



Debate with ‘Mrs. V.’

**Topic :
‘Doctrines of Grace’**

by

Terry Arnold

Topic: Calvinism/Arminianism

The following is a debate/discussion on Calvinism/Arminianism. The writer (Mrs. V) is in *italics* and the editors reply (Terry Arnold) is in **bold**.

Round 1

[Mrs. V] *...I consider your ministry a very important one, and have found your teaching very encouraging. I find myself generally in agreement with the views expressed in 'Diakrisis'. Therefore it was a surprise to me that you should speak so strongly against Dave Hunt's book 'What Love is This...' because I found it to be a very helpful book that made a great deal of sense.*

[Editor TA] **It's not a matter of whether it 'makes sense' or not...is it Biblical, and does it represent orthodox Christianity and does it refute accurately what historic 'Calvinism' really teaches?**

[Mrs. V] *I am writing to respond to your critique, and to ask you to reconsider your view and/or to explain to me where my understanding is lacking. It seems to me that the doctrine known as Calvinism is an issue which promotes a great deal of confusion and miscommunication...*

[Editor TA] **Dave Hunt's book has added enormously to this problem because it does not represent or [refute] true historic 'Calvinism'!**

[Mrs. V] *Yet I suspect that if we really understood each other we would find that those on each side of the debate are really much closer in their understanding than they realise.*

[Editor TA] **No, they are miles apart and always have been. Whitefield and Wesley separated over this issue. Wesley was the one exception who took an Arminian stance in comparison to all the other greats who were not Arminian. The reason people are confused and don't understand is that they see 'Calvinism' as a doctrine...when it is more a refutation [at the Synod of Dort] of the 'heresy' of Arminianism.**

[Mrs. V] *Whilst you found Dave Hunt's book confusing and full of contradictions, it was your book review of the same that I found confusing and full of contradictions! Just as you believe that Dave Hunt does not understand Calvinism, so it seems to me that you did not really understand Hunt's book.*

[Editor TA] **We understood it well enough to see that He portrays 'Hyper-Calvinism' as 'Calvinism'.**

[Mrs. V] *Somehow we all need to be willing to open our minds to try to really understand what the other is saying, and to evaluate our own presuppositions and line of reasoning as well.*



T. A. Ministries
A Ministry of Teaching

PO Box 432, Babinda, 4861,
Qld, Australia

Website: www.taministries.net
E-mail: taministries2@gmail.com

Ph. 0411489472

[Editor TA] **Dave reasons that God is portrayed as unloving because He has only chosen some, but is this not un-Biblical?**

[Mrs. V] *It goes without saying that all this must be done in the light of Scripture. I believe that both you and Dave Hunt are totally committed to Scripture as the final authority. The problem lies in coming to a correct understanding of what Scripture teaches on this matter.*

[Editor TA] **Exactly...here is what Scripture teaches for me. Please correct where I am wrong. This is what I do teach:**

1. God chooses man in salvation. Man does not choose God. (Eph.1:4,5; Jn.15:16; Rom.3:11).

2. Man is unable to come to God of himself for salvation unless the Holy Spirit draws him first (Rom.8:6,7; Rom.3:10-11; Jer.17:9; Is.64:6,7)

Only by the drawing of the Holy Spirit will the 'all' that the father has given, come (Jn.6:37)

3. God elects, chooses His people of His own determination (Eph.1:5,9,11; 1Thess.1:4; 1Pet.1:2,10; Tit.1:1; Rom.8:33; 11:5,7; Col.3:12; Rom.9:15-18; Gal.1:15,16; Jn.6:37; 5:21...etc etc)

4.The blood of Jesus is sufficient for all humans to be saved. But it will in the end be effective for only some, considering 'few' will ultimately be saved. (Jn.10:11-15; Heb.10:14; Matt.20:28; 1Cor.15:22; Matt.1:21; Rev.5:9,10)

...where is the above in error?

[Mrs. V] *I was amused during the radio debate to hear James White say, 'We all have our traditions, Dave', and challenged him to let go of them and look at the Bible. He even admitted that he had his traditions too, but it did not seem to occur to him to apply the same challenge to himself. (Perhaps 'blind-spots' could be substituted for 'traditions'?)*

[Editor TA] **We listened to the debate: White was debating Biblically, whilst Dave was debating much from logic and emotionally [from 'traditions']. Yes, we all have our traditions. But those must not contradict the Word of God. The traditional teaching of the faith once delivered is what I have itemised above! Dave does not teach this and worse, misrepresents true 'Calvinism'. True Calvinism does not teach that God predestines people to Hell! Dave ruthlessly plugs this point throughout the entire book...!**

[Mrs. V] *The problem arises because we have passages in Scripture which seem to say that God offers salvation to all...*

[Editor TA] **What are they? If you are thinking of 2Pet.3:9 then think again (Dave misuses this Scripture terribly!): ‘The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance’.** The whole passage is to the ‘brethren’! Read it in context (See my exegesis on this).

[Mrs. V] *He gives them a choice...*

[Editor TA] **Where does man ever choose God? Did we ever seek him?...‘There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God’ (Rom.3:11). Did we will to be saved? ‘He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God’ (Jn.1:11-13).**

So, who chose who and when? ‘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: 5 Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will’ (Eph.1:4). It was God who chose us and sought us for salvation...‘For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost’ (Lk.19:10).

There is not one single Scripture that teaches that man can or wills to choose God as His personal Lord and Saviour in salvation!...

[Mrs. V] *There are passages which seem to say that God decides to save some and, by implication, to not save others, but neither group has any say in the matter.*

[Editor TA] **Man is already condemned...He was always destined after the Fall to Hell...God has mercy on whom He will have mercy according to Romans Ch.9...**

[Mrs. V] *These two propositions are utterly contradictory. Although there are some who try to say that both are true at the same time.*

[Editor TA] **Absolutely!**

[Mrs. V] *Either the Bible contradicts itself, in which case we may as well throw it away because we would have no idea what to believe, or our understanding of some of these passages has been incorrect and perhaps superficial.*

[Editor TA] **The historic leaders (Spurgeon, etc) understood them well.**

[Mrs. V] *The holders of each position (Calvinist/non-Calvinist) take one set of Scriptures as being true presuppositions and then interpret the apparently contradictory statements through the ‘eyes’ of that fixed position. This was illustrated in the debate when Dave Hunt kept coming back to such texts as ‘The Lord is...not wishing for any to perish but for all to come to repentance’ (2 Pet.3:9) as his non-negotiable starting point...*

To me it seems that these are relatively few and somewhat obscure for the non-Calvinist position. The over-all thrust of Scripture seems to point to a loving God who is seeking reconciliation with all people. I suppose it must seem rather different through Calvinist glasses.

[Editor TA] **Please provide us with the scriptural references showing ‘a loving God who is seeking reconciliation with all people’?**

[Mrs. V] *In the radio debate, a key idea for Dave Hunt seemed to be ‘love’, whereas for James White it was ‘power’.*

[Editor TA] **Yes, God’s great love of the elect, and His all powerful sovereignty in election.**

[Mrs. V] *‘Jesus is a powerful saviour who saves all that He tries to save’, White said. Later on he said that the different ideas about God could be summarised by saying that he (White) had a God who could save everybody*

[Editor TA] **I have listened to this debate several times. White does not use this language at all.**

[Mrs. V] *In my view, the Calvinist position does not line up with the teaching of Scripture. This may be due to a failure on my part to understand the Calvinist position.*

[Editor TA] **Most definitely so. It is obvious to me you have little idea of what true Calvinists actually teach. May I suggest a book to you?**

[Mrs. V] *Thank you, Terry, for your continued work in keeping the Lord’s people on the alert to false ideas and pointing us to the truth.*

[Editor TA] **I think you need to refute what is real ‘Calvinism’. Hunt has not done this at all. To say that God predestines or damns some to Hell...that God is unloving, etc, is just not fair in any semblance of truth. I hate Hyper-Calvinism as much as any but I will not shrink from the doctrines of Grace as they are taught in Scripture and were originally taught by our heroes of the faith.**

Bless you heaps...

Love,

Terry

Editors final note: This debate was interesting from the point of view concerning ‘logic’. The logic employed by many in this issue is too often humanistic and extra biblical. That logic goes beyond what the Bible teaches and thus cannot be applied to the Doctrines of Grace. To deduce assumptions from the basic tenets of the Doctrines of Grace is to wander into a minefield of Hyper-calvinism and mind-games. Most debates I have had feature this to a more or less extent.

[Mrs. V] *Is it possible that they over-reacted, in their eagerness to uphold the truth that salvation is God's work, not man's?*

[Editor TA] **No, they were only teaching what had been taught and by the church fathers who taught the faith once delivered. So, it is 'truth' that salvation is God's work? What are we debating about then? Dave says it's not!**

[Mrs. V] *There are times when Scripture uses expressions that are open to misinterpretation if read superficially and not seen in the light of the whole of the Bible. For example, 'I came to set a man against his father...' (Matt 10:35) and 'If anyone comes to Me and does not hate his own father and mother...' (Luke 14:26) could be taken to say that it was Jesus' purpose to break up families; and 'You see that a man is justified by works, and not by faith alone' (James 2:24) could easily be taken on its own to deny the doctrine of salvation by faith alone. Is it possible that the same kind of misunderstanding applies to the verses that seem to teach Calvinism?*

[Editor TA] **It's possible. But after an 'unsuperficial' reading of the scriptures expounding God's sovereign election, what understanding have you arrived yourself? What about my points above? Are they true, scriptural or not? Please refute them.**

[Mrs. V] *8. Your statement, 'No amount of redefining can change the sovereignty of God in that no one can come unless drawn', implies that Dave Hunt contradicts this idea, which he clearly does not. However he does say that some may be drawn but not come.*

[Editor TA] **Yes, he is saying that man can frustrate the will of God. Hunt denies that all the ones drawn are saved and raised up which the text clearly says in contradiction to him.**

[Mrs. V] *Suppose a fisherman were to say that no fish could be caught unless there is bait on the hook. Can we logically conclude from this statement that every hook with bait on it catches a fish?*

[Editor TA] **Good logic. But God is not a fisherman with 'hooks' and chances. His Word does not return to Him 'void'. 'All' that the Father has given Him will be 'raised up' on the last day. If God has made salvation available to all men...then why aren't all saved?**

[Mrs. V] *Even so, we cannot conclude from 'No man can come to me, except the Father draw him' that all that the Father draws come to Christ. Jesus said 'I...will draw all kinds of men to Myself' (John 12:32). However, not all come to Him. If, as you say, Hunt is changing the obvious meaning of the text, then what are the Calvinists doing when they say that 'world' really means 'the elect' believing ones in John 3:16 and 'all men' really means 'all kinds of men' in 1Tim 2:4? Whichever position one takes, it seems there are some Scripture passages that remain difficult to understand.*

[Editor TA] **But does it matter that this scripture is misquoted?**

[Mrs. V] *James White says 'does not the potter have a right over the clay...?' (Romans 9:21). Both men are biased...which bias is the best bias to be biased with?*

[Editor TA] **It's not a matter of 'bias'...White exegetes 2 Peter 3:9 correctly...Dave does not exegete it at all!**

Round 2

[Mrs. V] *I will now proceed to respond to some of the issues you raised in Diakrisis and would appreciate receiving your feedback on these points.*

1. *Regarding the radio debate, which I've already mentioned: I don't understand what you mean by saying, 'Dave debated from an emotional and logical view of the love of God'. Would you be willing to expand and explain that statement please?*

[Editor TA] **Dave argues that God's sovereign election is unfair and unloving...this is emotional...and he uses pure 'logic' to explain his position.**

[Mrs. V] *I also don't understand the point made about extrapolating from a logical point derived from Calvinism. Are you saying we shouldn't think through our beliefs logically? Surely in all our contending for the faith we use logic.*

[Editor TA] **Not when it disagrees with the plain reading of scripture in context and especially when we don't understand the 'mystery' (Eph.1:9) of it all. Logic can never explain this. Romans 9 deals with this very well...Vs.18-23 'Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory'.**

[Mrs. V] *Without logic, communication is impossible. My very words to you now are depending upon it. When we argue against evolution and point to the design in creation, we are asking someone to use logic to conclude that there must be a designer.*

[Editor TA] **That's not human logic, that's the use of 'evidence' in argumentation that comes from Scripture anyway.**

[Mrs. V] *When we consider a Catholic who believes that he must do a certain quantity of good works or he will not go to Heaven, we logically conclude that he is not trusting solely in Christ's atoning work for salvation. Since we believe that Scripture says it is necessary to trust in Christ alone for salvation, we logically conclude that that person is not saved.*

[Editor TA] **That's a conclusion arrived at by believing stated fact. Dave uses Logic that is extrabiblical and then applies it as doctrine...e.g. - That some are predestined to Hell!**

[Mrs. V] *You say that Hunt's logic goes beyond Scripture, when he concludes that, according to Calvinism, God is 'pleased to damn billions'. What do you mean by this?*

[Editor TA] **This is logic that is against the nature and the character of God! It is logic that is extrabiblical and doctrinally wrong! We mean that his erroneous logical extrapolation brings him to an un-Biblical conclusion that 'God is pleased to damn millions'...But where is that in scripture?**

[Mrs. V] *If such a conclusion is beyond Scripture and seems contrary to it, is it possible that the original premise that led to that conclusion is what is actually beyond Scripture?*

[Editor TA] **Not in this case, because God *does* predestine some to salvation! Scripture testifies to this in too numerous instances.**

[Mrs. V] *We all communicate using logic.*

[Editor TA] **Yes, but not to adding doctrinally to scripture! We are not arguing against the correct use of logic.**

[Mrs. V] *Sadly, fallen human beings are very much prone to using faulty logic. If Dave Hunt's logic is faulty in coming to that conclusion, that must certainly be exposed, but to decry him for using logic at all is, dare I say it, illogical! Does this make sense, or have I completely missed the point?*

[Editor TA] **You've missed the point. We argue that Dave misuses logic and comes to an un-Biblical conclusion... - that God would be unloving and a tyrant to choose only a few for salvation...but the problem is...that is the truth - (that God chooses some in predestination, election, etc).**

[Mrs. V] *2. In a similar vein, referring to statements on P.116 of the book, you say 'Hunt's charge here is repulsive to Calvinists and it confuses love with justice'. Is it possible that Calvinists do not allow themselves to think through the implications of their beliefs because their God-given sense of right and wrong recoils at those conclusions? Are not love and justice both integral parts of God's nature?*

But what does God say?: 'Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?' (Rom.9:20,21).

- Hunt associates Calvinism with 'intellectualism' and describes it as 'legalistic' (P.17). Hunt says that '*Calvinists insist that it requires special (and apparently lengthy) preparation for anyone to become qualified to examine that peculiar [Calvinist] doctrine...*' Is this really true of men like John MacArthur, etc...? Hunt gives no examples here, and the word 'peculiar' is again a strange description considering almost all the Reformers, revivalists and church leaders to the 19th Century were Calvinistic!

- Hunt blames 'Calvinism' for causing '*many to turn away from the God of the Bible as from a monster*' (P.287).

- What of the misquotes of Spurgeon? On page 241 Hunt says '*Certainly Spurgeon rejected it [Limited Atonement] as a heresy*'. However, Hunt fails to continue the quote to the next page of Spurgeon's work where he refers to Hunt's position as '*a thousand times more repulsive than any of those consequences which are said to be associated with the Calvinistic and Christian doctrine of special and particular redemption*'! Hunt has misquoted Spurgeon clearly!

- Hunt says of Calvinism: '*God imposes His will upon*' those who would be saved' (P.373). He says: '*Most Calvinists teach that in his sovereignty God gave the ten commandments, caused men to break them, then damn him for doing what God caused him to do*' (P.338). Again, Mrs V, is this is a fair representation of Calvinism? Hunt says God is '*pleased to damn billions*' (P.42). Is this really what Calvinists teach?

- As mentioned before, Hunt's attacks on Calvin's life and character are vehement.

- Hunt says that '*Calvinists have hijacked the Reformation*'. This is a total disregard for history. The reformers taught the principles of election, predestination, etc. that Calvinists today teach.

[Mrs. V] *7. Is it possible that some people place too much confidence in the Reformers and the 'pillars of the Reformation' rather than in Scripture?*

[Editor TA] **We get accused of this all the time. Our first priority is Scripture alone! But did not the Reformers at least re-introduce scriptural truth to the Church?**

[Mrs. V] *James White, for example, began with the Reformers in his radio debate. Could not the Reformers be wrong in some things, particularly since they were emerging from the darkness of a Roman Catholic mindset?*

[Editor TA] **Yes, but not on the subject of election, depravity, predestination, etc.**

[Editor TA] **The principle of it is not wrong. But the facts were wrong and ‘Calvinism’ did not come from Calvin. Hunt also does not separate true Historic Calvinism from Calvin.**

[Mrs. V] *Jesus said we should judge teachers by their fruits (Matt 7:16). Surely the man who is credited with originating this teaching should be evaluated for the fruits of his life?*

[Editor TA] **Yes, except that Calvin did not ‘originate’ this teaching!**

[Mrs. V] *Likewise, to accuse Hunt’s book of dividing Christians unnecessarily is, I think, unfair. I believe it is right for you to contend for truth in a whole range of Christian issues, as you do in ‘Diakrisis’, even though many would accuse you of being divisive, and claim that doctrine isn’t important.*

[Editor TA] **You have missed the point again. Hunt is touting a doctrine (Hyper-Calvinism’) that has been considered by orthodox Christianity as a severe heresy for centuries? On top of that he terribly misrepresents the true orthodox historical doctrine of the sovereign election of God, etc.**

[Mrs. V] *In the same way, it is right for Dave Hunt to contend for truth regarding the doctrine of Calvinism. Rather than causing division, Hunt is speaking to a situation in which division already exists, as a result of confusion regarding the teaching of Calvinism.*

[Editor TA] **True, there is confusion but Hunt is as confused as any! He was warned by several leading ‘Calvinists’ that his manuscript was in grave error and grossly misrepresented the facts of true ‘Calvinism’. But he ignored these warnings and went to print! ...Tell me these statements by Hunt are Biblical, correct of true ‘Calvinism and that they do not misrepresent!:**

- Hunt says of Charles Spurgeon that he *‘couldn’t seem to make up his mind...Spurgeon should have stayed with Biblical exegesis...Spurgeon stooped to twisting Scripture to his own ends’* (P.177). Hunt calls one of Spurgeon’s quotes *‘nonsense’*.

...But where was Spurgeon ever confused in any of this? Where is Spurgeon unable to *‘make up his mind’*? Why is it that he is considered by all to be a great teacher...?

- Hunt says: *‘Calvinism presents a God who fills Hell with those whom he could save but instead damns them because He does not love them’* (P.116). This is absolutely unbiblical and a misrepresentation of true ‘Calvinism’! Did Spurgeon, Whitefield, etc. ever teach this?

- Hunt says: *‘The fact that the potter can do with the clay what he pleases does not excuse the potter from promising perfection to each lump of clay and then discarding many, if not most, onto the rubbish heap’*, (P.209).

[Editor TA] **Yes, they are. His justice demands damnation for all and therefore all are condemned. His love is shown in ‘mercy’ bestowed upon the believer. We don’t understand the full ‘mystery’ of that as Ephesians 1 clearly says. But it is fact and non negotiable and cannot be added to by logic. Spurgeon said the responsibility of man and the choosing/election/predestination of God are ‘two friends’ that will not be ‘reconciled’.**

[Mrs. V] *In providing salvation in Christ He expresses both his love (dying in our place) and justice (the penalty for sin was paid).*

[Editor TA] **The blood of Jesus is sufficient for all humans to be saved. But it will in the end be effective for only some, considering ‘few’ will ultimately be saved. (Jn.10:11-15; Heb. 10:14; Matt.20:28; 1Cor.15:22; Matt.1:21; Rev.5:9,10).**

[Mrs. V] *According to Calvinism, some experience only God’s justice, by receiving the penalty for sin in hell, and miss out on His love, having no opportunity to receive salvation in Christ.*

[Editor TA] **Dead Wrong. This is where you and Hunt are in error on what ‘Calvinism’ and the likes of Spurgeon taught! We all experience or will experience God’s justice (whether in substitution on the cross) or in Hell! The world is already condemned.**

[Mrs. V] *If this is not a fair representation of true Calvinism, describing only its extremes, then just what is true Calvinism?*

[Editor TA] **‘Calvinism’ was a term coined in refutation of 5 points of Arminius. I personally don’t like the term partly because it is clearly misunderstood (e.g. by Hunt) but this is what was taught prior and afterwards by the greats including Spurgeon, etc...that God damned the Adamic race. Man is now born spiritually dead. Man is unable to respond to, or seek after, God. (...please read Rom.8:6,7; Rom.3:10-11; Jer.17:9; Is.64:6,7). To be saved one has to receive the gift of Faith to believe and God must regenerate our spirit. Some He leaves as they are, already condemned...the elect He quickens. Only by the drawing of the Holy Spirit will the ‘all’ that the father has given, come (Jn.6:37). This is brought about through the preaching of the Word. A true ‘Calvinist’ (such as nearly all the great revivalists and evangelists were) is an avid evangelist - he preaches to all - he is not privy to the identity and number of the elect so he offers salvation freely to all...God elects, chooses His people of His own determination (...please read Eph.1:5,9,11; 1Thess.1:4; 1Pet.1:2,10; Tit.1:1; Rom.8:33; 11:5,7; Col.3:12; Rom.9:15-18; Gal.1:15,16; Jn.6:37; 5:21...etc etc)...God draws those to Christ whom He chooses (please read Eph.1:4,5; Jn.15:16; Rom.3:11).**

[Mrs. V] *If Calvinists do not believe the Bible explicitly teaches that God predestines people to hell, then where does He predestine the unsaved to?*

[Editor TA] **He does not predestine the unsaved at all! This is not anywhere in Scripture! Where do you get this terrible idea from? The unsaved are simply left in their sins and that is what sends them to Hell.**

[Mrs. V] *If God has not predestined them to Heaven, what other alternative is there?*

[Editor TA] **People are not ‘predestined to Hell’...they are already there!**

[Mrs. V] 3. *You said, ‘Hunt fails to acknowledge that without Christ’s sacrifice, we were all destined to Hell!’*

[Editor TA] **Already destined, not predestined as Hunt says...**

[Mrs. V] Then in the very next sentence you quote him as saying, ‘*there is no disputing that God would be just in damning the entire human race*’.

[Editor TA] **Exactly the sort of contradiction we are accusing Dave of! Elsewhere Dave says that God would be ‘unloving’ to do this.**

[Mrs. V] *Isn’t that an acknowledgment that we are all deserving of hell?*

[Editor TA] **Yes, but it was done out of justice, not a ‘lack of love’ on God’s part!**

[Mrs. V] *When he says that the notion that God would predestine any to hell is unfair, the statement you quoted makes it plain that he’s not saying he thinks hell is an unfair punishment for sin. What he says is unfair is that salvation from that punishment should be provided for some and not others, on an apparently arbitrary basis, when all deserve hell.*

[Editor TA] **Arbitrary? God’s sovereign will is arbitrary?**

[Mrs. V] *This idea presents God as showing partiality, which is something He says is sin and commands us not to do (James 2:9).*

[Editor TA] **No, it’s not partiality...it’s election...partiality is showing favour to someone whom we think deserves it! Can you see the difference here? We show partiality to someone who comes into the Church wearing fine clothes and jewellery over a beggar in dirty apparel...that’s partiality! God has chosen the ‘beggarly’ things of this world...that’s impartiality.**

But God answers your query here excellently in Romans 9:...He has just finished saying it is not of any merit that one is chosen over another and then he says: ‘Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against

God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory’.

[Mrs. V] 4. *In the paragraph dealing with Acts 13:48 you quote Hunt as saying ‘many Greek scholars call it a wrong translation’...and you refute that...*

[Editor TA] **The ‘translations’ used by Hunt are a small smattering amongst a huge volume of translations that translate it as the KJV and multitudes of other commentaries do!**

[Mrs. V] 5. *Re ‘no one naturally seeks the Lord’: Is it not possible for the Holy Spirit to intervene in the life of such a one to convict him of his sin and challenge him to seek the Lord while there is time, and for such a person to respond by doing so? There is no contradiction here, is there? Isn’t that the Holy Spirit’s role? (John 16:8)*

[Editor TA] **Yes, to the elect He does this...we have never suggested He doesn’t have we?...Man is unable to come to God of himself for salvation unless the Holy Spirit draws him first (Rom.8:6,7; Rom.3:10-11; Jer.17:9; Is.64:6,7). Only by the drawing of the Holy Spirit will the ‘all’ that the father has given, come (Jn.6:37).**

[Mrs. V] 6. *Hunt’s book is described as an ‘all out attack’ on Calvinism, Calvin, the Reformers and various authors. As I see it, Hunt does not attack the writers themselves. Rather, he offers a critique of their ideas, and in the case of Calvin, of the practical outworking of his theology.*

[Editor TA] **He writes of Calvin as if he were some kind of a monster! Hunt’s attacks on Calvin’s life and character are vehement! Calvin is also called ‘immature’ and ‘the Protestant Pope’, (P.118,313), etc.**

[Mrs. V] *If there were no interaction with the teachings of these people, you would probably complain that the arguments of the leading proponents of Calvinism had not even been mentioned, let alone dealt with. And, if it’s wrong for Dave Hunt to ‘attack’ the writings of others, then why are you attacking his?*

[Editor TA] **We are not bemoaning any ‘attack’ on people but that the information was wrong! The history was very selective as we showed. What we did say is that this ‘attack’ was unfair because it did not teach true ‘Calvinism’. Was Spurgeon wrong? He was a full 5 point Calvinist. I have writings of his that you will not find in bookshops to prove this!**

[Mrs. V] *Calvin’s life is indeed examined in some detail. Is this unreasonable?*