for him

in Macedonia. Now if an open door constitutes a road sign from God to be obeyed, then Paul's action would be unexplainable. But if an open door is an opportunity to be considered and weighed (and possibly bypassed) in light of other factors, then Paul's action was clearly understandable.

What does Scripture say about "closed doors"? Not a word! Yes, the concept of a "closed door" is found in Scripture, but it simply means the absence of an "open door" of

opportunity. For example, in Acts 16:7 when the Spirit did not "permit" Paul and Silas and Timothy to go into Bithynia, God sovereignly accomplished this by not giving them an "open door" of opportunity. And when ever Paul was sovereignly prevented from pursuing a godly plan, he didn't interpret it as a "no" answer from God but simply waited and tried again later (cf. Rom. 1:10-13).

What about this issue of "putting out a fleece" as a circumstantial sign of God's individual will? Is Gideon's practice a model for believers today? Let's notice several differences between Gideon's fleece in Judges 6 and today's practice of "putting out a fleece." In the first place, Gideon's fleece was not simply a circumstantial sign, it was a miraculous display of supernatural power. Gideon had already been visited by the messenger of the Lord, his offering had been consumed by fire from the rock, and God Himself had spoken aloud to Gideon. Now he was asking God for another genuine miracle of the fleece being wet with dew while the surrounding ground remained dry, something far different than, say, someone inquiring about your house before you advertise it for sale!

Second, Gideon wasn't using the fleece to gain guidance, but to gain confirmation of guidance that had already been given, guidance that had come through supernatural means. So Gideon was not seeking the right decision but enough faith to believe that God would deliver Israel through him.

Third, rather than being an example of a proper approach to receive guidance, Gideon's demand for further signs was really an expression of doubt and fear which God graciously tolerated, certainly not a model for us to follow.

In summary, then, Gideon was not seeking a circum-

Tapes of the Month

#A-7323 **Are We Obedient To The Faith?**

pastor Sheldon Emry. *A study of the true tenets of "the faith" outlined in the New Testament.*

#A-7404, A-7405 **Ezekiel 16-Old Jerusalem? Or America?** in 4 parts. *This very strange chapter is a complete mystery when applied to ancient Israel, but becomes very clear when applied to modern America.*

3 tapes this month \$12



stantial sign but a miraculous one; he didn't use a fleece to obtain guidance, but to confirm guidance already given; and his motivation wasn't a desire to do God's will but a reluctance to do God's will.

The other primary example of "putting out a fleece" is Abraham's servant, Eliezar, getting a bride for Isaac in Genesis 24. Does this passage teach that Christians are to seek detailed guidance beyond the moral will of God in the Bible? In this way we are to discover the specific person we're supposed to marry? No, the experience of Abraham's servant is an example of God's special, supernatural guidance which was not even the norm for believers in Bible times. Here was a unique incident in the salvation history of the Old Testament where God had promised Abraham in Genesis 15 that he would have innumerable descendants. But that promise first required the birth of a son, and that son had to have a wife. For this reason, the servant based his request on God's covenant-keeping character as one who is faithful to his promise - the literal meaning of "lovingkindness" in Genesis 24:14. Therefore, this example does not depict the *normal* father using the *normal* method to pick a *normal* wife for his *normal* son. Rather, this was the fulfillment of a special covenant with Abraham, using angelic assistance and a supernatural "fleece" to bring about success.

Having seen, then, that God does not communicate His will through circumstances, what about the second "road sign" of results or blessings? Actually, this is often viewed as a way of confirming God's will more than determining God's will, since God's will is said to bring good results or blessings to the believer. A good result is like the sign at your destination that reads, "Welcome, you made it." You were pretty sure you had followed the directions accurately, but that final sign assures you that you stayed on course.

But is this what the Bible teaches? It seems that if positive results and blessing are proof of God's will, then Jeremiah was never in God's will! In fact, many of God's servants throughout the Bible and church history have been faithful in their ministries yet have encountered nothing but difficulties and obstacles in life. Are they to be labelled as failures? Was their lack of results due to being out of God's will? The Bible teaches that results must always be viewed within the framework of God's sovereignty. And God's sovereign plan for His universe presently includes both good and evil. A day is coming when God will judge all evil and reward all good. But until then, we cannot interpret results or blessings as a sign or confirmation of God's will.

IMPRESSIONS DO NOT GUIDE US

The third "road sign" which is said to direct us to God's individual will is the "inner prompting" of the Holy Spirit. Since the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit dwells within each one who puts his trust in Jesus Christ. And one of the Spirit's many wonderful ministries is the leading and guiding of believers: "But when it, the spirit of truth comes, it will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13). "For all who are led by the spirit (or mindset) of God, these are the sons of God" (Rom 8:14). This inward guidance is sometimes called the "inner voice" because it comes from within our heart, not outside our body. It is described as "the still small voice" in contrast to physically audible sounds. "Inner impression, inward burden, inner witness, and checks in the spirit" are other expressions used to distinguish the nature of this guidance. Possibly the most common designation for this road

sign is the "peace of God" which is said to come when we are in the center of God's will (Col 3:15).

But herein is the dilemma of subjectivism. Christians who base their decisions on "feeling led" or "sensing God's will" can have widely different, even contradictory convictions. One father told me he had three different young men claim it was "God's will" for them to marry his daughter. Hmmm! How do you argue against the "inner impression" of a Christian who claims that God told him this or God told him that? You can't, because there is no objective standard (the Bible) by which his claims can be evaluated. This view of God's will can make Christians susceptible to all sorts of doctrinal error and deception. After all, how can one tell these impressions are from God or some other source? We know that inner impressions can come from any number of causes: God, human emotions, hormonal imbalance, sleep loss, medication, sickness, or even a Big Mac. Sinful impressions are

obviously not from God. But what about non-moral impressions, like whether to buy one car or another? Scripture gives absolutely no guidelines for distinguishing the source of your inner impressions. Tremendous frustration has been experienced by sincere Christians who have earnestly but fruitlessly sought to interpret the meaning of their inner impressions. Yes, impressions are real in that we do experience them. But they do not reveal God's will. Two examples, I think, will illustrate this.

First, if you read very many Bible commentaries, you will

soon begin to notice that no scholar writing his interpretation of the verses will appeal to inner impressions" as his guide to the Scripture. If an inner prompting is a good guide to God's will, then why do all the hard work of serious Bible study, learning the original languages and the principles of Biblical interpretation? Why not just say, "God, tell me the correct interpretation through your inner voice"? Would you trust a Bible scholar who came to his conclusions that way?

A second example of the problem with subjective impressions would be the typical decision made by a church's leadership or by a whole congregation. When two, or ten, or two hundred people must all have the same inward leading on an issue, the process becomes very complicated. Should a church require a unanimous leading before proceeding with a decision? What if the decision can't be postponed, but everybody has a different leading? What if equally godly men line up on opposite sides of the issue? How can you resolve an issue when some Christians think the Holy Spirit is telling them to vote "yes" and other Christians think they Holy Spirit is telling them to vote "no"?

But doesn't the Bible teach that one of the ministries of the Holy Spirit is to lead believers? The answer, of course, is yes. The issue, however, is not *whether* Holy Spirit leads us but *how* it leads us. Romans 8:14 is often quoted as proof that the Spirit leads believers through inner impressions into the "individual" will of God. But look at the context of this verse. First, the context is not dealing with daily decision making in non-moral areas. Second, this verse gives no indication whatever that the means of leading is by inward impressions. And third, there is no hint at all that the goal of the leading is the "individual will of God."

New Booklet IF GOD COULD SAVE EVERYONE, WOULD HE?

Dr. Stephen E. Jones

The belief that God cannot do some things, or that God is limited in His ability, is fairly common among Christians. Many think that God's ability to act is limited by man's "free will." People often think that God either cannot override man's will or that He is incapable of making man change his will to conform to the will of God.

#439 @ sug don \$2.50



What the Apostle Paul is discussing in this passage is righteous living, not which car to buy or which woman to marry. The issue set before us (beginning in 8:1) is the contrast between living according to the Spirit versus living according to the flesh, or put simply in vs 7, obedience versus disobedience to the Law of God contained in the Bible. It is Paul's answer to the problem of slavery to sin raised in chapter 7. In this context, then, "being led by the Spirit of God" is simply another way of describing "living according to the spirit" in which the Christian is "putting to death the deeds of the body" by obeying the moral will of God in the Bible.

But what about the next few verses of Romans 8, especially verse 16: "The spirit itself bears witness with our spirit...."? Doesn't this verse teach about an "inner witness"? Again, the context does not describe daily decision making. In verse 15 our "spirit" (i.e. our inner person), because it has been regenerated through spiritual adoption, cried out "Abba, Father." But why? Verse 16 explains that the Spirit bears witness to us, that is, it illumines our understanding of Scripture that the promises of God are now ours (cf. 1 Cor 2:14).

Another prominent passage on the leading of holy spirit declares, "the spirit of truth ... will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13). This promise is directed not to all believers but specifically to the Apostles to whom He was speaking. And the truth that Jesus would give them (truth that "you cannot bear now" and truth about "what is to come") was not inner impulses for daily decision making but direct revelation from holy spirit for writing the New Testament, truths related to Christ's death, resurrection and second coming.

WHAT ABOUT "PEACE"?

Perhaps the most common allusion to inner impressions is having "the peace of Christ" when we are in the center of God's will (Col. 3:15). Yet in this passage, Paul is writing not about God's provision for our decision making but about maintaining love and unity in the body of Christ. The word peace can mean one of two things in Scripture - either the absence of *anxiety* within a person or the absence of *hostility* between persons. The whole appeal of Colossians 3:15-17 is for believers to manifest Christ-like attitudes and virtues that will result in experiential unity among believers. So which definition of peace fits this context? Surely Paul is talking about the absence of *hostility* between believers, not a warm fuzzy feeling. He's calling us to peace with one another, not inner peace within our soul. The whole subject of inner guidance is entirely foreign to the context.

But what about the "lack of peace" - the lack of tranquility - you might have in the process of decision making? How do you explain it? What is the source of this anxiety? Well, it could be your conscience. If you are pursuing a course of action in violation of God's Word, then your conscience will produce a feeling of guilt. But if your decision is not a matter of disobeying God's revealed will, then like we said before, your feelings may have numerous possible causes: fatigue, illness, stress, timidity, uncertainty, weather, diet and so on. How did you feel the morning you were to be married? Didn't you feel a little unsettled inside? Yet if all marriages were called off because of nervous grooms, we'd have no

weddings! That "lack of peace" is perfectly normal whenever we face a major new step in life. In summary, then, impressions are just feelings, which can have numerous causes. But they are clearly not "road signs" for God's will.

What, then, is the proper place of emotions in the Christian life? Instead of being our method for *determining* truth, they are our God-given means for *responding* to truth. The emotional cart is to be pulled by the intellectual horse, and not the reverse. Our feelings are designed by God to express our response to objective truth. For example, if a friend is injured, my God-given emotions respond with sorrow; but if a friend gets saved, my emotions respond with joy. In our relationship with God, our minds learn from the Bible what God says is true. Our wills choose to accept God's truth and obey it. And our emotions then respond accordingly

with love, praise, thanksgiving, fear, hope, trust, rejoicing, and so forth, lifting our Christian experience to the highest possible level of enjoyment. The *Psalms* are an ideal place to explore the proper, biblical expression of our emotions! (Get our *CIM Psalter* if you don't have one, and learn to sing! #708 @ \$20.90)

One caution: Since our emotions are designed to respond to what we believe to be true, we must "walk by faith and not by sight" (2 Cor 5:7). We must believe what God says is true, regardless of our circumstances. If we believe our circumstances rather than God, then our life will be an emotional roller coaster as our circumstances change. That's why James exhorts us to "consider it joy, my brethren when you encounter various trials" (Jas. 1:2f). Why? Because of the truth

of God that trials will make you a mature Christian. That is cause for joy! But if your focus is on trial, then you will be emotionally depressed.

Finally, let's examine the fourth "road sign" said to direct us to God's individual will, namely, our personal desires. At the time of salvation, God gives us a new heart and begins renewing our desires. The more we grow in grace, the more our desires line up with God's desires. Though initially our experiential righteousness is like "filthy rags," God is washing those rags a little more everyday as we grow in Christ. But the problem with using personal desires as a road sign is that, this side of resurrection, Christians will still have some sinful desires, foolish desires, prideful desires and many other desires that are difficult to identify because "the heart is deceitful and desperately wicked" (Jer 17:9). Even the Apostle Paul expressed his own inner conflict with desires (Rom. 7:15-25) and taught that Christians in this life will *always* experience internal warfare as the flesh lusts against the Spirit (Gal. 5:16-26). Ultimately, all desires must be judged by God's moral will, the Bible, because only the Bible explains which desires are which.

HOW GOD GUIDES US

Though it can be emotionally unsettling to probe our fundamental assumptions, we have tested the doctrine that God has an "individual will" for every person which he or she must discover in order to be within the will of God (1 Thess. 5:21), "examining the Scriptures to see whether

New Tapes:

S-862 Thoughts From a Bed and Breakfast,
Pete Peters

S-868 Closing Message Summer 2000
Camp, Pete Peters

S-873 The Sin that Gives Serpents Success,
and Saints Sorrow. Pete Peters

S-903 Prophecy, Power, Destruction and
Deliverance, Pt 15. Pete Peters

S-905 How to Suffer and Stay out of the Pig
Poop, Pete Peters

C-114 The Spirit of Shinar Lives Today, Earl
F. Jones

E-102 The Fight Over the Will, (Basics 10)
Don Elmore

E-103 Take Heed to Thyself, (Basics 11)
Don Elmore

E-104 How to Lose Friends & Be Hated,
(Basics 12) Don Elmore



these things are so" (Acts 17:11). And having seen how each of the four arguments and each of the four "road signs" are unfounded, we must conclude that this viewpoint is actually an unbiblical teaching that will lead us into confusion, not clarity, about God's will. It is not that God does not craft every detail of our life - **indeed, He does** - but He simply has chosen **not** to reveal those details to us. They are part of His sovereign will (Deut 29:29), purposely kept secret because He wants us to learn to "Trust and Obey" as the hymn writer so aptly put it. Trusting is our response to His sovereign will; obeying is our response to His moral will (the Bible). But how do the two work together in our choosing of a spouse?

God's sovereign will has four primary characteristics, each of which has a crucial application in the choosing of a spouse. First, as mentioned above, God's sovereign will is *secret* or hidden until it happens. Would you like to know whom you will marry? Just wait until the day after the wedding! Why, you might wonder, doesn't God tell us His sovereign will in advance? It is because He wants to build in us a character of trusting Him for our future, "walking by faith, not by sight" (2 Cor. 5:7). Moreover, He is protecting us from information we are not equipped to handle. Jesus teaches that we are "wired" to handle only one day's anxiety at a time - and no more (Matt. 6:34).

Second, God's sovereign will is exhaustive. As "the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim 6:15), God is the ultimate determiner of everything that happens, including our choice of a mate. In a word, God "works ALL things after the counsel of His will" (Eph 1:11). Even the sinful acts of men are included in God's sovereign will as Peter divulged that Jesus was "*delivered up by the predetermined plan*" of God (Acts 2:23; cf. Luke 22:22). And yet, as we said before, God accomplishes this without being the author of sin, without violating the will of man, and without destroying the reality and responsibility of decision making. He simply uses man's nature to bring about His predetermined end.

The third characteristic of God's sovereign will is that it is *certain*. Daniel 4:35 declares that God's sovereign will cannot be frustrated by men, by angels or by anyone else. Thus, it is not blind chance, impersonal fate, human manipulation, or 'satanic' trickery, but rather God Himself who brings a man and a woman together in marriage. And nothing - including someone marrying the "wrong" person - can thwart God's sovereign will. Did Mr. or Miss Right pass you by and marry someone else? God's sovereign will makes **no mistakes** - He knows better who is ideal for us. Perhaps there was some hidden flaw in that person which God was protecting you from. Or maybe God was protecting them from you as God continues to conform your character to Christ. Could be you two weren't a good match for each other.

Fourth and finally, God's sovereign will is *perfect*, bringing the highest glory to God and the greatest good to man. "*God causes all things to work together for good to those who love God*" (Rom 8:28). God does not say all things are good, because they're not. He says all things "work together for good" to make us conformed to Christ. Even a difficult marriage can "work together for good" to conform us to Christ's qualities of endurance, forbearance, and forgiveness as we learn to love a less-than-perfect mate. So in the perfect sovereign will of God, there is no such thing as getting stuck

with "God's second best" spouse. And whether we become bitter or better in marriage simply depends on how much we are trusting in the sovereign will of God.

But trusting God's sovereign will is only half the equation for our choosing a spouse. Remember "Trust and Obey"? The second half is obeying God's moral will. And the substance of God's moral will is the Bible, pure and simple (Rom 2:18). It is our perfect and complete guide for all faith and practice (2 Pet 1:3-4; 2 Tim 3:17), encompassing not only **WHAT** we do, but also **WHY** we do it and **HOW** we do it. Speaking of this truth, Jesus told His disciples in John 13:17, "If you know these things, you are blessed if you do them." So our responses to God's moral will are (1) to know it and (2) to do it. The holy spirit does not guide us apart from God's Word, rather He guides us through God's Word as we diligently study it. Then He blesses us with success as we faithfully obey it (Josh 1:8, Ps 1:1-3).

It is the purpose of these articles to diligently search

Only a few left, get it for your children NOW:
**Discovering Australia's Christian Heritage -
Australia- South Land of the Holy Spirit,**
by Col Stringer.

Few Australians know anything of their nation's rich Christian heritage and the fact that many of our early explorers, pioneers and politicians were men and women of God. It is unknown and sadly untaught that the first spoken words over this nation by one Fernandez de Quiros on the day of Pentecost 1606 not only named Australia "South Land of The Holy Spirit," but also claimed it in the name of Jesus and for the proclamation of the Gospel.

#699 @ \$20 ppd.

out the principles, precepts, practices, promises, and prudence of God that relate to choosing a spouse. This is a process which relies on faith, not feelings - faith in the sovereign will of God to overshadow our feeble efforts, and faith in the moral will of God to direct our uncertain steps. Though we may crave the multi-sensory experience of miraculous circumstances and mystical impressions, God has given us His completed revelation as our fully sufficient guide. Then when we make our decisions based on the objective truth of Scripture, our emotions can find their God-ordained place

in responding to that truth with love, praise, hope, rejoicing, and thankfulness!

I was reminded of this truth recently when our family had the opportunity to minister in Europe for several weeks. As we travelled through France, Switzerland, Austria, and Germany, there were many road signs that were bewildering to us because we couldn't interpret them correctly (like the mystical view of God's will). If we had sought to follow them, we would have wasted many miles and turns, perhaps even ruining our trip. Thankfully, we had brought along a complete touring guide to Europe, all mapped out in plain English. Similarly, God has given us His authoritative and inerrant Guidebook (the Bible) for our Christian journey, written in plain English. He has not intended us to become confused and frustrated trying to "read" road signs He never designed us to understand. Instead, He wants us to be guided by the principles of Scripture for all of life's choices. Nothing more is needed; it is "*adequate to equip us for every good work*" (2 Tim. 3:17), especially the good work of choosing a spouse!

Courtesy Patriarch, PO Box 50, Willis, VA 24380

**FACTS ABOUT STATE MANDATORY SEAT
BELT HARNESS LAWS**

William J. Holdorf

This information is not being provided to debate the value of wearing or not wearing a seat belt harness, nor to oppose or discredit voluntary seat belt use. Its main purpose is to oppose seat belt laws and to protect our right to choose our own individual personal safety and health care standards without government interference or coercion as



guaranteed in the Bill of Rights (USA).

1. While the use of a seat belt has saved some people in certain kinds of traffic accidents, there is ample proof that in other kinds, some people have been more seriously injured and even killed only because of seat belt use. In the latter case, such injuries and deaths are not given the same degree of publicity, if any, as given when people are saved by seat belt use. Such bias in compiling traffic accident data exaggerates the so-called benefit of seat belt laws which misleads the public into thinking seat belt use automatically means safety; non-use automatically means death in all kinds of accidents, which is false!

2. In spite of the fact the government is forcing the use of a device that can be injurious and even lethal in certain situations, the government refuses to be held financially responsible for such injuries or deaths. Instead, the government expects the injured or survivors of those killed to obtain financial satisfaction from their own savings, or insurance, or by suing the auto makers.

3. Some people in certain kinds of traffic accidents have survived only because a seat belt was not used - injured, perhaps, but not dead. Such persons, by law, are subject to a citation and a fine for not dying in the accident using a so-called safety device arbitrarily chosen by politicians. Traffic accident data on such traffic accidents only reflect one more injury without using a seat belt, which, again, exaggerate the so-called benefit of seat belt laws.

4. If a person is killed while using a seat belt, law supporters claim the accident was so severe not even a seat belt could save the person. That might be true in some cases, but the severity of an accident is never mentioned in compiling a list of persons killed while not using a seat belt, which adds to the bias in compiling traffic accident data in favour of seat belt laws.

5. Evidence of seat belt use is increasing injuries or causing a person's death in certain kinds of traffic accidents is well documented in the hundreds of successful lawsuits filed against the automakers since the advent of seat belt laws in 1985. Court ordered settlements and punitive damage awards forced the automakers to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to the injured or survivors of those killed as a result of the failure of the seat belt to save as promised. Some lawsuits were settled out of court which sealed the evidence of seat belt design defects from the public, including other lawyers with similar cases.

6. Hundreds of thousands of autos, vans and light trucks have been recalled as a result of discovering defects in certain seat belt designs after the fact, which means the motoring public has been forced by law to become unwilling **guinea pigs**, unlike how all other products in the marketplace are treated. In a letter published in the September/October 1990 edition of *AAA World*, a publication of the Chicago Motor Club, Jerry Curry, NHTSA Administrator, said: "*We opened 213 new defect investigations in 1989, the highest one-year figure in the agency's history. A total of 6.8 million vehicles were recalled that year, a million more than the national average.*" While Mr. Curry did not say how many such recalls involved seat belt defects, such recalls, again, reflect how the public is being used as guinea pigs for automotive products.

7. There is a body of law that states a person has the right to refuse any personal health care device, drug, treatment, or surgery, even if such refusal might result in an ear-

lier death or an increase in medical expenses. All seat belt laws violate that right, that is, to freely choose to use or not to use a "health care" seat belt. Any medical professional attempting to do the same would be prosecuted, yet politicians claim they can ignore the law while demanding strict compliance from the private sector.

8. In 1991 the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed the right to determine one's personal health care standard in the Johnson Controls case. Also, a federal appeals court upheld a \$100,000 award in 1993 to a 320 pound woman who sued the state of Rhode Island for refusing to hire her back to work unless she lost weight. The federal Equal Opportunity Commissioner had earlier ruled obesity a protected right under the Act, and the court agreed even though obesity is a self-inflicted health hazard and causes more premature deaths each year than highway fatalities.

9. While there is extensive publicity always given those who support seat belt laws, research published by independent professionals, that is, those not on the federal payroll, which challenges the so-called benefit of seat belt laws, is never printed in the national news media, thus the public is denied the right to know there is a legitimate contrary side to the seat belt law controversy.

10. At one time, it was the same with air bags until one investigative reporter decided to start printing the truth about air bag dangers in certain kinds of traffic accidents. The bureaucrats in the U.S. Dept of Transportation were so adamant against telling the public about such dangers, which the public had a right to know, the reporter had to use the Freedom of Information Act to force the government to release its own records of air bag injuries and deaths.

PRIMARY ENFORCEMENT STATES

The insidious nature of seat belt laws is shown even further in states with primary enforcement of the law. The following is what can happen in states with primary enforcement:

1. Your vehicle can be stopped anytime, day or night, by police merely under *suspicion* a seat belt is not being used. And even if mistaken; once the vehicle is stopped the officer can begin routine interrogation and testing - force occupants to exit - visually check out the contents of the inside of the vehicle looking for any kind of a violation of the law, all without the right of legal counsel; all under the pretense of not using a seat belt.

2. Primary enforcement encourages the use of random roadblocks. In a 1994 statewide campaign, North Carolina conducted 2,038 roadblocks in two weeks under the pretext of checking for seat belt use. In spite of further use of random roadblocks that year, which the governor boasted increased seat belt use to 80%, total highway fatalities actually increased in the state for 1994 over the record of the preceding 3 years.

3. If not using a seat belt, you could be stopped for a minor traffic violation that otherwise would be ignored if using a seat belt. You may also be targeted because of a bumper sticker, your license plate, your age, race, or gender. Primary enforcement opens the door for police harassment, intimidation and profiling. Young people, women, and minorities are vulnerable, especially when travelling alone and at night, or in certain neighbourhoods.

4. You are subject to an officer's misinterpretation of

Get Your Copy Now!

TAXES: A MORAL ISSUE

by Charles Weisman

**Are we under a lawful system of Taxation?*

**Do we have a moral obligation to pay taxes?*

**What are the principles of law regarding taxation?*

**What does the Bible say about taxes?*

**What did the founding fathers of our country say about taxes?*

**What is the reason, need, and purpose of our taxes?*

#564 @ sug. don. \$10.50



your answers, your attitude, or what the officer sees in your vehicle. You could become the victim of a corrupt act, such as planting drugs in your vehicle by an officer. You could be accused of using drugs because the cash in your possession has the odor of drugs. Officers can confiscate your cash and vehicle if there is some drug residue without proving you knew about or caused the residue to be there. Courts have recognized most currency in circulation has some discernible drug residue. It is reported that 80% of the assets confiscated by law enforcement do not lead to a criminal charge, but only a small percent is ever returned. Confiscation of assets has become a lucrative business for some police agencies and offers big incentives to increase roadblocks and speed traps.

5. Some states issue a seat belt violation fine against the driver even if the driver is using a seat belt but a passenger is not, and even if the driver did not know about it. Drivers, therefore, could easily become distracted while driving by a constant watch of passengers, both adults and children in the rear seat.

6. Primary enforcement is an easy way to enhance state revenue through fines. Also, additional income comes from the federal government in the form of grants (bribes) to pay the police to enforce the seat belt law. Such grants are used by the police as overtime pay while enforcing the seat belt law, which is why the police support primary enforcement laws. Such lucrative overtime pay helps relieve pressure for a police salary increase. And in some areas where job performance standards include a citation quota, seat belt violations offers easy compliance.

7. Some insurance companies target seat belt law violations as an excuse to increase rates even for drivers without an accident or moving violation record. In fact, even if you habitually use a seat belt but forget just once, that might be the time an officer stops your vehicle, thus your driving record is unjustly marred.

8. Some states level points against a driver's license for not using a seat belt in addition to a fine, which means a person is being punished twice for the same offense. Also it means a driver's license could eventually be suspended for repeated offenses even if the driver has been a careful driver for years with no accident or moving violation.

9. If you are medically exempted from seat belt use, your vehicle could still be stopped since an officer cannot know until you are stopped. This applies to drivers who are using a seat belt but a passenger who is not using one because of an exemption. Even with a medical exemption, once the vehicle is stopped, the officer can begin routine interrogation, testing and visually looking for any kind of violation of the law. Persons with medical exemptions are also subject to being stopped repeatedly during any travel route by other officers along the way. Also, providing an officer with your confidential medical records and exemption is a violation of your right of privacy.

10. It should be noted, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, a federal agency, in a 1995 study: *Safety Belt Use Law - An Evaluation of Primary Enforcement and Other Provisions*, stated "The analysis suggests that belt use among fatally injured occupants was at least 15 percent higher in states with primary enforcement laws."

11. Primary enforcement is promoted as saving lives, however, stopping vehicles for non-seat belt use is only an excuse to arbitrarily and capriciously accuse people of traf-

fic violations of one kind or another, thus issuing citations as a means of easily increasing revenue, as well as providing easy lucrative overtime income for the police. Primary enforcement has nothing to do with saving lives; but has all to do with revenue enhancement at the expense of fleecing the motoring public.

CONCLUSION

Politicians have no authority to willingly and knowingly force some people to maim and kill themselves in certain kinds of traffic accidents using a so-called safety device, a seat belt harness, just because they hope others will be saved in other kinds of accidents merely by chance. The Constitution forbids the government from taking chances with a person's body, the ultimate private property. The government has no right to play Russian roulette with a person's life.

Also, seat belts are an after-the-fact device. As such, not one penny of the millions of tax dollars spent in support of seat belt laws has ever prevented one accident.

Conversely, because we feel safer wearing our seat belts, studies have shown that we tend to drive more recklessly. This is known as "risk compensation," which is covered in more details in the 1995 book, "Risk" by Dr. Johan Adams, University College London, England.

In a free society, if a person is injured or killed in a traffic accident because he/she freely chose to use or not to use a seat belt, that is a personal tragedy, as it is with all other kinds of freely chosen risks in life. That is freedom working. However, if a person is injured or killed in a traffic accident because the government forced that person to use a seat belt, that is TYRANNY working, and reflects injury and death by government. All seat belt laws must be repealed in order to restore true freedom.

The insidious nature of seat belt laws is further shown in the April 2001 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court which foolishly ruled that it is illegal for a police officer to arrest, handcuff and jail a woman for not using a seat belt in the Atwater/Lago Vista case, including impounding her vehicle.

We do not allow doctors to send the police over to our homes to check to see if we are following the doctors' health care orders and, if not, to issue a ticket as a punishment (e.g. not vaccinating ourselves or our children!!), so why do we allow politicians to send the police over to our autos, vans, and trucks to see if we are following the politicians' health care orders, that is, using a seat belt and, if not, to issue a ticket as punishment?

As with all other kinds of individual personal health care recommendations in life, there is nothing wrong with voluntary seat belt use; however, there is a great deal wrong with all state mandatory seat belt harness laws!

William J. Holdorf, 5839 S. Harlem Ave., #517, Chicago, IL 60638 -
Wholdorf@msn.com -

THE CHRISTIAN HOME SCHOOL & THE COVENANT LAW OF DEUTERONOMY

William Einwechter

The book of Deuteronomy contains four separate commands to Christian (Israelite) parents to teach and train their children. These precepts are important to the Christian homeschooling family because they provide



explicit Biblical support for the duty of parents to teach their own children. However, the covenantal setting for each of these commands is frequently not understood or appreciated. First, Deuteronomy itself is structured in the form of a covenant - containing a preamble, historical prologue, stipulations, sanctions, and provisions for the continuity of the covenant. Thus, the education of children by their parents is an integral part of God's covenant; and the command to teach the children must be understood in the context of that covenant. Second, although the four specific commands to parents to teach their children are similar in wording, the setting within the covenant structure where each command appears is different. The import of this is often overlooked, and the repetition of these precepts is simply seen as a restatement of a fundamental duty. Rather, we should see that each command is placed where it is in Deuteronomy in order to emphasize four vital aspects of the training of children for the progress of God's covenant.

The significance of these four commands in Deuteronomy for Christian homeschooling will be explored here. In so doing, it is our hope that both the Biblical basis and the covenantal importance of homeschooling will be evident, providing both encouragement and a clear demonstration of the high calling of Christian parents in regard to the advancement of God's covenant in history.

1. *The Christian homeschool enables parents to give an important covenant witness (Dt 4:9).*

The command of Deuteronomy 4:9 "to teach them (all this law) thy sons, and thy sons' sons" appears in the concluding part of Moses' first address to the nation where he calls the people to obedience based on the lesson of Israel's history. In 4:5-9, Moses exhorts the people to careful obedience of the law of God for this is their wisdom in the sight of the nations, i.e., obedience is essential to their witness to the perfection of God and his covenant. Israel's covenant with God is what makes them a great nation. Because of this covenant, God has delivered them from Egypt, revealing his love; and because of this covenant, God has given them his law, revealing his righteousness. By faithfully keeping God's law, Israel will walk in wisdom, enjoy God's presence, and as a nation, thus giving powerful witness to the glory of God and his covenant to the world. In 4:9, Moses states that this witness can take place *only* if: 1) they take heed to themselves to keep God's law, and 2) they teach God's law to their children. In other words, Moses emphatically states that the ongoing testimony to the greatness of God and his covenant to the world is directly tied to the faithful training of the covenant seed.

Therefore, Christian homeschooling parents must understand that the thorough teaching and training of their children in God's word is an essential part of their witness to the greatness of God and his covenant. There are two aspects to this witness. First, by obeying God's Law in its extensive instructions concerning the teaching and training of children, Christian parents will raise up wise, disciplined, godly, mature, productive, and joyful children. What a contrast these children will be to those raised according to the wisdom of the world by ungodly parents! Parents who have obeyed God's wisdom in raising their children will be considered wise and understanding parents and give witness to the superiority of God's covenant and law. Second, by obeying God's law in regard to training their children, they will raise up a new generation with knowledge of and a commit-

ment to God's Word that will demonstrate the superiority of God's covenant in their homes, churches, and communities. In other words, when homeschooled children reach adulthood, they themselves will be a powerful witness to God's covenant through their wise and productive lives.

2. *The Christian homeschool enables parents to fulfill their covenant duty (Deut. 6:7).*

Deuteronomy chapters 5-11 set forth the basic stipulations of the covenant. In 6:1-5, Moses summarizes the covenant requirement that the people fear the Lord and keep his statutes and commandments - the first and greatest commandment being that they love the Lord with all their heart, soul, and strength. Then in 6:6-9, Moses declares that to love God and keep his commandments requires three things: 1) to engraft God's law into your heart; 2) to inculcate God's law into your children's hearts; and 3) to establish God's law as the standard of truth for all of life. The command in 6:7 to teach God's Law diligently to your children calls upon parents to teach the Word of God in an incisive fashion, impressing the truth of that word upon their minds by frequent repetition and with penetrating power. According to verses 7-9, parents are to teach the word of God in both formal and informal settings with the goal of relating all knowledge to God's truth and bringing all spheres of thought under God's authority.

The context, therefore, of this command indicates that parents who are in covenant with God have

an unalterable responsibility to teach their children God's Law and how it applies to all of life. God's covenant places the duty of educating children squarely on their parents, not on the church or on the state. The Christian homeschool is ideally suited for the fulfillment of this covenant duty.

3. *The Christian homeschool operates in view of God's covenant sanctions (Deut 11:19).*

Deuteronomy chapter 11 comes at the end of the section that establishes the basic stipulations of the covenant. Moses here summarizes the requirements of the covenant and gives a call for the renewal of the covenant. Interspersed throughout Moses' call is the promise and threat of covenant sanctions (11:14-17, 26-29). Deuteronomy 11:18-21 is nearly identical in wording to Deuteronomy 6:6-10. Both texts are intended as summaries of our covenant duty, and both contain the specific command to parents to teach God's Law to their children (6:7, 11:19). However, in Deuteronomy 11 the command is directly related to the covenant sanctions by the word "therefore" in vs 18, and by the explicit declaration of blessing and cursing in the verses immediately following. Thus, the covenant duty of parents to train their children according to God's Law is enforced by the promise of blessing for obedience and the warning of cursing for disobedience.

Christian parents must understand that God's commands concerning the training of their children are not idle suggestions, but law backed by definite sanctions personal and corporate (cf. Dt.28:4, 18, 32, 53ff.; Pr. 10:1, 17:21, 25; 19:13; 22:6; 29:17). By failing in their covenantal duty of education, Christian parents elicit God's curse on themselves and their children. Therefore, in view of God's covenant sanctions, Christian parents ought to act in the fear of God and earnestly strive to obey God's Law concerning the education of their children. The

New Tapes:

- War in Iraq: Unfinished Business, pt 1
- War in Iraq: Unfinished Business, pt 2 by Ted Weiland (no G- number has yet been allocated for these)
- B-442 Why The Slaughter (2) Barley
- B-443 Dreamers (1) Barley +
- Capt: Ruth - Faithful daughter-in-law.
- K-413 The Blind & The Lame (1)
- K-414 The Blind & The Lame (2)
- Character of Saul, 31 & 32, Bruggeman
- D-049 Strongholds: Freedom in 2001, LB
- D-050 Foundations of Bible Translations, Which Bible is Best (1) Blanchard



Christian homeschool must believe in God's promise of blessing and tremble at God's threat of cursing.

4. *The Christian homeschool is vital for the continuity of God's covenant from generation to generation (Dt. 32:46).*

A central aspect of God's covenant is that of continuity. Accordingly, God makes provision in Deuteronomy 31:1-34:12 for the perpetuation of his covenant from generation to generation. The command of Deuteronomy 32:46 that "ye shall command your children to observe to do, all the words of this law" indicates the central importance of training the covenant seed for the continuity of God's covenant in history. This command is given at the close of the public ministry of Moses (32:44-47) as part of his final words to Israel. After exhorting the people to set their hearts to keep all the law of God, he solemnly charges them to *command* their children also to keep the law of God. By being part of the last words of Moses the principal importance of covenant parents teaching their covenant children the word of God is further established. The context indicates that this teaching is crucial for the continuity of the covenant.

It is interesting to note the significant variation in this command to parents. The three previous commands were to *teach* your children. Here, however, the mandate is to "*command* them to keep ... " Not only does this indicate that the goal of covenant continuity suggests something more. It suggests that the teaching and training have been faithfully carried out, and that the time has now come to give a solemn charge to the child (and remember that this child may themselves be a parent!!) not only to remember what has been taught but also to *keep* (guard and obey) it. Although parents are regularly to command their children to keep God's law, the setting implies a formal charge given at the time when they leave home or when the parent is facing death (even as Moses charged the nation to keep God's law prior to his death). As the next generation, they are enjoined to carry on the Faith and keep God's covenant law. The Christian homeschool plays a vital role in the perpetuation of God's covenant from generation to generation; it looks to the day when sons and daughters go forth with the solemn charge to hold fast what they have been taught and to carry on the work of the covenant people in the world for the glory of God.

Courtesy Chalcedon Report, Box 158 Vellecito CA 95251

"ELECTION"

by Pastor Don Elmore

According to Loraine Boettner, in his much-studied and theologically influential book, **The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination**, "The Calvinistic view is the only logical one if we accept the Scriptural declaration that salvation is by grace" (p.103). Calvinists insist that God in His sovereignty, and in eternity, chose or picked out of mankind whom He would save (by means of Christ's death and the work of the Holy Spirit) for no other reason than His own wise, just, and gracious purpose. The Reformed Faith separates the human race into two portions and ordains one to everlasting life and the other to everlasting death. As the Westminster Confession states:

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated to everlasting life, and others are foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

This doctrine, which was taught by both Martin Luther (Lutheran Church) and John Calvin (Presbyterian Church), leaders of the Protestant Reformation, was learned from Augustine. This should not be surprising as both Luther and Calvin were Augustinian Roman catholic monks. Besides the Lutherans and Presbyterians, the Puritans of England and America, the Covenanters of Scotland, the Huguenots of

France, the Afrikaners of South Africa, some Baptists of America and Europe, and for a short time, the Roman Catholic Church, were thorough-going Calvinists.

While I strongly disagree with Boettner's statement that Calvinism is the only logical view on election, I strongly agree with his following assessment: "Every Christian must believe in some kind of election; for while the Scriptures leave unexplained many things about the doctrine of Election, they make very plain the FACT that there has been an election." (p.87).

To summarize, Calvinists believe that God elected predominantly individual Israelites in the Old Testament era but now He elects individuals of all races as special and peculiar objects of His favour. In both time periods, they strongly assert that, "Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, loved, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only" (p.84). Despite the promises of God and many divine prophecies to the contrary, they promote the popular idea that anyone of any race can become God's people by being "saved."

CALVINISTIC ELECTION:

- God Chooses Some Of All Races To Salvation - The Elect

- God leaves the Rest to Damnation - The Non-Elect

FIVE OBJECTIONS TO CALVINISM

1. Calvinism has no explanation as to why God chooses some to salvation and leaves others to damnation other than His own sovereign will. The love of God, according to their theology, is both random and without any reason.

But is God's love and salvation without any basis? Lorraine Boettner nowhere in his book mentions the most sure thing in the entire world - the Abrahamic Covenant; guaranteed by God's PROMISE and OATH ("two immutable things"-Hebrews 6:18). The fact that a heifer, a she-goat, and a ram were cut in half and, along with a pigeon and a turtledove, were placed to form a path by which only God, Himself, passed through while Abram was "in a deep sleep" is evidently considered to be nonessential by Boettner in God's predestination plan of His people.

By this very important ceremony, a once-in-the-history-of-the-world occurrence, when the Creator of the entire universe cut an unconditional covenant with His friend Abram, and later confirmed it to his son, Isaac, and his grandson, Jacob/Israel, the foundation of God's choice of His people was determined for ever. From this pivotal time in history, it was divinely ordained that the sons of this covenant would be the ones to whom God would declare, "**And I will be your God.**"

Several years later, Abraham proved his faith in this divine promise. He willingly obeyed God's command to offer Isaac, who was childless at the time, as a burnt offering. By faith, he believed that God would keep His promise no matter what. So, if Isaac were to be sacrificed, God would bring him back to life, like He did Lazarus. Isaac couldn't die and be without seed - for that would make God's promise null and void. As a result of Abraham's steadfast faith in God's promise, God swore by Himself that this covenant of election would never be set aside.

But nevertheless, Calvinistic writers, like Elisha Coles in his book, **God's Sovereignty**, as well as Boettner, ignore the importance of this covenant when they expound on verses like these two from Deuteronomy:

Coles: "What then was the cause or motive of God's choosing them [Israel] above others [Deut. 7:8]? It was his undeserved love and favour to them. 'He loved them because he loved them'" (p.48).

Boettner: "Here [Deut. 10:15] it is carefully explained that Israel was honoured with the divine choice in contrast with the



treatment accorded all the other peoples of the earth, that the choice rested solely on the unmerited love of God, and that it had no foundation in Israel itself.” (p.89).

But these two verses quoted from Deuteronomy (7:8 and 10:15), along with many other scriptures, actually disagree with Calvinistic thought that God’s love was without careful choice and purpose. In fact, the constant theme of the Bible is that God’s love was NOT random but that it was related to the oath that He made with patriarch Abraham:

For thou [Israel] art an holy people unto the LORD thy God; the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people who are upon the face of the earth. The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people. But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep **the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers**, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt.- Deut 7:6-8.

Only the LORD had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and **he chose their seed after them**, even you above all people as it is this day. - Deut. 10:15.

And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt.... Deut. 4:37. (CIM: Keep these verses in mind when reading Stephen Jones’ new booklet: ***If God Could Save Everyone - Would He??*** #439 @ \$2.50)

These verses reveal that God ELECTED the physical seed of Jacob/Israel BECAUSE HE LOVED Abraham, Isaac and Jacob - the ones with whom he made His binding covenant. God’s choosing was not without aim or purpose.

2. While Calvinists agree that God elected Israel as a nation for centuries and “were the only people to whom God was pleased to make any special revelation of Himself” and “that Jesus confined His public ministry almost exclusively to them and forbade his disciples to go among others until after the day of Pentecost” (p. 117), they deny that God’s covenant with Abraham and his anointed seed was an everlasting covenant.

But the Scriptures proclaim: “O ye seed of Abraham, his servant, ye children of Jacob, **his chosen** ... He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.” - Psalm 105:6,8-10.

These verses teach that God’s election is based upon the everlasting covenant that He made with the fathers of the Israel people. And if the covenant of God’s elective people was declared by God’s own sworn word to never end, but then, as Calvinism teaches, it was only temporary - **wouldn’t that make God a liar?** But we know that “... it was [is] impossible for God to lie...” (Hebrews 6:18b). Therefore, God did not have a special people for several thousand years and then suddenly, after Pentecost, switch to someone else!

3. Calvinists ignore that God’s election is based upon the love of Israel’s fathers and the covenant that He made with them. Maybe it is because they insist that after thousands of years of not electing anyone outside of Israel, God began to choose and bless individuals of other races beginning with Pentecost.

But the Scriptures do not uphold the presupposition:

Yet now hear, O Jacob, my servant; and **Israel, whom I have chosen** ... I will pour out my Spirit upon thy seed, and **my blessing** upon thine offspring. - Isaiah 44:1,3b.

And wasn’t this fulfilled when on Pentecost Peter preached, “Ye men of Israel, hear these words ... repent, and

be baptized ... and ye shall receive the gift of holy spirit. For the PROMISE is unto you, and to your [Israelite] children ... “ Acts 2:22, 38a, 39a.

And after Pentecost, Peter preached, “Ye are the **sons ... of the covenant** which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be BLESSED” Acts 3:25. In the letter to the church at Galatia, the Apostle Paul writes that this was the gospel that was preached unto ABRAHAM!! Gal 3:8.

During the Apostle Paul’s first missionary journey at Antioch in Pisidia, he preached, “And we declare unto you [Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham... (Acts 13:26a)] glad tidings, how the **promise which was made unto the fathers**, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children...” (Acts 13:32, 33a). “us their children” has to be the seed or stock of Abraham and cannot in any way be spiritualized. Later, it is recorded that, “as many [from the stock of Abraham in Antioch] as were ordained to eternal life believed” Acts 13:48b

In addition, John the Baptist’s father proclaimed these words about Jesus, that He would “perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember His holy covenant; **the oath which he swore to our father**, Abraham ... to give salvation to His people [not to those who were not His people!] by the remission of their sins ...” Luke 1:72, 73, 77.

The elect of the New Testament are the same as the elect of the Old Testament. In no wise did God’s chosen people totally disappear. For to them only were the promises made and to no one else.

4. Boettner writes that God rejected His chosen people of the Old Testament Congregation of Israel “that salvation might be given to the Gentiles...” He then adds, “Historically we see that the Christian Church has been almost exclusively a Gentile Church.” (p.122). Furthermore, it may be said that Calvinism makes membership in the New Testament Congregation of Israel (local visible church) optional. Membership is recommended but not required (p.146).

Boettner would be right when he says that salvation was given to the Gentiles, if he knew the true identity of the Gentiles of whom he refers. But he identifies the Gentiles of the New Testament as being people who are separate from the everlasting covenant that God made with the physical seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Irregardless, Boettner and other Calvinistic writers quote Ephesians 1:4,

“According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love....”

...as if it applies to anyone of any race. But those who were “chosen” (v.4), also were “predestinated” (v.5), and had redemption through His [Jesus’] blood” (v.7), and had the “forgiveness of sins” (v.7), and heard and believed the gospel of their salvation and were sealed with holy spirit (v.13). These chosen redeemed people were Israelites in the local church of Ephesus. They were dispersed and uncircumcised Israelites (ch. 2, v.11), who were “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise” (ch. 2, v.12). And like the dry bones of the house of Israel, prophesied by Ezekiel hundreds of years earlier, they had “no hope” (ch. 2, v.12 and Ezekiel 37:11).

The failure to understand the prophecies and destinies of the House of Israel, who were cut off from being God’s people in 640 BC, is a major error of Calvinism. The omission of Calvinism to provide any insight into Hosea’s prophecies of this larger population of Israel



becomes the Achilles' heel of this flawed system of theology.

They quote verses from the epistles of the Apostle Paul and Peter in an attempt to prove their *universal* random election, but they misidentify the people that these early church apostles were writing to and about. All Calvinistic writers fail to recognize that it was the Northern Kingdom of Israel that was prophesied by the prophet Hosea! The people of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, who were the elect people of God at the time of Hosea, were, according to this prophet of God, to soon become no longer "the people of God." But, by God's loving grace, these hopeless Israelites were later in history to be "grafted back into the olive tree [Israel]" and be restored again to the status of the "people of God." This was to happen after they, for many centuries, were to be "scattered" to many parts of the earth "without mercy."

Notice the particular description of the elect people to whom Peter writes:

"Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers *scattered* throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, **ELECT** according to the foreknowledge of God, the Father, through sanctification of the spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ ..." 1 Peter 1:1-2.

"But ye are a **CHOSEN** generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a people of his own ..."

And then the disciple of Jesus quotes Hosea: "Who in time past *were not a people* but are now the people of God; who had *not obtained mercy* but now have obtained mercy" (1 Peter 2:9-10).

So these elect people of God who Boettner calls non-Israelite Gentiles are in reality the people who are the fulfillment of the names of the three children of Hosea:

- (1) "Jezreel": "*scattered*"
- (2) "Loruhamah": "*no more mercy*"
- (3) "Loammi": "*not my people*"

-they could be no one else but the dispersed, punished House of Israel. The **ELECT** Gentiles written to/about by Peter and Paul were Israelites.

Think about it. The House of Israel, according to the epistle written to the Ephesians, was "without hope" (Eph. 2:12). The ten tribes of Dan, Gad, Ephraim, Reuben, Simeon, Zebulun, Naphtali, Manasseh, Asher, and Issachar along with many from the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and Levi were, since the days of the Assyrian Captivity, far off and without God in the world. What could they do to be made alive, since they were dead in sins? NOTHING! They, like a marred clay vessel in the hand of the potter, had to be refashioned into a new vessel (Jeremiah 18:1-10).

At the end of the Apostle Paul's ministry, he said before King Agrippa at his trial, "And now I stand and are judged for the **hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers**, unto which promise our **TWELVE TRIBES**, earnestly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused by the Jews" (Acts 26:6-7).

What was this hope? It was the hope of the promise that God made in the covenant that he cut with Abraham - that "in his seed should all the families (of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) be blessed." This gospel of the Kingdom would include the ten tribes of Israel who had been cut off for over six centuries. Jesus Christ would "confirm the promises made unto the fathers. And that the Gentiles [nations of dis-

persed Israel] might glorify God for His **MERCY**." (Romans 15:8b,9a).

Does it not follow as reasonable why the Bible emphatically declares that the New Covenant was made only with the House of Israel and the House of Judah? This unique covenant, which was sealed with the divine blood of Jesus Christ, confirmed forever the Abrahamic covenant and its promises (Romans 15:8). It took the power of the blood of Jesus Christ to reconcile both kingdoms of Israel back to God and to each other. Is this not the mystery of the New Covenant church - the "gather[ing] together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matthew 24:31)? Calvinism has shortened the gospel message of "Repent and be baptized," to "just have a saving faith in Christ." The influence of the Protestant Reformation's doctrine of "The Priesthood of the Believer" is also evident in Calvinistic theology as it is in the rival Arminian theology. Baptism, The Lord's Supper, not forsaking the assembling together, having the resurrected Jesus Christ as one's High Priest, being in the "holy temple," the dwelling place of holy spirit, striving for the unity of the brethren, continuing steadfast in the apostles' doctrine, loving the brethren, etc. are taught that they are commanded by God but not required.

It is unclear if Calvinism believes that the local, visible church has the "powers of the keys of heaven." And there seems to be some differences of opinion among themselves if the elect (saved) can be members of other religious apostate and false organizations. Does the "saving faith" of the elect required by Calvinism include faith in a Jesus who is an angel, or a Jesus who is the offspring of Mary and Adam, or a Jesus who is multiracial, etc? Is it possible for an elect of Calvinism to be a 33rd degree Freemason and still have saving faith? Is it possible to be a Calvinistic elect if he has been JUSTLY excluded from the ecclesia of God?

5. Boettner asserts, "God undoubtedly does choose some nations to receive much greater spiritual and temporal blessings than others." This form of election has been well illustrated in the nations of Israel, "in certain European nations and communities, and in America. The contrast is very striking when we compare these with other nations such as China, Japan, India, etc." (p.88).

Touché: "... election has been well illustrated ... in certain European nations" and in the lands that they colonized - in America, in South Africa, in Australia, in New Zealand, etc. Is it not very significant that these are the dwelling places appointed of God for the nations of the dispersed House of Israel and the House of Judah? And ONLY in these lands, amongst its Caucasian people, is there a common heritage of being part of Christendom for countless generations.

But in striking contrast, as Boettner points out, China, Japan, India, and most of the countries of the earth, do not have a heritage of Christianity. Hinduism, Buddhism, Islamism, Judaism and many other -isms, but not Christianity. Why? Calvinism just attributes it to God's sovereign choice. A mystery that, admitted by them, is hard to understand and explain.

How much simpler it is to understand if one realizes that the Elect people of God have remained the same for

This Month Only!

THE GIANT WITH FEET OF CLAY Raul Hilberg and his Standard Work on the "Holocaust"

by Jürgen Graf

Our investigation will concentrate on the following points: -
What proofs does Hilberg provide that the NS regime planned the physical destruction of Jews living in its area of control? -
What proofs does Hilberg provide for the existence of extermination camps with killing gas chambers? -What proofs does Hilberg provide for the figure of close to 5.1 million which he claims is the number of Jewish victims?

#478 usually \$13.40 this month only \$10



the last four thousand years. AMAZING GRACE! The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob proved His love to the world of His elect people, by faithfully keeping the covenant that He made with their fathers. He so loved their (world, and their) fathers and their posterity that even though they became adulterous and rejected the covenant, God would not cast them away. As it was prophesied to Joseph by an angel in a dream, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matthew 1:21). By His suffering and shed blood as their Passover Lamb, He did bring salvation to His people - known as the elect.

While Calvinism claims to be the ONLY logical view of election, on a closer examination is it really logical at all?

- Is it logical that Calvinism teaches that God's election is different before and after Pentecost? For the long periods of time before Pentecost, from Genesis 12 to Acts 2, God's election was exclusively with the fleshly descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; an election that was based on His love for the three patriarchs and their seed as promised and sworn by the everlasting covenant. But then, God supposedly went back on His word by nullifying this everlasting covenant with Israel and began to elect people who were not "His special people," "His peculiar people," "His holy people" and "His people that He had placed above all peoples"? So, post-Pentecost, instead of still electing people based on His love for their fathers, He now totally **reverses** His election plan and supposedly chooses predominantly people who are not "the sons of the covenant" - even those (like the Canaanites and Edomites) whose fathers God *hated*, and forever cursed and doomed to destruction.

- Is it logical that Calvinism teaches that God's election totally ignores the dispersed House of Israel? A people never called "Jews" in the Bible. A people that the prophets of God continually prophesied of their reconciliation back into the commonwealth of Israel. A people that would once again have Abraham's God as their God and would once again be His people. The people that are the subjects of God's grace and called the elect in the epistles of the New Testament.

- Is it logical that Calvinism teaches that God's love is random and aimless and inconsistent? For a period of time, God was the actual King of Israel and fought for and defended them against their enemies. But now He supposedly offers the blessings of Abraham to the descendants of these perpetual enemies of Israel and Himself?

- Is it logical that Calvinism teaches that God never elected anyone from New Guinea, China, India, Japan, Zulu-land and many other nations for thousands of years until recent time?

- Is it logical that Calvinism teaches that the "rejection of the Jews" brought about God's elective love being poured out on non-covenant peoples, but are silent about the rejection of the House of Israel six centuries earlier? Why didn't the cessation of the larger portion of Israel bring about a change in God's election?

- Is it logical that Calvinism "extends saving grace far beyond the boundaries of the visible church" (p.145)? It promotes the popular idea that anyone of any race can **become** God's people by being "saved." But many verses, like Matthew 1:21b, "...for He shall save His people from their sins" show that these are God's people **before** they are saved. And some of the chosen people of God, like King Ahab of Israel and King Manasseh of Judah, were some of the most evil people in all of history. So they were an elect person, but did not have "saving faith."

- Is it logical that "Most Calvinistic theologians have held that those who die in infancy are saved" (p.143)? However, while there is almost unanimous agreement among Calvinist scholars that the children of believers who die (up to "the age of accountability") are automatically elected by

God, there is much indecisiveness in regards to the election of the infants of unbelievers. The vast majority are silent on this dilemma. How ironic, that Calvinism separates a physical seed of elect believers from unbelievers when it comes to the death of their young children, but refuse to separate the physical elect children of the covenant from the rest of the world! [school being one of the first areas to "come out from among them and be ye separate"!]

While Calvinism claims to be the only logical view of election, it admittedly is unable to provide any reason for God's election except His random love. It insists that since the first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus, the divine choice of God is completely independent from the promise and oath that He made with Abraham. It argues that salvation is by grace, even if some of the recipients of God's grace were never under God's Laws. [Psalm 147:19-20]

But covenant theology not only provides a consistent view of election, it also maintains God's integrity of His promise, oath and love. It alone provides a logical and biblical reason why salvation is and must be by grace through faith.

Amazing grace, How sweet the sound,
That saved a wretch like me.
I once was lost, but now I'm found.
Was blind, but now I see.

One of the favourite hymns of Christendom and Calvinists, "Amazing Grace" rightfully praises God's grace towards those who were lost and blind. But who, in the Holy Scriptures, are the lost and the blind that were to be found and given sight? - The Japanese? The Chinese? The Incas? The Zulus? The Koreans? The Mexicans?

NONE but "the lost sheep of the House of Israel" - the elect of God!

Courtesy The New Covenant Messenger, Box 321, Union KY 41091

Another month has gone - doesn't time fly? Or is it only me? Thank you all so very much for the many favourable comments I have had about the newsletter. We are very happy that you appreciate it so much. Remember, if any is sick with any complaint at all, you must see the Lorraine Day videos, and learn about her 10-point plan. Following this plan can not only remove most health problems over a period of time, it may even prolong your life - and the quality of your life. Just following some of her points, as some have done with just changing diet will not suffice. It requires commitment to follow all the points. This program is superior to the Malkmus "Hallelujah" diet which was on another video previously.

Take advantage of the reduced book offered - we need to clear some space. We are also slowly clearing out small pamphlets by gradual inclusion with the newsletter. In future they will only be available on a "reprint" basis of a minimum of 50 copies, as it is becoming difficult to store them all.

As far as the next camp is concerned, the dates have been tentatively set for Dec 26 to Jan 2, as we have found this time of year to bring the best numbers. Sorry to those who this time doesn't suit. To those who can, we look forward to seeing you again at this time. Start planning and saving now so that you will be able to come at that time. Speakers will be advised at a later date. Remember it is a good time for children to get together as well! We appreciate those especially who will play an instrument or recite something to take part. Let us know if you will be wanting to do anything like that. May the God of Israel bless you and keep you safe and well,

