

Points To Ponder

Matthew 6:12-15, says to continue to pray so that we will be forgiven and that if we don't forgive others that we will not be forgiven.

But Unconditional Securists claim that we don't have to pray to be forgiven and that we don't have to forgive to be forgiven because our future sins have already been forgiven.

Question: Why would Jesus make this statement if future sins were already forgiven? What might be implied here if we don't continue to pray or not forgive others?

Luke 8:13 says that there are some who receive the word with joy, but because they have no root, they believe for a while and in time of temptation fall away.

But Unconditional Securists claim that these are people that never believed in the first place and that it is impossible for anyone who believed to fall away in time of temptation. Some go as far as to say that it is impossible to stop believing.

Question: If these are people that never believed, then why does the verse explicitly state that they believed? (First 12 implies that Jesus is speaking of a belief that leads to salvation.) And how can one "fall away" from something that he doesn't possess, in this case, belief?

In Luke 15:11-32 the prodigal son received his inheritance and freely left the home of the father, when he returned home (of his OWN accord with nothing left of his inheritance), he was twice described by his father as having been "dead" and then "alive again".

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible for a son of the Father to be "alive again" because a true son would never leave home and become "dead" or even be able to.

Question: What does it mean to be alive, then dead and then alive AGAIN? (Remember, the son would not have received the inheritance unless he was first alive.)

In John 15:1-6 Jesus says that he is the vine and that we are branches and that if we don't bear fruit we will be cast forth as a branch, withered, and cast into the fire.

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible for a branch to be cast out of Jesus and cast into the fire.

Question: Read this passage and take note of the following: Jesus states, "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he (the Father) taketh away". If we are the branches (as Jesus stated we are), what does this mean? Of those who do not "abide," (continue, remain) "he is thrown away as a branch, and dries up; and they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." Does this sound like merely losing rewards?

In John 17:12 Jesus prays to the Father, telling Him that He had lost none of those that Father has given Him, except one, Judas.

But Unconditional Securists claim that that nobody who the Father has given

to Jesus will ever become lost again.

Question: Was it the Father's will or decree that Jesus not lose any? Did Jesus claim that He lost none that the Father gave Him or that He lost none but one, implying that it IS possible for one given to Jesus by the Father to become lost?

Romans 11:20-22 says that the Jews were broken off of the tree because of unbelief, and that we keep our place in it by believing. Not only this, but that we should fear, because if God did not spare the natural branches he might not spare the branches that were grafted in.

But Unconditional Securitists claim that no one can ever be cut from of God's tree because of disbelief as it is impossible for a believer to disbelieve.

Question: If it is impossible to stop believing, why did Jesus say it was possible? (Luke 8:13, above)

In 1 Corinthians 9:24-27 Paul says that not every runner who runs in the race will receive the prize, so he brings his body into subjection, lest after preaching to others he himself should be a castaway.

But Unconditional Securitists claim that you can't even join the race unless you're going to win the prize, and that it was impossible for him to become a castaway.

Question: If Paul thought it were possible that he could be castaway, why should we think that we can't? Or, if Paul thought it were impossible, then why make this statement in the first place?

1 Corinthians 10:12 says "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

But Unconditional Securitists claim it is impossible for anyone to fall. A true believer won't fall because he is eternally secure and a false believer can't fall because they were never standing in the first place.

Question: If our salvation is irrevocable, why would Paul tell those who had it to take heed lest they fall?

In 2 Corinthians 13:5 Paul says to examine yourself to see if you are in the faith.

But Unconditional Securitists claim that if you are no longer in the faith, you never had the faith to begin with.

Question: If salvation is dependent upon having a point in time when we accepted Jesus, why does Paul say to examine yourself to see if you are in the faith (present tense)? Why didn't Paul simply state, "Look into your past and remember if you ever accepted Jesus"?

In Galatians 5:1-4 Paul says that anyone who tries to be saved by works of the law becomes severed from Christ and has fallen from grace.

But Unconditional Securitists claim that it is impossible to be severed from Christ and impossible to fall from grace.

Question: If it is impossible to be severed from Christ or fall from Grace, then what is Paul saying? And if you can fall from Grace as Paul states, doesn't this mean that salvation is NOT irrevocable as the Securitist claims since you are saved BY grace?

Galatians 6:9 tells us that we will reap eternal life if we do not grow weary in doing good and faint.

But Unconditional Securists claim that anyone who does grow weary and faints was never going to reap eternal life in the first place.

Question: If this is true, then why isn't it stated "We shall reap eternal life because we will continue in doing good and not grow weary"?

In Colossians 1:21-23 Paul says that those God has reconciled will be presented holy and blameless IF we continue in our faith and not be moved away from the hope of the gospel.

But Unconditional Securists claim anyone who doesn't continue in his faith never was reconciled. They also claim that anyone that is moved away from the hope of the Gospel never had that hope to begin with.

Question: Short and sweet...Why does Paul continue to insert the conditional word "if" into verses such as this, IF he wasn't attaching a condition?

In 1 Timothy 1:19-20 Paul warns Timothy to hold fast to his faith and not make shipwreck of it like Hymenaeus and Alexander.

But Unconditional Securists claim Hymenaeus and Alexander never had faith to shipwreck in the first place and that if Timothy ever did have faith, he couldn't shipwreck it.

Question: If the Securist's claim is true, why would Paul make this statement and what did he actually mean by it?

In 1 Timothy 4:1 it says that the Spirit "expressly" says that in later times some will depart from the faith.

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible because Jesus will never let anyone depart from the faith.

Question: If Paul stated that some would depart from the faith, doesn't that imply that they had to first be IN the faith rather than not having faith in the first place? How can you depart from something that you never had or were never in? If I ever leave Mississippi, was I never IN Mississippi?

1 Timothy 5:8 says that if any one does not provide for his relatives that he has disowned the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.

But Unconditional Securists claim that you can NOT disown the faith and be worse than an unbeliever.

Question: If we can not disown the faith, then why does Paul say we can?

1 Timothy 6:10 says that for the love of riches some have wandered from the faith.

But Unconditional Securists claim it is impossible to wander away from the faith and that those that appear to have wandered from the faith, never had it!

Question: How can we wander from the Faith if we never had it? And if it is impossible to wander from the faith, why does this verse state that some have?

Hebrews 2:1 tells us, "Therefore we must pay the closer attention to what we have heard, lest we drift away from it."

But Unconditional Securists claim if we accepted what we heard that it is impossible to drift away from it, and if we didn't accept it then we can't drift away because we never had it.

Question: Once again, how can we drift away from something we never had? And if it is impossible to drift away, then what is the meaning of this verse

and others like it?

In Hebrews 3:12 says, "Take care, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil, unbelieving heart, leading you to FALL AWAY from the living God."

But Unconditional Securists claim it is impossible to fall away from the living God.

Question: Very simply asked...Why have this verse if it is impossible to fall away? Who are being addressed? What leads to falling away? What is it that we can be led to fall away from?

Hebrews 6:4-6 says that "...those who have once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit" can fall away.

But Unconditional Securists claim it is impossible and that this is only a hypothetical situation.

Question: Where in this passage does it even "hint" that this is hypothetical? And if the people being described are non-believers, can the Securist provide scripture to show that non-believers are referred to as being enlightened?

Hebrews. 10:26-27 tells us that there is no longer a sacrifice remaining for those that continue to sin deliberately, "...but a fearful prospect of judgment, and a fury of fire which will consume the adversaries."

But Unconditional Securists claim that those sins are already forgiven (others maintain that it is impossible for them to willfully sin), so it is impossible to enter the fury of fire which will consume the adversaries.

Question: If it is impossible for a Christian to sin willfully, was the writer of Hebrews misinformed by implying that a Christian can? And was the writer ill informed to assume that the people he was referring to were sanctified? (verse 29)

Hebrews 10:35 tells us "Therefore do not throw away your confidence, which has a great reward."

But Unconditional Securists claim it is impossible for us to throw away our confidence.

Question: If it is impossible to throw away your confidence, why is it, more that being implied, but being stated in this verse?

In James 5:19-20 it says that "if anyone among you wanders from the truth and some one brings him back, let him know that whoever brings back a sinner from the error of his way will save his soul from death."

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible for anyone to wander from the truth.

Question: If a believer can not wander from truth, why would James imply that they could? And if it is impossible for them to be brought back to repentance (as some Securist teach), why then does James imply that it IS possible. And if all future sins are already forgiven, why would this act of bringing a sinner back result in forgiveness of a multitude of sins? Further, if the sinner was "never saved in the first place", what are we supposed to be bringing him back to?

2 Peter 1:5-11 tells us to "be the more zealous to confirm your call and election, for if you do this you will never fall; so there will be richly provided for you an entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus

Christ."

But Unconditional Securists claim that if we make an effort to do anything at all to confirm our place in the kingdom, we have embraced a work's salvation and were never in Grace.

Question: Why would Peter tell us, in verse 10, to make our calling and election sure if it is already a sure, irrevocable act of God?

In 2 Peter 2:1 Peter says "there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who BOUGHT them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction."

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible for anyone Jesus ever bought to deny him and bring upon themselves swift destruction.

Question: If this is the case, then these false teachers were "never saved in the first place"? And if "never saved in the first place" who is the Master that bought them and what does it mean?

In 2 Peter 2:20-22 Peter writes of false teachers that promise freedom, saying, "if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overpowered, the last state has become worse for them than the first. For it would have been better for them never to have known the way of righteousness than after knowing it to turn back from the holy commandment delivered to them. It has happened to them according to the true proverb, The dog turns back to his own vomit, and the sow is washed only to wallow in the mire."

But Unconditional Securists claim that when someone has escaped the defilements of the world through a knowledge of Christ that it is impossible for them to turn back, or to turn back from knowing the way of righteousness. Some even claim that it doesn't affect salvation to return to "wallow in the mire" as it doesn't affect your relationship, only fellowship.

Question: Wasn't Peter speaking of people that could be saved and then fall away into a worse state that they were in? Peter states that they "escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" but yet were "entangled therein, and overcome". What is he talking about if not someone that becomes saved and then later falls away from their faith?

In 2 Peter 3:16-17 Peter warns that some of Paul's teachings were hard to understand and that "the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction . . . You therefore, beloved, knowing this beforehand, beware lest you be carried away with the error of lawless men and lose your own stability."

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible to lose your stability and twist things to your own destruction.

Question: If the Securist's belief about this is true, then what does this passage mean?

1 John 1:7 (one of MY favorites) says that "...if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin."

But Unconditional Unconditional Securists claim that if we ever walked in the light we have already been cleansed from all sin and do not need to be continually cleansed.

Question: Given this verse, what is the implication of not walking in the light?

In 1 John 1:9 it says that "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, and will forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

But Unconditional Securists claim that we have already been forgiven our sins and do not need to be continually cleansed from all unrighteousness because it was a one time event that stays.

Question: If our forgiveness is a "one time" event, why does the passage state that God WILL FORGIVE our sins, rather than God HAS FORGIVEN our sins? And what, by implication, does it tell us will happen if we don't confess our sins?

1 John 2:24 tells us to let that which we have heard from the beginning abide in us. And if it does abide in us, we shall continue in the Son and the Father.

But the Unconditional Securists claim that we can do nothing but abide in the Son and the Father.

Question: Why would John tell us to let it abide in us if there is no other choice but for it to abide in us? Also, To say that it never was there to begin with brings this question...If it never was in us, how could we let it abide in us, since abide means to continue or remain? And why, if salvation is irrevocable, would he state that "IF" that which we heard from the beginning shall remain in us, that we shall CONTINUE in the Son and Father? (with IF implying that this is conditional and CONTINUE implying that NOT continuing is a possibility. If not, then why make the statement in the first place?)

1 John 2:28 says, "And now, little children, abide in him, so that when he appears we may have confidence and not shrink from him in shame at his coming."

But Unconditional Securists claim that it is impossible for a saved person NOT to abide in Him, but the Securist's view makes this verse meaningless. You can not **"abide" in something you are not in, anymore than you can leave Mississippi if you aren't in Mississippi.**

Question: What is the meaning of the word "abide"? And how does it relate to this scripture?

In Revelation 3:4 Jesus says that in Sardis there were a few people who have not soiled their garments; "...and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy."

Yet Unconditional Securists claim that all that professed a one time faith in Jesus will receive a white garment because it is impossible for them to soil their garments.

Question: If it is impossible for a believer to "soil their garments", then who was Jesus referring to in this scripture?

In Revelation 3:5 Jesus says that "He who overcomes shall be clad thus in white garments, and I will not blot his name out of the book of life; I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels."

But Unconditional Securists claim it is impossible to be blotted out of the book if you were ever in it. But many will also agree that children are listed in the book of life until they reach the age of accountability. They deny that God will blot whoever sins out of the book, yet God says He will in Exodus 32:33.

Question: Jesus states that He will not blot a name out of the book of life,

implying that He can blot a name out. If He CAN blot a name out, then it must be possible to do so. If not, why? And if this verse doesn't imply that names can be blotted out, then what is the implication of stating that He won't blot out a name? If Salvation is irrevocable, should Jesus have stated that He CAN'T blot a name out of the book of life rather than WILL NOT blot it out?

In Revelation . 3:11 Jesus announces, "I am coming soon; hold fast what you have, so that no one may seize your crown."

But Unconditional Securists claim that we can never lose our crown and that no one can ever seize it.

Question: If the Securist is correct, then what does this verse actually mean?

Revelation 22:19 says, "if any one takes away from the words of the scroll of this prophecy, God will take away his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this scroll."

But Unconditional Securists claim it is impossible to have your share of the tree of life taken away and your share in the holy city taken away.

Question: Given the Securist's view of this scripture, what then does the verse mean? If rewards, then the reward must be a part in the tree of life. Does this not imply that eternal life is a reward? And if a reward, what does it mean to the Securist that we will "only" lose rewards if we are not faithful?

These are not the only verses that teach OSAS is not of truth, there are numerous others that Securists have to flat out deny or wriggle their way around. And these are not just my "views" and "feelings" about salvation. This is what the Bible says.

A simple layman can sit down with the Bible and see that OSAS is NOT the teaching of the Bible.

I could offer to give you a house as a gift and make the condition that you need to provide a foundation that the house can be set upon. Did you earn the house by building a foundation, or did you meet the conditions of receiving the free gift of the house by building the foundation?

If later on you decide that you would rather have something that can be obtained by forsaking the house that I gave you and give it up in exchange for what you wanted, did I take the house away or did you forfeit it? Did the house suddenly become something you had earned, or did it remain as a free gift? And what if the house was guaranteed to last for eternity? Did this eternal house stop being eternal because you gave it up? If it were still eternal does that mean that your possession of it is eternal?

Don't let the slick talking Securist deprive you of your salvation. You CAN fall! And embracing the OSAS doctrines of unconditional eternal security is one of the ways that can lead to it!
