

Eternal Security

Of the Believer in Christ

A Discussion between Robert Waters and Dr. Lloyd Olson

Propositions:

"THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST."

Robert Waters Affirms
Dr. Lloyd Olson Denies

"THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST."

Dr. Lloyd Olson Affirms
Robert Waters Denies

Dr. Lloyd Olson Introduction and Biography

Mr. Richard Jackson (ppquimby01@gmail.com)

Mr. Robert Waters (robertwaters@yahoo.com)

Greetings in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior:

I am Dr. Lloyd Olson. I'm white, 66 yrs old, 5'10", and 215 lbs. I'm happily married with five children, and seven grand children. I am quite good at chess.

With regard to the secular world, I have a B.S. in Psychology (minors in Mathematics, Greek, and Linguistics), a B.S. in Mathematics (minor in Physics), and an M.S. in Mathematics. I am the Cost Team Leader, within the Close Combat Weapon Systems Project Office, within the Missiles and Space Program Executive Office, within the Department of the Army. My daily tasks include building comprehensive budget requests and defending them through several levels of reviewers on the way to The Congress and the President's budget. My job depends on fanatic completeness, demanding grammar, and carefully worded justification. I also am an adjunct faculty at Calhoun Community College where I teach various math classes from College Algebra through Differential Equations.

With regard to biblical studies, I have a B.S. minor in Greek, an M.S. in Bible (with 6 hours in Greek) and a Ph. D. in Theology (with a concentration in Apologetics and 20 hours in Greek). I was the pastor of a Lutheran Church in north-west Minnesota in the 70s and the pastor of a Church of Christ in southern Tennessee in the late 90s. I am a published author and currently worship at a Church of Christ in northern Alabama.

While there are certain disagreements with regard to theology, I assume that these are swallowed up by our common bond and faith in Jesus Christ. As common brothers in Christ by the grace of God, we all desire to serve Jesus the best we know. As rebels washed in Jesus' blood, we all desire to grow in Christ and be ever closer to Him. As undeserving saints, we all seek to increase our knowledge of Jesus.

Therefore my brethren, since we have access to the same Bible, copies of the original languages, many commentaries, and dozens of good English translations - - may the forthcoming exchanges draw us all ever closer to the one gospel truth so clearly showcased in the pages of our common Bible. May all this bring God glory, praise, and honor! May Jesus be uplifted and glorified by our conduct, our words, and the explications of our fledgling theologies.

I see my role as a moderator (when I'm not the participant) to be rather simple and unobtrusive. First, I will police the submissions with respect only to suggesting clarifications and word count. Obviously, I have no authority for whatever I suggest. However, I trust that my suggestions will be duly considered. Second, I will give an overarching appeal for certain aspects of apologetics, exegetics, and theology which lend themselves to the chosen debate topics. For example, the use of Bible references in context. This is something we all claim to do. This is also something we all think that others, especially our opponents, fail to do. Third, at the end of the debate, I will give my scholarly opinion at the end as to how each party has performed in the debate, how the arguments have ebb and flowed, and how those arguments pertain to the chosen debate topic.

Thank you both for allowing me to participate – even if ever so slightly – in this debate. I hope and pray that the God of peace may bless the forthcoming exchanges.

Dr. Lloyd Olson (orsalao@yahoo.com)

Robert Waters' Introduction and Biography

I'm honored to be a part of this discussion on the issue of whether a child of God can fall from grace. Both Richard Jackson (moderator) and Lloyd Olson, opponent in the debate on eternal security, have been great to work with to this point—a breath of fresh air, actually.

I first learned about God by faithfully attending a small country church. The only time I heard a real sermon presented by a professional was during our yearly gospel meetings. My true spiritual journey began at about the age of 16, when I determined to respond to the invitation (after the sermon) and be baptized into Christ to be part of his body (Gal. 3:27; 1 Cor. 12:13). My family moved to a larger city shortly thereafter, where I had the opportunity to learn from a seasoned gospel preacher. However, my knowledge of the Bible and faith in God was minimal until I went to Florida College, where I took Bible courses such as “The New Testament Church,” “Old Testament,” “Persuasion” (writing), “Evidences for Christianity,” etc. Two trips to the “Holy Land” (Israel) helped increase my faith that encourages action, or “works” (James 2:20).

Even though I had decided to become a preacher, the cost of attending Florida College was too much of a burden on my parents. Therefore, I determined to peruse my education at a state college. Having grown up on a farm and taken numerous agricultural classes, I decided to major in Agricultural Education. After getting a BS degree I immediately got a job in Caraway, Arkansas, preaching at a congregation of about 100. Five years later, I procured an agriculture-related job, but continued to preach as opportunity availed itself. Being self-supported, I encountered no difficulties in preaching the truth where it contradicted tradition. Preaching the truth has resulted in many being converted to Christ and also helping those already converted to remain faithful that they not be, as Paul warned, “a castaway” (1 Cor. 9:27).

Even before I began preaching I submitted articles to several religious journals and from time to time engaged in exchanges on controversial topics. I wrote and published some tracts and books to include religious debates.

I'm known mainly for my website called “Total Health.bz,” which receives from 700 to 1500 hits a day and presents religious articles by various authors as well as health news. I've always been known, especially in the early years of my ministry, for being a warrior for the idea of “continual cleansing.” Some members of the “Church of Christ” think any and every sin causes a Christian to fall from grace, but I do not. And I believe that this will be helpful in my efforts to persuade others to the truth regarding whether a Christian need be concerned about falling from the grace of God.

Robert Waters

RobertWaters@yahoo.com

Waters' First Affirmative

Introduction:

Working with Lloyd Olson and Richard Jackson has been uplifting, and I'm happy to be involved in this discussion to affirm the proposition noted below. What could benefit the devil more than to convince God's children that no consequences will come if they give up the faith, or that turning to a life of sin will not result in forfeiture of the blessings God promises to those who remain faithful until death? On the other hand, what could benefit the child of God more than words of warning and admonition to "watch" and "continue in the faith," lest one be overtaken in sin and lost in the end?

Who came up with the notion that a child of God could cease to believe, turn from God, and fall from divine favor? My position, as a teacher of the gospel, is not just a notion but a fact well established by numerous passages found throughout the Bible. Adam and Eve were told, "In the day you eat...you shall surely die" (Gen. 2:17). They chose to eat and consequently died that same day (death meaning separation), as they were driven from the garden (separated) where they had eternal life. On the other hand, it was Satan who said, "Ye shall not surely die" (Gen. 3:4). While I happily side with God, and recognize that what He said would happen DID happen, my opponent holds to the position that one who is in the favor of God (as were Adam and Eve) cannot lose that favor. Of course, this position becomes more pronounced when applied to Christians in the New Testament. But it is an impossible position to sustain if good hermeneutic is applied. Lloyd has to explain away very clear passages teaching that a child of God can fall, and be finally lost.

While one might struggle with a few passages that at first glance seem to help my opponent, the goal of the truth seeker is to take a position that allows harmony of the scriptures. This requires avoiding drawing a conclusion, based on a few obscure texts, that contradicts many passages that are unequivocal and unambiguous.

An issue of concern among all Christians is whether there can be any security for the believer. What would be the use even bothering to live for Christ if there is no possible way to be saved eternally? Since we all commit sins of ignorance, sins of weakness, and sins inadvertently, God must offer grace (unmerited favor) if anyone is to be saved. Indeed, grace is applied to those who meet the conditions set forth in the New Testament. And those conditions are not burdensome, or more than we can handle (1 John 1:1-3). My opponent and I agree that God has not set up a system that results in Christians' being automatically ousted from grace the instant we sin. We agree that He is the Judge of our heart and that He looks at our life—not just a single act—in making His judgments. What we need to agree upon is the truth that is between these extreme views. One extreme, which Lloyd apparently believes, is that no sin—not even rebellion, not even ceasing to believe—can result in the loss of eternal life. The other extreme position is that any sin, no matter the circumstances, results in instant loss of eternal life that we have in Christ, and that the sinner must learn of the sin, repent and confess it, before he can be reconciled. Again, the truth is between the extremes.

Proposition:

"THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST."

Definition and Explanation of the Proposition:

By "scriptures," I mean both the Old and New Testaments.

By "possible" I mean that it can and does happen.

By "child of God" I mean one who has been born again.

By "finally lost" I mean outside of God's saving grace at the time of departure from this life.

In at least 16 passages in the New Testament the word "IF" is used to qualify salvation as being **conditional**. The word "if" is "Used to say that a particular thing can or will happen only after something else happens or becomes true" (Cambridge Dictionary). So God is evidently telling us, in all these passages in which He uses various means of persuasion, that we can lose our salvation and be "finally lost." Here is one passage:

#1

"For IF we walk in the light...the blood...cleanses us of all sin" (1 John 1:7, emphasis added)

The issue is not whether God can save sinners. He can and does. The real issue is whether or not conditions must be met to continue in the faith, which will result in a crown of life (Rev. 2:10). I have security, but it is based upon not only what Jesus has done but also conditions set forth in the word of God that require something of me. John tells us that **"IF we walk in the light...the blood...cleanses us of all sin."** Now "IF" is a little word but it is a powerful one. The BLOOD of Christ is what cleanses us and it is what KEEPS us clean. While my opponent has taken the position that this cleansing continues even when the believer has ceased to **"walk in the light,"** I affirm that such is true **ONLY IF** the believer meets the conditions set forth by the apostle and Jesus Himself, in various passages.

Warnings to be careful not to "fall," be a "castaway," or be "disqualified" in the "race":

In both the Old and New Testaments, God's people were/are WARNED, over and over, not to turn from the ways of God, lest they "fall" or be "cut off," etc. This implies and WARNS that it is possible to be "finally lost".

#2

Romans 11:20-22

Well; because of **unbelief** they were **broken off**, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: For if God spared not the natural branches, **take heed lest he also spare not thee**. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which **fell**, severity; but toward thee, goodness, **if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.**

In the above text, Paul is speaking of physical Israel (“natural branches”). He states that they were “broken off” because they ceased to believe. Then he admonishes, or warns, the Romans in the church (spiritual “Israel of God,” Gal. 6:16) to “**take heed**” lest the same thing happen to them. Paul speaks of the severity of God against those who fell from His favor. While they experienced His favor they had security due to His protection and guidance, and they enjoyed the hope of receiving promises that God had made. But they “fell” from His favor and were “cut off” from His “goodness” that provided those blessings. The latter part of the above passage is both an admonition and a WARNING to Christians: “**continue in his goodness**” (keep the faith) or be “**cut off.**”

#3

1 Corinthians 10:5-12

And were all **baptized** unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the **same spiritual meat**; And did all drink the **same spiritual drink**: for they **drank of that spiritual Rock** that followed them: and **that Rock was Christ**. But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were **overthrown** in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them;...Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were **destroyed** of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them... murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition...” **Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.**

In the above passage, Paul notes that God’s people of old were baptized (as were the Corinthians), ate of the same spiritual meat, and drank of the same spiritual rock (Christ), but they displeased God with their actions and were “**destroyed.**” Paul then states that these things are ensamples for our admonition, and he concludes with a stern warning to anyone who thinks he stands to “**take heed lest he fall.**” It cannot be successfully argued that Paul is speaking of people who were not saved because they (those under each covenant) are said to be partakers of Christ in various ways. Thus they were saved BEFORE their departure from Him.

#4

Galatians 5:4-7

Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For...neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. **Ye did run well;** who did **hinder** you that ye should **not obey the truth?**

In the above text, Paul stalwartly tackles the problem of the sin of rebellion. In this case, it was Christians looking to the Law, rather than Jesus, for justification. That some Christians were doing this is evident from the fact that Paul addressed the issue to them. So it was not just a warning about something that real Christians would never do. In fact, he called out those who were guilty and judged that they were “**fallen from grace.**” It cannot be said that they were never a Christian in

the first place because he reminds them that they “**did run well.**” In other words, those who had fallen from grace had at one time been IN God’s grace. But something happened; they were HINDERED. Paul asks a rhetorical question as to WHO did the hindering that caused them to cease to “**obey the truth.**”

#5

2 Peter 1:5-10

And beside this, **giving all diligence, add to your faith** virtue; and to virtue knowledge; And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For **if** these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore...brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall:

In the above passage, the apostle utterly destroys both the extremes I noted in the beginning of this affirmative. He notes the various attributes that need to be added to one’s faith. Then, he states that if the one who has this faith lacks “**these things**” he is blind and no longer appreciates what Christ did for him. Paul then commands to “**give diligence**” if one wants to be sure he is saved. Finally, he says “**if you DO these things you will never fall.**” This is really MORE than a SUGGESTION that one will fall if he does not add to his faith the characteristics, or graces, Peter noted—qualities that are important to growth and salvation. Hence, we have the requirement to “**give diligence**” to keep saved and the acknowledgment that one will not fall if he puts into practice the behaviors noted.

Conclusion

I have established that the Bible teaches that one who ceases to meet the conditions for grace, which God has set forth in the Bible, will be “cut off” or “fall” from grace and will be “finally lost.” It is my prayer that this teaching will be well received, and will serve to help others be more diligent in the faith that they might better resist the temptations of the devil and continue in hope. I look forward to seeing my honorable opponent’s reply.

Robert Waters

Olson's First Negative

PROPOSED: "THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST."

DO

Robert's proposition centers on the *underlying command* "DO." The debate proposition implies there is something a child of God can FAIL to DO and so be finally lost. To avoid damnation, Robert urges us to DO five things:

DO confess.

DO continue in goodness.

DO take heed.

DO stay in grace.

DO add to your faith.

If you DON'T DO, you can be lost.

Robert's demand is restricted to human-centered obedience. Worse! God's work for us via Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice is never mentioned.

POSSIBLE

How much or little must we DO? Any one sin makes one guilty of the **WHOLE LAW** (James 2:10). Robert is caught! God demands 100% but the best of human-centered obedience is but **FILTHY RAGS** (Isa 64:6) to God. Were there some little thing we had to DO, we could not DO it! The best human-centered obedience can produce is 0%. Robert's human-centered system urges us to DO the IMPOSSIBLE. He foists upon us a hopeless system of certain death.

Robert dare not deny the *underlying command*; that would deny his proposition. To maintain his legalism he ignores **human depravity**. Christ-centered grace has no trouble with this question!

IMPOSSIBLE

Why does Robert's legalism

demand depraved human works?

not mention the sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice?

ignore human depravity?

embrace a hopeless system of death?

ROMANS 11:6

The crucial contrast throughout this debate will be Robert's legalism versus biblical grace.

**And if by grace, then is it no more of works:
otherwise grace is no more grace.**

**But if it be of works, then is it no more grace:
otherwise work is no more work.**

Rom 11:6

LEGALISTIC PHILOSOPHY

Human-centered Philosophy drives Legalistic Theology!! Legalistic philosophy is the master; theology the servant. Human-driven theology declares:

If I keep obeying God's laws, then I stay saved.

Robert's debate proposition is the contra-positive of this. Faith plus my good works is the same misdirected Pharisaical legalism that Jesus condemned.

The Jews started with The Ten Commandments. Over time, their righteous zeal for the LORD devised 360+ extra commandments and pages of scholarly opinions. They assumed obedience to their laws would automatically assure obedience to God's laws. Justification became a process of law-keeping. What they missed was that the Ten Commandments were meant to drive them to the all-sufficiency of Christ (Gal 3:23-24).

Misdirected self-righteous Pharisaical zeal does **NOT STOP** at the total sufficiency of Christ. Legalism adds a self-confident denial of the biblical judgment to **impossible human obedience** (Isa 64:6). Claiming the name of Jesus, the sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice is denied by adding impossible human obedience.

BIBLE PHILOSOPHY

God's Word mandates Christ-centered Philosophy!! God's Word is the master; philosophy is the servant. Gospel-driven philosophy declares Jesus' sufficiency in every aspect. "In Christ shall all be made alive." The gift of righteousness only comes through Jesus (Rom 5:15-17).

We are complete in Jesus. Col 2:10

I challenge Robert to find the word "I" in these verses.

Since we are truly complete in Jesus, nothing can be added. Our additions to Christ are really subtraction from His sufficiency. Christ-centered philosophy looks outward to God's work in Jesus; NOT inward to our works, NOT even to God's work inside us. The righteousness which makes believers acceptable to God is an alien righteousness residing securely in Jesus in heaven.

ROBERT'S VERSES

Prayerfully consider how Robert's misdirected legalistic zeal has contorted the proposed verses:

RW#1: 1 John 1:7

“IF we walk in the light”

First, Robert was unfaithful to **CONTEXT**. John wrote to enhance our fellowship with God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ (v3). Amazingly, Robert ignored the word “fellowship” in verse 7. Fellowship with God has nothing to do with being lost. Fellowship relates to rewards.

Second, Robert misunderstands “IF.” Because there is no perfect English translation of the underlying Greek, the KJV translators tried a wooden word-for-word translation. However, the conditional English “IF” does not show the underlying Greek structure: a more probable future occurrence (Wallace, *Beyond the Basics*, 696). A less wooden translation is: **we will likely** walk in light, have fellowship, and be cleansed from sin. This verse has no English conditionality.

Third, Robert wrongly unites new birth and spiritual growth into one process: impossible human obedience produces final justification. The Bible says otherwise. Eternal life does NOT depend on a process of works.

“For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.”

Hebrews 10:14

Don’t dismiss this verse because believers’ security is heralded. The “forever” aspect of *perfected* (τετελείωκεν) will show up in my proposition.

Crucial for this proposition is that being perfected is not conditioned on **impossible human obedience**. The word sanctified (ἁγιαζομένου) is a present participle. Believers have not yet arrived. God has permanently perfected them even while they stumble in an imperfect process. Thankfully, the believer’s position in Christ is permanent and distinct from an imperfect process of spiritual failures and disobedience. Eternal life is not a process. This confusion of DESTINY with REWARDS is **ONE SURE SIGN OF LEGALISM**.

Confession of sins relates to issues of fellowship (REWARDS) - not “IF” the child of God can be lost (DESTINY). This verse, properly understood in context, does not support the proposition.

RW#2: Romans 11:20-22

“because of unbelief they were broken off”

This is in Paul’s excursus on Israel. Paul asks, “Has God cast away His people?” Then he trumpets, “**CERTAINLY NOT!**” (11:1). Robert’s verse is dismissed and eradicated by this simple denial. But there is more!

Robert ignored **CONTEXT** again! He only sees that God cut Israel from the vine and grafted in Gentiles. Olson (*Eternal Security*, 136) notes:

Israel’s entire history is the pattern for eternal security. God called Israel for no special reason. He kept them when they rebelled and apostatized, when they crucified Jesus, and even when they were cut away from the vine and Gentiles grafted in. God promises

to save Israel in the end (Isa 66:7-8; Zech 12:10-13:1) so that even their disobedience will exalt His mercy (11:32). Israel's future is certain and secure.

Just as God remained faithful to undeserving Israel, He will also be faithful to every believing sinner. God will never cast out those who have come unto Him through Christ (John 6:37; 17:2). The believer's future is certain and secure.

But there is even more!

Robert confused Israel's DESTINY with their REWARDS. Israel's destiny is "**IRREVOCABLE**" (11:29 NIV) even while Israel's rewards are rather minimal to date. The believer's destiny in Christ is as certain and secure as Israel's irreversible destiny even while rewards vary. Believers are warned about losing their rewards so that they can get the best heavenly reward. Good works apply only for rewards. Good works have nothing to do with one's destiny.

This verse, properly understood in context, does not support the proposition.

RW#3: 1 Corinthians 10:5-12

"they were overthrown in the wilderness ... destroyed of serpents"

Robert states that the Israelites of old displeased God and were destroyed. Robert misunderstands the word "destroyed." Moses helps us understand the issue. Moses was disqualified from the prize and "destroyed" in the wilderness. Yet from the Transfiguration we know that Moses was saved. "Destroyed" was a temporal judgment not related to eternal life. Again, the issue is not eternal life. The issue is spiritual growth. The redeemed Israelites lost their reward and were judged. The whole generation (save two) was destroyed.

Robert ignored the **CONTEXT** again. Thankfully, the story doesn't end there. The next generation inherited the land. Even after repeated failures, sins, falling away, idolatry, years of dispersion, and crucifying their Messiah, the remnant of Israel will be saved in one day (Isa 66:8, Zech 3:9, Rom 11:26 quoting Isa 59:20, 21). Robert CONFUSED Moses' DESTINY with his temporal (loss of) REWARD.

This verse, properly understood in context, does not support the proposition.

RW#4: Galatians 5:4-7

"ye are fallen from grace"

Robert ignored **CONTEXT** again! Robert sees "fallen from grace" and wrongly assumes "loss of eternal life." Fallen (ἐκπίπτω) is pictured in withered flowers. In this context, fallen refers to the loss of one's grip on grace. Paul is referring to the Christian's choice of submitting to the yoke of the law or embracing the liberation of **all-sufficient** grace through faith in Jesus. If one embraces a human-centered philosophy that demands **impossible human obedience**, then one has automatically turned their back on the way of grace-alone. One who has fallen has gone from blessing to bondage. Even the slightest inclination to attributing destiny to **impossible human obedience** is the same as renouncing (falling away from) Christ. None of this refers to eternal life.

This verse, properly understood in context, does not support the proposition.

RW#5: 2 Peter 1:5-10

“add to your faith ... if ye do ye shall never fall.”

Peter lists several things that should be added to faith. He then says “if ye do these things, ye shall never fall.”

Incredibly Robert ignored **CONTEXT** again! Verse 8 shows that Peter is discussing spiritual growth. His goal is that believers won't be barren or unfruitful. **SPIRITUAL GROWTH** is not **DESTINY**.

The real negative is that those foolish believers are like the blind who cannot see (v9). Peter's strongest criticism is that the foolish believer had “forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.” Is that all?!?

Note carefully that the worst Peter can say is something like “blind forgetful idiots!” We are all blind to some extent. Spiritual blindness, even for believers, is not a condition to keep or lose the gift of eternal life. Forgetfulness is not related to destiny - not sufficient to make a child of God be lost.

Notice that Peter never said the believer was lost. Destiny has NOT changed from the perspective of God the Judge. Idiot forgetfulness loses rewards before God our Father. Peter, unlike Robert, rightly kept **DESTINY** distinct from loss of **REWARDS**.

If a child of God could truly be lost, then Peter was unspeakably negligent in sounding the alarm. Falling deals with loss of rewards; not changes in destiny.

This verse, properly understood in context, does not support the proposition.

SUMMARY

Robert made four catastrophic errors. He consistently ignored **CONTEXT**. He **rejected human depravity**, **denied the sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice**, and confused **DESTINY** with **REWARDS**.

Some important contrasts between Robert's legalism and the Bible are:

Robert: My good works please God.

Bible: My good works are as filthy rags to God. Isa 64:6

Robert: Destiny is the same as rewards.

Bible: Destiny is distinct from rewards.

Robert: Jesus' sacrifice is sufficient, but I must add a process of my works.

Bible: Jesus' sacrifice is all sufficient (Col 2:10). I can add nothing.

Robert: Justification is a process of good works.

Bible: Justification is not dependent on good works. Heb 10:14

Thankfully, none of Robert's verses supported the proposition. If his view is true, then none of us can either be saved or stay saved because the best of our works cannot please God (Isa 64:6). Robert's proposition is a hopeless gospel of death.

To bypass the all-sufficiency of Christ in favor of a justification before God on the ground of obedience to law is to overturn the most basic and fundamental purpose of the suffering and death of Jesus Christ our Lord.

***"But now a righteousness coming from God has been brought to light apart from any law ... which depends on faith in Jesus Christ
We maintain that it is as the result of faith that a man is held to be righteous, apart from actions done in obedience to Law."
Romans 3:21-22, 28 (Weymouth)***

Thankfully, Robert's proposition is shattered, debunked, and rejected. There is no possible sin such that a child of God **CAN** be finally lost.

Thank you for this opportunity to herald the believer's permanent unending security in Jesus.

Lloyd Olson

Waters' Second Affirmative

Upon reading Lloyd's rebuttal my first thought was, "Is he replying to what I wrote?" That is, of course, what he was supposed to do when in the negative—deal with everything I had said and show it to be error, if it is. One should not make affirmative arguments while in the negative. In my introduction I showed God's command "**in the day you eat...you shall surely die**" and Satan's twisted version, "**ye shall not surely die.**" Lloyd made no reply. This tells us he either has no problem with the text or he cannot answer it; either way, it affirms my proposition—a child of God can rebel and lose eternal life and be "finally lost."

I then wrote about the TWO EXTREME positions and explained that the believer can have security if he walks in the light. Lloyd, did you ignore this part because you see you have taken an extreme position?

Lloyd's "Do Nothing" Philosophy

It appears that Lloyd has a problem with biblical instruction regarding the Christian's responsibility to "do" or perform certain acts in obedience to God. "Do" is found 1368 times in the KJV and "doeth" is found 96 times. Thus, it must be important—so much so that Jesus emphatically stated that DOING the will of God is required to enter heaven (Matt7:21). But my opponent has made light of God's teaching on the matter, charged me with "legalism," and stated that I "denied the sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice." Lloyd, you are supposed to be dealing with my arguments—not making up things and hurling false charges.

Jesus told the Jews "**except ye repent...ye shall...perish**" (Luke13:3). This clearly was a COMMAND to DO something. Surely Lloyd believes one must have FAITH to be saved. If so, then he should see that one must **DO** something to be saved.

And then we have Jesus saying, "**Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city**" (Rev22:13). Thus, we have to DO something to even have a RIGHT to eternal life. This undoubtedly means a Christian can be "finally lost" if he is not a **doer of the word** (James1:22,25).

According to **Thayer**, a DOER (*poiētēs*) is "*one who obeys or fulfils the law.*"

Not only does Lloyd's "do" argument fail to refute any of my arguments, his "do nothing" philosophy allows **no one** to be saved because DOING is a requirement to get into Christ, where are all spiritual blessings (Gal3:27; 1Cor12:13; Eph1:3). Lloyd, can one be saved outside of Christ?

Christian Security

I pointed out that 1John 1:7 is the basis for Christian security in Christ. I showed that "**walk in the light**" is a condition for being continuously cleansed by the blood of Christ. I noted that Lloyd takes the position that "this cleansing continues even when the believer has ceased to **walk in the light.**"

My position is that “Such is true ONLY IF the believer meets the conditions.” Verse 6 says: “**If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth.**” Thus, if we “**walk in darkness**” we do not have fellowship with God. There is not a Christian alive today that cannot, if he is not watchful, lose faith and go back to the ways of this world, as did Demas (2Tim4:10).

Lloyd’s Problem with "IF":

“If” is found 1595 times in the KJV.

Strong: (*eh-an'*)

a conditional particle; in case that, provided, etc.; often used in connection with other particles to denote indefiniteness or uncertainty:—before, but, except,

It was Jesus who said, “**If you obey my commands, you will remain in my love**” (Jn15:10 NIRV). Lloyd, can one be “finally saved” if he does not obey Jesus to stay in his love?

In speaking to Solomon, God clearly set forth CONDITIONS for forgiveness of sin, and virtually all translators use the word “IF”:

“And the LORD appeared to Solomon...and said unto him...If my people...shall humble themselves...and turn from their wicked ways; then will I...forgive their sin...**”** (2Chr7:12,14).

Lloyd stated:

“Were there some little thing we had to DO, we could not DO it!”

Using Naaman, God illustrated the requirement to DO something to receive cleansing (2Kings5:1-14)? There are things that we CAN and MUST do, to include confession, believing, repenting, and being baptized. Jews who heard the gospel asked “**Men and brethren, what shall we do?**” (Acts2:37). They were commanded to “**Repent and be baptized.**” Lloyd’s problem with the word “do” reflects his Calvinistic philosophy that denies man’s part in salvation. If we take “DO” (and other related words) out of the Bible, we are left with universal salvation, which leaves out faith in Jesus.

Lloyd wrote:

“Robert’s human-centered system urges us to DO the IMPOSSIBLE. He foists upon us a hopeless system of certain death.”

Certainly one cannot save himself by his works (which Paul clearly teaches in various places), as seemed to be a notion of many of the Jews of Jesus’ day. But in view of what I wrote about the security one who walks in the light has, Lloyd should not have made the statement quoted above. I presented TWO extreme views and stated that the truth is in the middle, which is that those who “**walk in the light,**” as opposed to a “**walk in darkness,**” have spiritual security. But my opponent denies the word of God by denying that a Christian must “**walk in the light**” to be continuously

cleansed by the blood of Christ, which is how one STAYS SAVED. Instead of debating me he chose to debate someone that believes one of the extremes I shared.

Previous Affirmative Passages:

#1

1 John 1:7

This text presents a condition for walking in the light that one might have fellowship with God. Lloyd denies that a condition is presented and that fellowship with God is even necessary. Unbelievably, he said, **“Fellowship with God has nothing to do with being lost.”** But did he offer scripture to prove it? No, and we can be certain that fellowship with God has EVERYTHING to do with being lost or saved. It is sad when one latches onto a position that is contradicted by clear passages and is willing to deny the obvious teaching rather than give up the error.

I related that in the Bible we find “Warnings to be careful not to ‘fall,’ be a ‘castaway,’ or be ‘disqualified’ in the ‘race’.” I stated, “This implies and WARNS that it is possible to be ‘finally lost’.” Lloyd made no reply. Lloyd, why are we warned...if it isn’t possible?

#2

Romans 11:20-22

“...if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.”

LO: **“Israel’s entire history is the pattern for eternal security.”**

RW: First, God divorced national Israel (Jer3:8) but she became spiritual—the church, when Jesus married her (Rom7:1,4; Gal6:16). All become one in the body of Christ, the church (1 Cor12:13; Col1:24).

In this text Paul notes the fall of Israel and warns the Roman church (made up of individual Christians) that it can happen to them. Lloyd simply does not believe it! He noted Paul’s previous statement that he had not cast off *Israel* (verse 1). But God divorced physical or national Israel (Jer3:8,14). The *church* is the **“remnant,”** the new Israel, the “Israel of God,” whom Christ married (Gal.6:16; Rom7:1,4). We do indeed need to learn from God’s dealing with Israel.

I wrote:

“The latter part of the above passage is both an ADMONITION and a WARNING to Christians: **‘continue in his goodness’** (keep the faith) or be **‘cut off.’**” Unfortunately, Lloyd rejects both the *admonition* and the *warning* and asserts that *continuing* is not necessary and that if you refuse to continue you will NOT be cut off.

Lloyd wrote: **“Good works have nothing to do with one’s destiny.”**

Jesus and James taught differently: Revelation 2:5,19,23,26; 3:15; 20:13; James 2:14,17,20,21,22,24,25,26.

“because of unbelief they were broken off”

LO: “The believer’s future is certain and secure.”

RW: One can have security, but in NUMEROUS places the Scriptures teach that such is true only if certain conditions are met. Sadly, Lloyd’s loyalty is to Calvinism—a system of errors that are devastating to the church.

Question: Can a Christian cease to believe?

#3

1 Corinthians 10:5-12

Lloyd asserted that I ignored the context, but then he ignored the part of the text that gives the warning:

Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition...Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.

The only way out of this for Lloyd is to admit that one can fall, but that God will not let him die before he gets restored. I will not let him get by with the “he was never saved” quibble. When he is in the affirmative I’ll have opportunity to respond to passages he thinks teach God will not let him die in a fallen state.

#4

Galatians 5:4-7

LO: “Robert sees ‘fallen from grace’ and wrongly assumes ‘loss of eternal life.’ Fallen (ἐκπίπτω) is pictured in withered flowers. In this context, fallen refers to the loss of one’s grip on grace.”

RW: I see grace as essential to being saved and having hope. And if one falls from it (no longer has it) he no longer has eternal life. *Withered* flowers can indicate a dead plant. Those who expect to be saved must have a “grip on grace,” which illustrates “doing” something.

A Christian has fellowship with God if he walks in the light. He has “life,” the life of God, which by nature is eternal. Eternal life is to be viewed as “quality of life” rather than duration (ISBI). One who has fallen has LOST eternal life, but he can get it back if he chooses again to “walk in the light.” Paul proclaimed some HAD FALLEN from grace. Lloyd, can one be “finally saved” without grace?

#5

2 Peter 1:5-10

Wherefore...brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall:

LO: "Robert urges us to **DO** five things."

RW: Aren't those five things what Peter says are necessary to "never fall"?

LO: "Falling deals with loss of rewards; not changes in destiny." "Fellowship with God has nothing to do with being lost. Fellowship relates to rewards."

RW: Is it not true that HEAVEN is a reward? "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven" (Matt5:12). Some Galatians (Gal5:4) had lost grace (God's favor and fellowship) and were on track to losing their reward (heaven) and being "finally lost."

LO: "Peter is discussing spiritual growth. His goal is that believers won't be barren or unfruitful."

RW: True, but those who do not grow by adding the attributes Peter mentioned are warned that they will fall.

New Arguments:

#1

Mark 4:3-20

Jesus explains that some hear the word and receive it into their hearts with gladness, but things happen: 1) affliction or persecution arises; 2) cares of this world, riches, and other things choke the word, and it becomes unfruitful, allowing Satan to "take away the word that was sown in their hearts."

#2

1 Corinthians 9:27 (ASV)

But I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected.

Using a personal example, Paul, a devout Christian, warned of the danger of his becoming a "castaway" (KJV). Thus, it was an unambiguous warning to all Christians not to conclude, or assume, that the soul cannot be "finally lost."

#3

1John 5:16

John said, "There is a sin unto death."

But Lloyd thinks he knows better. He said, "There is no possible sin such that a child of God CAN be finally lost."

I appreciate the study and anxiously await Lloyd's reply.

Robert Waters

Olson's Second Negative

PROPOSED: "THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST."

ROUND 1

I summarized Robert's first affirmative by noting four catastrophic errors. Robert never used **CONTEXT** for any of his verses. He **rejected human depravity**, **denied the sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice**, and confused **DESTINY** with **REWARDS**. How did Robert answer these charges?

Pharisee vs Theologian

Robert wondered if he got a reply to his arguments. Yes, but not as he expected!

Robert is a 21st century Pharisee: moral, esteemed by the public, but zealously pursuing righteousness by human-centered obedience. His Bible approach is a merry-go-round: grab a verse, rip it from **CONTEXT**, and twist it to fit creeds. Do the same with verse after verse. Robert is no

debater	else he would NOT use a merry-go-round.
Bible scholar	else he would have welcomed the Greek "more probable" condition behind the English "IF" in 1John1:7.
theologian	else he would have defined his system. But Robert is understandably reluctant to be identified with the same Pharisaical system Jesus condemned.

Robert wants the debate to focus on verses. It is easier to pervert verses than to understand them in **CONTEXT**. His human-centered Christ-denying philosophy prevents debate at any other level.

Conversely, I debate as a **THEOLOGIAN**. I was thrilled when Robert said I have a "Do Nothing" philosophy. He is right! Everything that needs to be done to receive and keep eternal life was done for me by God in Jesus. I answer Robert's verses by way of an overarching integrated **SYSTEM** of truth.

DEPRAVITY

Robert's human-centered system urges us to **DO** the IMPOSSIBLE.

My first negative noted that the best of human-centered obedience is **FILTHY RAGS** (Isa64:6) to God. Were there some little thing we had to **DO**, we could not **DO** it! The best human-centered obedience can produce is 0%. Since human-obedience is impossible, Robert foists upon us a hopeless system of certain death.

Robert answers this by saying FAITH is something that we “**must DO to be saved.**” Robert made yet another crucial error. According to Bible, faith is receiving what God has provided. It is not a work.

Ye are “justified (δικαιωθέντες) by faith.” Rom5:1

The word “δικαιωθέντες” is a passive verb. Eternal **DESTINY** happens passively to us. We don’t **DO** anything active.

God alone activates the new birth. Faith is but the means to activate God’s Spirit. The key to eternal life is not the size or activity of faith. The key to eternal life is the object of faith. If the object is Jesus, then the believer receives (not earns) eternal life. If the object is my good works, then no amount of good or strong faith can save or keep one saved.

Robert’s legalism redefined faith as a work. Jesus faced this same legalistic deception in John 6. Jesus fed the 5,000 but left when they wanted to make Him king. The next day, when the crowds found Him, Jesus told them He left because all they wanted was more miracles. He told them to **LABOR** for the meat which endures unto everlasting life (v27). The crowds asked Robert’s legalistic question, “What shall we **DO**, that we might **WORK** the works of God (v28)?” Jesus answered, “Believe on ME.”

Notice how Jesus denied Robert’s legalistic demand for human-centered works. Jesus put faith in Him in contrast with legalistic **DO**-ing.

Establishment of the law (Rom3:31) is foundational, but a Christ-centered philosophy also knows that only Jesus had perfect obedience. Sinners become saints only when Jesus’ perfect obedience is credited to them by means of faith. True gospel hope is Christ-centered and lies outside believers. Ye are saved **NOT OF YOURSELVES** (Eph2:8).

JESUS’ SUFFICIENCY

My first negative noted that the Bible is a Christ-centered philosophy.

We are complete in Jesus. Col 2:10

Since we are truly complete in Jesus, nothing can be added. Our additions to Christ are really subtraction from His sufficiency. Christ-centered philosophy looks outward to God’s work in Jesus; NOT inward to our works, NOT even to God’s work inside us. The righteousness which makes believers acceptable to God is an alien righteousness residing securely in Jesus in heaven.

This would have been very easy for Robert to challenge. Instead, he only said I was hurling false charges. But the Bible is quite clear!

If one affirms works, then one automatically denies grace.

If one affirms grace, then one automatically denies works. (Rom11:6)

Robert’s legalism versus biblical grace is the crucial contrast in this debate.

DESTINY versus REWARDS

Heb 10:14 was a key passage from my first negative. Believers are permanently perfected even while they stumble in an imperfect process. The Bible denies any idea about believers losing their eternal DESTINY. The Bible condemns Robert's proposition through several worst case scenarios.

LOST SON

First, the son requested his inheritance (tantamount to wishing his father was dead). Any law keeper would have written him off now. But it gets worse. The son leaves home and country severing all ties with his family and nation. Spiritually, he turned his back on God and the Church. But it gets even worse. He arrives in a distant land and squanders his inheritance. Spiritually, he has dead faith and lives in Satan's homeland. Legalists say he is finally lost! After all, he has NO INHERITANCE. But it gets way worse! The son gets defiled with pigs!

At that worst possible instant he says, "I will go to **MY FATHER**." He was still a son even in defilement in a distant land. He lost his inheritance (REWARDS), but never lost his SONSHIP.

1 COR 3:15

The foolish believer went through the fires of judgment. His faith was **DEAD** (James 2:17,20,26) since no work survived judgment. He lost everything (REWARDS), but was still saved (DESTINY).

ROMANS 7

We are depraved (v14). We sin even if we don't want to (v15). We produce no good human-centered work (v18). We have fallen into captivity to the law of sin (v23). Human-centered obedience destines us to death and hell (v24). But even so, thanks be to God who has delivered us through Jesus Christ (vv24-25).

MOSES

Moses' disobedience broke a type. Since Moses stood in the very presence of God, his disobedience was similar to the fallen angels who were condemned with one sin. His punishment was immediate. He was fired as Israel's leader. He lost the right to enter Canaan. God killed him in the wilderness. But we know Moses never lost his SONSHIP for he appeared at the Transfiguration.

These worst-case scenarios all show the one same thing: the distinctiveness of DESTINY from REWARDS. Believers sin – sometimes radically – sometimes bad enough to deserve death. But they never lose their eternal life. These worst-case scenarios deny Robert's proposition.

Robert's fool-hardy merry-go-round scheme never addressed the distinctiveness of DESTINY from REWARDS. Denial of this biblical teaching unwittingly leads to another alarming ghastly error.

GOD OUR FATHER

When children misbehave in a "normal" family children, they receive discipline. They do not get kicked out of the family. Such normal discipline is the topic of Hebrews 12. Disowning a child is abnormal. Yet this **ABNORMAL** act is an assumed fact in Robert's Pharisaical interpretation. What is abnormal for the physical world is the standard of Robert's legalistic interpretations. Robert's

defaming God as a vile **ABNORMAL** loveless parent is contrasted by the Bible. God is love (1John4:8).

What Robert doesn't realize is that the God of love wants His children to get the most out of life. Spiritual growth goes beyond the new birth. God wants His children to grow. Loss of rewards is part of normal parenting.

CONTRASTS

Before I turn to Robert's specific **CONTEXT** violations, let's review some crucial contrasts in this debate.

	<u>Robert</u>	<u>Bible</u>
Philosophy	Human-centered	Bible-based
Theology	Legalism	Christ-centered (Eph1:23)
Preserved by	Works	God (1Pet1:5)
My works	are needed to please God.	are as filthy rags to God (Isa64:6, Psa39:5, Jer17:9).
Jesus' Sufficiency	I must add my good works.	I am complete in Jesus (Col2:10)
Destiny / Rewards	Destiny is a process of rewards	Destiny is distinct from rewards (Heb10:14)
Eternal Life	A gift that I must work to keep.	An irrevocable gift. (Rom11:29).
God as a parent	ABNORMAL loveless	NORMAL loving (1John4:8)
Security	Based on my works	Based on Jesus' works (Rom3:21-24)

ROBERT'S FIRST VERSES

Robert's merry-go-round violated the **CONTEXT** of every Bible verse.

1John1:7

Robert first ignored fellowship and then failed to respond in his second affirmative.

Rom11:20-22 & 1Cor10:5-12

Robert cherry picked one verse about Israel being cut out of the root and one verse about Israel being overthrown in the wilderness. The rhetorical, “Has God cast away His people?” was soundly answered, “GOD FORBID” (11:1). Again, Robert was silent about this in his second affirmative.

I noted that proper use of **CONTEXT** must use Israel’s entire history. Israel’s calling is “**IRREVOCABLE**” (11:29). Robert tried to ignore context by referring to Jer3:8, which sounds as if God divorced Israel. But proper use of **CONTEXT** notes that God was only showing His right to such a decision. Just a few verses later God declares, “Return, O backsliding children for I am married to you.” The fate of disloyal Israel stands in stark contrast to what the Mosaic Law decrees for an unfaithful wife. God is faithful to His covenants (Deut 7:9); even when we are not. God’s grace overturns Robert’s legalistic judgments.

In Hebrews 8, God confirms His covenant with rebellious unfaithful Israel. He will be merciful to their unrighteousness (8:12). In Revelation 21, we see the Lamb’s wife in the New Jerusalem. The 12 gates are named after the 12 tribes of Israel. **CONTEXT** rules! “**Israel’s entire history is the pattern for eternal security.**” Israel is secure to the end. Believers are too!

Gal5:4-7

Robert’s merry-go-round answered this by pointing to his busted view of 1John1:7. Robert isn’t a debater. This is called circular reasoning. He defaults to parroting church creeds.

2Pet1:5-10

Robert merely found another “fellowship” verse to rip out of context. He also repeated his busted view of Gal5. The merry-go-round continues.

ROBERT’S NEW VERSES

Mark4

Robert ignored **CONTEXT** again. The seed in first soil never generated life. Robert ignored that seeds in the other soils where choked (lost **REWARDS**), but never lost their lives (**DESTINY**).

1Cor9:27

Robert confused **DESTINY** for **REWARDS**. Paul’s warning was about losing **REWARDS**.

1John5:16

Yes! There is a sin unto death. Moses is the best example. This is an issue with **REWARDS**. Death makes one lose **REWARDS** not **DESTINY**. Moses, who sinned unto death, is saved!

Robert is neither debater, bible scholar, nor theologian. He can only debate by merry-go-round. A Bible merry-go-round is an easy tactic for cults to use since there are so many **REWARDS** verses in the Bible that can be redefined as **DESTINY** and twisted to fit legalistic creeds.

Acts 2:38 is well known for being so ripped from **CONTEXT** and forced to fit man-made creeds. Churches of Christ make it a pillar of their theology. All denominations are then “tested” by the

corrupted CoC view of this verse. In reality, Robert is mainly concerned with defending church creeds like this. Confusion of **REWARDS** for **DESTINY** is an easy non-biblical tactic to use.

SUMMARY

Robert's graceless proposition is pulverized. It is inconsistent with all aspects of biblical grace. His proposition is denounced by human depravity (Isa 64:6), countered by grace (Rom 11:6), and contrasted by the Christ-centered Bible. Robert's system unwittingly casts God as a loveless ABNORMAL parent disowning His children for any sin. Four worst case scenarios put Robert's proposition in the grave.

Never debate a Pharisee verse by verse. There are so many **REWARDS** verses that can be redefined as **DESTINY**. But cults cannot long stand before true Bible **THEOLOGY!**

Robert's system of impossible perfect human obedience is a hopeless gospel of death. All who trust in human obedience are in jeopardy of hellfire. True hope comes from trusting Jesus' perfect alien righteousness – alone.

Grace to you!
Lloyd Olson

Waters' Third Affirmative

I'm happy to affirm what the SCRIPTURES teach regarding the possibility of a Christian's falling and being "finally lost." Unfortunately, the clear and undeniable scriptures Lloyd has been confronted with have resulted in his ridiculing the use of Scripture. He wrote, "**Never debate a Pharisee verse by verse,**" and "**Robert wants the debate to focus on verses.**" Yes, indeed I do. The participants in this debate are obligated to defend their position based upon what the **Scriptures** (verses) say: "The SCRIPTURES teach" is the first part of the proposition. Lloyd, did you have this attitude before the debate? If not, why then did you agree to the proposition? We are not supposed to be debating what Lloyd thinks, as a theologian—that is not what I signed up to do. In fact, when Lloyd wrote, "Never debate a Pharisee verse by verse," this was a tacit admission that I have affirmed my proposition. Friends, there can be no doubt about it—the Scriptures are clear: a Christian can fall from grace and be finally lost. How can one who claims to believe the Bible discount the Scriptures, and ridicule his opponent for using scripture, while engaged in a debate regarding what the Scriptures teach pertaining to the issue being debated?

Does Lloyd think classifying himself as a theologian gives him license to disregard clear scripture? A true theologian seeks to learn about God, which involves learning what the Scriptures say pertaining to various subjects. Should we not ALL "**give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine**" as Paul commanded Timothy (1Ti4:13-16)? Paul continued, "**Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them...Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.**" Thus, once again we see the Scriptures warning about the possibility of being lost and of the need to CONTINUE in doctrine.

Lloyd can respond in the manner he chooses, but I will stay with scripture to confirm my position. Because Lloyd cannot logically explain away the passages he has been confronted with, he has had to go some other route. He not only has not stayed in the negative but also brought up other subjects to cloud the issue and keep focus off the passages that affirm my proposition.

In addition, Lloyd has made some serious false charges regarding what I believe, which causes me to waste space clearing up the matter. Yet, he holds to a series of doctrines known as "Calvinism"—a false system dreamed up in the minds of theologians like Lloyd who are not bothered by clear scripture that contradicts their theory.

Lloyd said, "**Robert's system is a hopeless system of death.**" What a strange comment coming from one who has SAID one does not have to **do** ANYTHING to be saved! This would include: God's requirement to hear, believe, repent, confess Christ, and be baptized—all *conditions* which Lloyd rejects. **Unconditional** salvation equals **universal** salvation! Basically, Lloyd is saying EVERYONE will be saved, but those who hold to Robert's system will die. If Lloyd is correct we must conclude that all who lived before Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, died without hope and that only those who now hold to their teaching can be saved eternally.

Is faith a command to obey and a condition that one can achieve?

We have discussed Lloyd's problem with "do" (work) and "if" (conditions), and we have seen what the Scriptures say. While contending that *grace* and *faith* are necessary, Lloyd contends that GOD provides both—that man has NO part in his own salvation. But what sayeth Scripture? The jailor asked Paul and Silas, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts16:30,31). The jailer determined to *believe*, which is a comprehensive word that includes obedience—he, in the same hour, was baptized.

The very fact that "believe" is a command is proof that it is something one must DO. "And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ" (1Jn3:23). Jesus said "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe" (Jn4:48). One must evaluate the evidence available and *believe* or *disbelieve* based upon the clarity and validity of the evidence. John commands: "Do not put your faith in every spirit, but put them to the test, to see if they are from God: because a great number of false prophets have gone out into the world" (1Jn4:1 BBE).

The above texts prove that believing (faith) is a matter of choice—not something God FORCES on a select few. Jesus says, "Come unto me, ALL ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me...and ye shall find rest unto your souls" (Matt11:28,29). Clearly people have a choice as to whether to COME to Christ, TAKE his yoke, and LEARN of him. My opponent needs to accept this teaching and give up and denounce Calvinism.

Lloyd wrote,

"Robert's legalism redefined faith as a work."

The words "faith" and "believe" are very close in meaning. If you "believe" you have "faith"; if you have "faith" you then "believe."

FAITH

Strong (G4102) "assurance, belief, believe, faith, fidelity."

Thayer "conviction of the truth of anything, belief."

To Believe

Strong (G4100)

"to have faith..."

Lloyd noted that Jesus told his disciples, who were concerned with being fed, to "Labor for the meat which endures unto everlasting life." They then asked, "What shall we DO, that we might WORK the works of God?" Jesus answered, "Believe on ME" (Jn6:27,28). They understood that to OBTAIN "everlasting life" they MUST "labor." They obviously understood that works, on THEIR part, were necessary to have this life Jesus offered. Thus, Jesus' answer indicates that labor and work are involved in *believing*, as proven above. Did Jesus rebuke his disciples for their "legalistic question"? No, they asked what they must DO and Jesus told them. Thus, Lloyd's own argument affirms my position.

Lloyd Denies God Divorced Israel (Jer. 3:8)—takes verse 14 out of context.

Considering verse twelve, it is indisputable that Jeremiah was talking about what he had been told to say *before* the divorce had actually been given.

Lloyd's Distracting False Charges:

1) **"Robert is mainly concerned with defending church creeds."**

This could not be further from the truth. The only creed I'm interested in defending is the New Testament. Human creeds are written based upon human thinking and human desires. While one might desire a plan of salvation that requires absolutely nothing of men, I have shown that the Bible does not support this concept.

2) **Pharisee.**

Lloyd actually had a heading called **"Pharisee vs Theologian."** He said I'm **"Zealously pursuing righteousness by human-centered obedience."** Thus, once again it becomes necessary to remind the reader that Lloyd is not debating me but rather someone who believes the extreme position I noted in my second affirmative. Lloyd, the "Pharisees" of whom you speak did not acknowledge that Jesus was Lord. I have. The Pharisees were of the mind that they could be saved by the works of the Law, which I deny. Are we clear on this now? And, not even those who hold the extreme view (opposite yours) fit the charge you have made against me.

3) **Ignored context.**

The scriptures I used were very clear and I explained most of them in detail. Some obviously did not need any explanation. Yet Lloyd asserted that I took every one of them out of context. Lloyd's problem with the passages I used is that they contradict Calvinism—not that they were "out of context."

4) **Did not properly define words.**

I have used both scripture and scholarship to prove the meaning of key words.

5) **Robert's human-centered system.**

I've shown what the Scriptures say, which Lloyd ridicules.

6) **Redefined faith as a work.**

Jesus defined it already, as I have shown.

That Lloyd's theology is nothing short of universalism is something he has yet to deny.

In my previous affirmative I asked four questions, but Lloyd ignored them all in his negative. He did reply in an email when I called him on it.

I asked, **"Can one be saved outside of Christ?"**

Lloyd correctly answered "no." But he throws in the towel because, as I noted, one must be baptized to get into Christ (Gal3:27; 1Cor12:13).

I asked, **“Can one be ‘finally saved’ if he does not obey Jesus to stay in his love?”**

Lloyd replied, **“‘Staying in Jesus’ love has nothing to do with my obedience.”** Really, Lloyd? Jesus says otherwise: **“If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love”** (Jn15:10).

The following passage indicates that one does not have “life” if he does not come to God and that those who do not obey, as commanded, do not have the love of God. Thus, Jesus equates **“love of God”** with being saved.

“And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you” (Jn5:40,42).

In the following verse, Paul puts **“grace of...Jesus”** and **“the love of God”** in equal terms.

“The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all” (2Co13:14).

Lloyd, read the following passage and tell the reader how we can KNOW we are in him.

“But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him” (1Jn2:5).

“Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life” (Jude1:21).

The above passage ties **“eternal life”** and **“mercy of our Lord”** with one’s efforts (work or obedience) to KEEP in **“the love of God.”**

I asked, **“Can a Christian cease to believe?”**

Lloyd correctly answered “yes.” But, again, he throws in the towel. All who claim to be Christians understand that *faith* or *belief* in Christ is required to be saved. Without it one will be finally lost, unless there is repentance. Perhaps Lloyd can show (when in the affirmative) that God will not let a Christian die until he REGAINS his faith. If/when Lloyd does, he will prove that one can live forever—just lose faith and don’t repent. Sigh.

I asked, **“Can one be ‘finally saved’ without grace?”**

Lloyd correctly says “no.” But if/when one FALLS FROM something (like those noted in Gal5:4) he no longer has it. Lloyd has admitted that without grace one cannot be “finally saved.” I applaud his honest answer, but he gave up the farm—my proposition is affirmed.

Lloyd quibbled that I confused **“destiny with rewards.”** I replied that **heaven** is a **destiny** AND a **reward** according to Jesus (Matt5:12); yet Lloyd continued the quibble in his second negative.

Lloyd says, **“We don’t DO anything active.”** Lloyd, was Paul *active* in obeying the command to, **“Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins...”** (Acts22:16)?

2 Peter 3:16-18

Peter	“beware...lest you fall from your own steadfastness.”	Lloyd	No reason for action. Can't be “finally lost.”
Peter	“grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord”	Lloyd	Man is passive in everything.

Depravity

Lloyd wrote,

“Robert’s human-centered system urges us to DO the IMPOSSIBLE.”

While we agree that it IS impossible for one to save himself by works of the Law (apart from Christ), it is NOT **impossible** to comply with the simple commands of God to receive his blessings, which include eternal life.

Lloyd has admitted that one can **“lose his grip on grace.”** That is a start. He now needs to see and admit that **IF** CONDITIONS, set forth by God, are not continually met, a Christian can, without that grace, be lost eternally.

Robert Waters

Olson's Third Negative

PROPOSED: "THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST."

The points of tension between our two worldviews are not peripheral. They are systemic and foundational. Rom3:31 is one of several foundational pivots. The questions

"How can we keep the law?"

"How can we be sure of eternal life?"

are related.

ROUND 1 - EXPOSED

I EXPOSED four catastrophic errors in Robert's first affirmative. He

never used **CONTEXT** for any of his verses.

rejected human depravity.

denied the sufficiency of Jesus' sacrifice, and

confused **DESTINY** with **REWARDS**.

ROUND 2 - PULVERIZED

Cults always have at least one non-biblical view. They twist scripture to fit their non-biblical view. But as more of the Bible is examined, their errors get exposed. I also showed that the natural result of human-centered creeds is an unwitting castigation of God as an abnormal loveless parent.

Since non-biblical views don't come from the Bible, cults have no interest in using the Bible to learn the truth. They only want to use the Bible to perpetuate their false gospel. This is why Robert ran from the catastrophic errors that doom his failed proposition, repeated already busted arguments, used circular reasoning, and simply repeated his errant cultic creeds.

Robert's graceless proposition is **PULVERIZED**. It is inconsistent with all aspects of biblical grace.

ROUND 3 - SILENCE

Robert's continued **SILENCE** to his catastrophic errors is **DEAFENING**.

Robert's corrupted human-centered Christ-denying creeds are his sole focus. He is not interested in an honest debate or a genuine study of God's holy Word. Verses are secondary and only useful if they can be contorted to fit his creeds. Since he wants no truthful Bible answer, Robert avoids discussing his CATAclysmic systemic errors via any convenient serpentine tangent.

TANGENTS

Robert's third affirmative retold his cult's creeds: John6:27,28 for example. The crowds asked Jesus a human-centered question: "What shall we **DO**?" Just like Robert, they wanted human-centered "labor." But Jesus denied human-centered labor. Jesus contrasted labor with, "Believe in Me."

Robert denied Jesus by claiming labor and faith are equal. This is a perfect example of how cults twist verses to support their human-centered Christ-denying creeds.

Robert commented on my warning: don't debate Pharisees verse by verse. He proudly claims his John6:28 rip-a-verse-out-of-**CONTEXT** approach, which violates God's Word, actually affirms his position. A verse-by-verse approach is only acceptable if one does this in **CONTEXT**. Robert used eight verses and defiled **CONTEXT** every time.

Robert wants to talk about verses, but only those that can be ripped from **CONTEXT** and redefined by human-centered creeds. The difference is: I use verses in **CONTEXT** every time; Robert has

- not used **CONTEXT**
- not even once
- not even when he thinks he is using **CONTEXT** !

Robert claims I've brought up subjects that cloud the issue. Those catastrophic errors are a **SYSTEMATIC** storm-CLOUD demolishing his proposition.

Robert must realize his proposition is busted. So he tries to defend a different proposition; namely, the steps needed to get saved. This proposition was supposed to be on whether it was possible for a believer to be finally lost. Remember! Robert wants no truthful answer to his CATAclysmic errors and is in serpentine tangent avoidance mode.

Robert tried to defend his busted proposition claiming that I'm for universal salvation. Robert is clueless of the Viet Nam presidential amnesty. Amnesty was offered universally to all draft dodgers. All who wished could freely receive amnesty and return home. The universal offer did not make a universal return home. The same is true for God's universal offer of eternal life. It is offered freely to all. But only those who wish to believe in Jesus passively receive eternal life (Rom5:1). So the fact that we don't have to **DO** anything to receive eternal life does not mean universal salvation. Remember, in John6:27-28 Jesus denied that faith is a work. Paul says the same thing in Eph3:8: Salvation is NOT of ourselves. We don't need to **DO** anything because Jesus has already done it all for us! The moment we try **DOING** even one little thing, we automatically deny the sufficiency of what Jesus has done for us.

Robert accused me of Calvinism. But I'm no Calvinist! I deny all five Calvinistic points. Robert doesn't realize that his human-centered creed is the same as Calvinistic "Perseverance." So between us two, Robert is the most Calvinist:^^)

Robert says Paul was ACTIVE in obeying the command to be baptized (Acts 22:16). Robert has already lost this proposition. So he tries the losing side of another proposition. Robert missed that Paul was saved days before on the road to Damascus when God commissioned him to go to the gentiles. God does NOT commission the ungodly to be His representatives! Conversion is by faith – alone! Conversion does not include temporal water baptism (2Cor4:18). Paul's non-saving water baptism was for issues of **FELLOWSHIP** – not **DESTINY**.

Robert has no Bible answer as to how the Bible, as an integrated **SYSTEM**, denounces his proposition.

FIVE CATASTROPIC ERRORS

Robert's continued **SILENCE** is **DEAFENING**. The debate should focus on foundational doctrines – not on unrelated tangents!

HUMAN DEPRAVITY

Robert never answered this. **SILENCE**. The Bible declares,

“every man at his best state is altogether vanity.”

(Psalm39:5,11, 41:6, 62:9, 78:33).

“the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked:
who can know it?” Jer17:9

“all our righteousness are as filthy rags.” Isa64:6

“In Adam all die.” 1Cor15:22a.

Let me add

“There is **NONE** that understandeth, there is **NONE** that seeketh after God.

They are **ALL** gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable;

there is **NONE** that doeth good, **NO, NOT ONE.**” Rom3:11-12

Robert doesn't talk about human depravity because if this Bible doctrine is right, then everyone is doomed. The best his Pharisaical human-centered false obedience system can offer is hopeless judgment and certain doom: a gospel of death.

JESUS' SUFFICIENCY

In contrast to Robert's human-centered gospel of death, the Bible heralds a Christ-centered gospel of victory.

We are complete in Jesus. Col 2:10

This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. 1John5:4

While human-obedience produces death (1Cor15:22a); Christ-centered faith produces life (1Cor15:22b). Any Christian should be quick to affirm this Bible truth. Not Robert. He is **SILENT**.

Since we are truly complete in Jesus, then any system that demands human-centered obedience is actually a Christ-denying system. Where Robert's hopeless gospel of human-centered obedience stops, the true hope based on Jesus' obedience answers both foundational questions.

Q1: “How can we keep the law?”

A1: We can't, but Jesus did for us!

and

Q2: “How can we be sure of eternal life?”

A2: The believer is accepted on the basis of Jesus' obedience. Rom 4 shows that

Jesus' righteousness is imputed to the believer at the moment of faith. Since

Jesus' righteousness never changes, believers can know for sure they have eternal life (1John5:13). They will never be lost!

DESTINY versus REWARDS

Robert's **SILENCE** continues. Heb10:14 was a key passage from my first negative. Believers are permanently perfected even while they stumble in an imperfect process. The Bible denies any idea about believers losing their eternal DESTINY.

This biblical doctrine is crucial since most of Robert's errant responses hinge on this confusion. Since I repeatedly smash his responses with this doctrine, one would think Robert would be quick to answer Heb10:14. He has not done so. Remember! Robert is not interested in an honest debate. All he wants to do is parrot church creeds and twist verse after verse to support his human-centered creeds.

CONTEXT

Robert based his debunked proposition on eight verses. But I've shown that in every case he violated the **CONTEXT** of those eight verses. Robert tried to answer the context of three verses. One of his answers pointed to other verses that were likewise ripped from **CONTEXT**. Another merely repeated an already busted argument. The third answer used a circular argument. Abject stumbling and dishonoring God's Word can be called **SILENCE!**

GOD OUR FATHER

Robert's **SILENCE** continues. His cult operates on fear. They actually believe that God will disown His children – even when it is a universally **ABNORMAL** un-god-like act. What is abnormal for the physical world is the standard of Robert's legalistic interpretations. This is a major knockout punch. Robert is **SILENT** because believes in a lie and doesn't want the truth.

WORST-CASE SCENARIOS

The Bible's worst case scenarios condemn Robert's proposition. Not one word from Robert on these. **SILENCE** on top of **SILENCE**.

The wayward son (Luke15) squandered his inheritance in a distant land and became defiled. At that worst possible instant he knows he is still a son. He lost his inheritance (REWARDS), but never lost his SONSHIP. The father welcomed the son without lecture, without demanding confession of sins, without payment for lost inheritance, or without inventing ways for the son to "prove" himself worthy.

The foolish believer (1Cor3:15) went through the fires of judgment. His faith was **DEAD** (no works survived), but he was still saved.

We are depraved and have fallen into captivity to the law of sin (Romans7). But even so, God has delivered us through Jesus Christ.

Moses' disobedience broke a type. His punishment was immediate. He was fired as Israel's leader. He lost the right to enter Canaan. God killed him in the wilderness. But we know Moses never lost his SONSHIP for he appeared at the Transfiguration.

These worst-case scenarios all show the one same thing: the distinctiveness of DESTINY from REWARDS. Believers sin – sometimes radically – sometimes bad enough to deserve death. But they never so sin as to be finally lost. The worst-case scenarios show that even DEAD FAITH (with no works) saves if the object of that dead faith is Jesus. These worst-case scenarios deny Robert's proposition. Robert's SILENCE is an admission of defeat!

QUESTIONS

Robert thinks highly of four questions.

Q1

Robert: Can one be saved outside of Christ?

Lloyd: No.

Robert: Lloyd is wrong because one must be baptized to get into Christ.

Lloyd: Robert wrongly referred to Gal3:27 and 1Cor12:13. These baptisms are of the Holy Ghost. They are done without water. True saving baptism is done without hands (Col2:11). If you can see water, then water baptism does not save (2Cor4:18). This is another serpentine tangent. Why would Robert want to debate a different proposition? He would lose this one as well.

Q2

Robert: "Can one be 'finally saved' if he does not obey Jesus to stay in his love?"

Lloyd: "Staying in Jesus' love has nothing to do with my obedience."

Robert: obedience is needed to stay in the Father's love (John15:10).

Lloyd: Like all his other responses, Robert ignored CONTEXT. John15 talks about how believers stay in fellowship with God. Robert has again confused REWARDS and DESTINY.

Q3

Robert: "Can a Christian cease to believe?"

Lloyd: "Yes."

Robert: Faith is a work needed for salvation (John6:27,28).

Lloyd: Robert violated CONTEXT again. Earlier I showed that Jesus denied Robert's response. Jesus put labor and faith in contrast. Salvation is not a work of ourselves (Eph2:8). Faith is not a work.

Q4

Robert: "Can one be 'finally saved' without grace?"

Lloyd: "No."

Robert: Heaven is both a destiny and reward.

Lloyd: This doesn't pertain to the proposition. It is an aimless rabbit trail.

Robert's questions are B-U-S-T-E-D!

SUMMARY

This is an easy debate from my side. All I had to do was track how Robert ran from truth. His **SILENCE** is **DEAFENING**. His graceless proposition more than pulverized. It is inconsistent with all aspects of biblical grace. His proposition is
denounced by human depravity (Isa 64:6),
countered by grace (Rom 11:6), and
contrasted by the Christ-centered Bible.

Robert's responses consistently violate **CONTEXT**. He unwittingly casts God as a loveless ABNORMAL parent disowning His children. Four worst case scenarios put Robert's proposition in the grave.

I predict Robert will forfeit the debate with more **SILENCE** concerning his cataclysmic errors. He wants neither truth nor debate, but the praise of fellow-Pharisees for faithfully repeating their cultic creeds.

Grace to you!

Lloyd Olson

Waters' Fourth Affirmative

Lloyd's replies have been short on substance but LONG on fiction, deception, and false charges. He waxed eloquent in writing but is clearly unskilled when dealing with the word of God. That it is HE who is guilty of the blunders of which he has accused me is evident to the careful reader. Such tactics, ranting and boasting are not uncommon when a debater is unable to respond with reasonable, logical answers to arguments or answer persuasively.

My Three Affirmative Arguments:

(Mark 4:3-20, 1 Corinthians 9:27, 1 John 5:16)

I made convincing arguments based on the above passages, but Lloyd ignored them all except to say I took them all out of context. Perhaps he will actually deal with them in his final negative. But don't hold your breath, as neither he nor his friends helping him can defeat the word of God.

When a debater who is in the negative, and supposed to respond to what is said by his opponent who is in the affirmative, goes into the attack mode and also makes affirmative arguments, it is a sure sign of weakness. Lloyd had several affirmative arguments (contrary to the rules and our agreement). They probably should all be ignored, but I shall deal with one (below) because it actually affirms my proposition.

New Arguments

#1 Luke15:11-32

Lloyd actually used the **Parable of the Prodigal Son** as an affirmative argument. This parable teaches multiple lessons that are interesting and enlightening. The *father* symbolizes God who is loving, patient, and forgiving. The *younger son* symbolizes the lost children of God who need to return. One of the more obvious lessons is that one can *turn away* from God and be *lost*. Lloyd said the son only "became defiled," but the text says: "**For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.**" Then verse 32 says, "**It was meet that we should...be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.**" Why "**be glad**" if it was not possible to "DO" anything, such as repent, and the son could not possibly be "finally lost"? Actually, the text tells us WHY this young man's family and friends should be happy—he had been lost but repented and came home. But Lloyd denies it all! And is it not astounding that, after accusing me of taking every single passage out of context, he turns around and uses this text as an affirmative argument?

Lloyd said, "He lost his inheritance (REWARDS), but never lost his SONSHIP." That "inheritance" (in the parable) symbolizes "eternal life" is not apparent, yet Lloyd tries to

force the text to teach that it is, notes that the prodigal continued to be a son, and attempted to force the text to support the idea that a child of God cannot be “finally lost.”

Question: Considering that the text says the son “**was dead**” (see Eph2:1-5 for what it means to be dead) and that he “**was lost,**” would the son eventually have been “finally lost” had he not chosen to return to the father? If Lloyd answers “yes” he has given up the debate, but if he answers “no” he denies the gist of the parable. If he refuses to answer he is not an honorable debater. Will he take the position that God would somehow FORCE the wayward son to repent? If so, keep in mind that such goes against the fact that man has *free will* (Matt28:18; Jer24:14-16; Rev22:17) and remember that Lloyd CLAIMS he holds to no part of Calvinism. Cough. One cannot honestly make the argument that if the son had died in rebellion “**he was never saved in the first place**” because this text makes it abundantly clear that the rebellious and lost one was in the family.

Lloyd then asserted that “**The father welcomed the son without lecture, without demanding confession of sins, without payment for lost inheritance, or without inventing ways for the son to ‘prove’ himself worthy.**” The MAIN thing God expects, in taking back one that becomes “dead” and “lost,” is sorrow, repentance, and confession of sin—all conditions that the text tells us the son met. Thus, he complied with the father’s *conditions*.

Question: If one is LOST and dies lost, will he be “finally lost”?

The young man rebelliously turned from his father, and would have been “finally lost” had he not come to his senses, become sorrowful, acknowledged his sin, and returned to his father.

The idea that God has no conditions for one to be saved, stay saved, and be “finally saved,” is utterly destroyed by this parable as well as numerous other passages. Lloyd would have you believe none of these texts say what they say—all are “out of context.” SIGH.

#2 John 15:1-10

If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned (verse 6).

The key word is “**abide**” (*mene*). **Strong** says it means “...to stay (in a given place, state, relation or expectancy):--abide, continue, dwell, endure, be present, remain, stand, tarry...”

Jesus compares the Christian who does not labor, or work (in bearing fruit) to a *branch* that is **dead** and is to be **destroyed**. The lesson pertains to both **RELATIONSHIP** and **DESTINY**. Failure to *abide* results in loss of *relationship*, and the *destiny* is final destruction or being “finally lost.”

#3 1 Corinthians 15:1-2

Now I make known to you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you received, in which also you stand, by which also you are saved, if you hold fast the word which I preached to you, unless you believed in vain.

That Paul is talking to people who received the gospel, and are currently standing in their faith (saved), is crystal clear. The main point, which one would need help to miss, is the *condition* (“**IF** you hold fast the word”) that must be met for one to have assurance that his faith is not in vain. The word of God contains commands, but Lloyd says, “we don’t have to **DO** anything to receive eternal life.” What would have happened if someone were to have taught the Corinthians that there were no conditions for keeping saved, as Lloyd has said, and they had **failed** to *hold fast*? Paul gives us the answer—their believing would have been in vain. (See also 1Thes.3:5.) Thus, the word translated “if” does indeed point to *conditions*, contrary to Lloyd’s claim.

#4 Philippians 2:12 NASB

So then, my beloved, just as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your salvation with fear and trembling;

Why would we need to “*work out our salvation*” with “*fear and trembling*” if there were no risk of losing it? We would have nothing to *fear* if that were the case.

#5 James 5:19-20

Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death...”

This verse (IN CONTEXT) clarifies that it is possible for those who are in the truth to stray from it even to the point of losing their soul. Otherwise this warning is a truism.

Miscellaneous

To my question “**Can one be saved outside of Christ?**” Lloyd answered “**no.**” I then showed that to get into Christ one must **DO** something, which Lloyd has denied. I cited Galatians 3:27 and 1 Corinthians 12:13. He replied, “These baptisms are of the Holy Ghost. They are done without water.” But the BIBLE says “*there is one baptism*” (Eph4:5), and Acts 8:36 makes it clear that this one baptism is in **water** (see also Rom3,4).

Lloyd asserted that “**Paul was saved...on the road to Damascus,**” but did not cite scripture. The text tells us that after Paul asked “**what wilt thou have me to do?**” the Lord told him, “**Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do**” (Acts9:6). While in

the city he was told to “**arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins**” (Acts22:16). (See also 1Pet3:21). Thus, he was still in his sins and needed to obey God.

In an effort to deal with a convincing affirmative argument in my first installment (2Pet1:5-11), Lloyd replied that “SPIRITUAL GROWTH is not DESTINY” and tried to distinguish between *destiny* and *rewards*. But when I proved from Scripture that “Heaven is both a destiny and reward,” Lloyd’s only reply was, “**This doesn’t pertain to the proposition.**”

Summary

I have provided several scriptures (in context) that warns Christians about the danger of falling and being “finally lost.” The warnings make sense only if a believer can forfeit salvation by rejecting his or her relationship with God. I have examined the words “do” and “if” —common words that relate to **responsibility** and **conditions** for being saved. And, we have looked at examples where some DID fall.

Consequences

The believer who trusts God, heeds God’s warnings, is a “**doer of the word**” (Jas1:22), understands the idea of “conditions” and is therefore *diligent* in service (walking in the light), has no reason to fear being lost eternally. He has *life* NOW and no man can take it away. But since man has FREEWILL he can “**sin willfully**,” which will result in there being “**no more sacrifice for sins**” (Heb10:26). Contrariwise, Lloyd’s doctrine results in: 1) laziness; 2) lack of spiritual growth; 3) no fear of God; 4) no fear of “**sin and death**”; 5) a lack of concern for others; and 6) a false hope.

What could benefit the devil more than to convince God’s children that no consequences will come if they drop their guard, allow Satan to come into their heart, and give up the faith; or that turning to a life of sin will not result in forfeiture of the blessings God promises to those who “**remain faithful until death**” (Rev1:10)? On the other hand, what could benefit the child of God more than diligent efforts to heed warnings and admonitions to “**watch**” and “**continue in the faith**,” lest one be overtaken in sin and be “finally lost”?

Conclusion

My opponent stated that he does not hold to any point of Calvinism, yet “eternal security of the believer” is one of the **major** points of Calvinism. (It is also called the "perseverance of the saints," "impossibility of apostasy," and "once saved, always saved.") So are we to conclude that Lloyd is debating a position he does not believe, or that he has become confused? In response to his false accusations I have this reply: Any Christian attempting to

be saved by the Law of Moses (Rom9:32) will fail and be “finally lost.” But this is not to say labor and works have no part in a Christian’s journey to his reward in heaven.

The danger of not accepting the truth regarding the possibility of apostasy cannot be overemphasized. But my opponent says there is NO danger—you can’t apostatize and be “finally lost” even if you try. This is Calvinism, which is a very dangerous and false system.

While some of Lloyd’s fears and attacks may be applicable to others, I remind the reader that he has not addressed the position I hold. In my first affirmative, I noted Paul’s statement that to be *continually cleansed* by the blood one must “**walk in the light**,” which is not the same as *sinless perfection*. A believer can have security even though he knows he is not perfect (Rom3:3). With *diligence* in service, we know that because of God’s *grace* and our *faith* in the promise of what the BLOOD (when contacted; 1Jn1:7; Rom6:3,4,17,18; Eph2:13; Heb9:14; Rev1:5) will do, we can have FULL ASSURANCE of being “finally saved.”

Robert Waters

OLSON’S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

PROPOSITION_2: THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST.

DEFINITIONS

Scriptures	are the 66 canonized Books of the Bible.
Not Possible	denies any occurrence of the event discussed.
Child of God	is any believer who is in full possession of eternal life. This precludes and obviates any provisions, conditions, transitions, or limitations.
Finally Lost	means to be outside of God’s saving grace at the time of departure from this life. I start with Robert’s woefully inadequate definition. I will expand it to mean that believers have continuous, permanent, unbroken possession of eternal life beginning with the new birth and stretching forever past final judgment. This goes well beyond Robert’s inadequate “time of departure from this life.” Believers can’t EVER be lost.

INTRODUCTION

This is the second proposition between Robert Waters and myself. No doubt Robert is a man of credentials, loved by family, esteemed by his denomination, respected by his community, and known as one who zealously strives for godliness.

Proposition_1 revealed that Robert pursued godliness as the OT Israelites; by a works-righteous philosophy that:

denied human depravity,
denied the sufficiency of what God did for us through Jesus,
confused **REWARDS** for **DESTINY**,
castigated God as an abnormal unloving Parent, and
violently abused **CONTEXT** to support Proposition_1.

All of these doctrines are equally important in Proposition_2 from a Christ-centered philosophy. I’ll discuss three of them now.

I affirm human depravity. We can do nothing to earn or maintain our position as God’s children. If eternal life depends on human obedience, then all we have is Robert’s gospel of hopeless death.

I affirm the sufficiency of what God did for us via Jesus. Jesus did for us what we could not do for ourselves. Nothing can be added to Jesus’ perfect obedience which is freely offered to

Adam's fallen race. All who have Jesus' imputed righteousness have forgiveness of sins and peace with God.

I affirm that God is love; the perfect parent who MILITANTLY GUARDS His children.

ROM11:6

The fundamental natures of our two propositions are:

Robert's Proposition_1: GRACE plus WORKS.

Lloyd's Proposition_2: GRACE without WORKS.

GRACE and WORKS are incompatible and antithetical.

If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.

But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

Rom11:6

Antithetical means there is no possible **COMBINATION** of GRACE and WORKS. If any one condition is added to the gracious offer of eternal life, then grace is instantly nullified and the offer becomes a work to comply with the condition.

KEY VERSES

REPEATS

Heb10:14

“For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.”

In Proposition_1, Heb10:14 denied the new birth as a process of human obedience. Destiny and rewards are distinct. Believers are forever secure even as they continue sinning and rebelling.

In Proposition_2, Heb10:14 affirms believers' security apart from any activity, process, or contingency related to obedience or disobedience. *Perfected* (**τετελείωκεν**) is a Greek Perfect Tense (**GPT**): a past act continues undiminished. As the result of a past act of new birth, believers stand in an unending state of perfection. *Sanctified* (**ἀγιάζομενους**) is a present tense. God has permanently perfected the believers even while they continue life in an imperfect process.

1Cor3:15

“He shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved.”

In Proposition_1, 1Cor3:15 denied believers can so sin as to be “finally lost.” This is a worst-case scenario where the believer's every work is burned in judgment. According to James2:20, the foolish believer's faith was DEAD. Nevertheless, the foolish believer is still saved, **“yet so as by fire.”** It is impossible for believers to sin such that they can **EVER** be lost.

In Proposition_2, the exact same argument holds! It is impossible for believers, even with DEAD faith, to **EVER** be lost!

Robert's **SILENCE** to these verses was a pleasant admission of defeat in Proposition_1. I anticipate with delight his continued **SILENCE** and unwitting admission of defeat in Proposition_2.

NEW

John10:28

“And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.”

The Greek structure uses a double negative (οὐ μή) with the subjunctive (ἀπόλωνται). The double negative is for extraordinary emphasis. The subjunctive relates to possibility. The double negative with the subjunctive has the force of a categorical and super emphatic denial of possibility. It is not **EVER** possible to think of believers perishing.

Col2:13-14

“And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it (ἤρκεν) out of the way.”

The word ἤρκεν is a Greek Perfect tense: unabated continuance of a past act. Believers have never ending eternal life because of Jesus' perfect sacrifice. Their entire lifetime of sins was forgiven and all legal charges eliminated. Those past results continue without end! Joe Beam (*Forgiven Forever*, 222), CoC lecturer and author says:

If the Greatest Being in existence, the God who knows me better than I know myself, sees me as forgiven, I am a fool to see myself any other way.

Therefore, no one can condemn the believer! Nothing can separate us from God! It is not possible that believers can **EVER** be lost!

Romans5:1-2

“Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.”

This was my father's favorite verse! Justification (δικαιωθέντες) is passive. We do nothing active. We passively receive justification by faith in what God has done for us through Jesus. Because of the past act of faith, we have (ἔσχήκαμεν – another perfect tense) permanent unending peace with God. Because of the past act of faith, we permanently stand (ἑστήκαμεν – another perfect tense) in God's grace. This is cause for rejoicing! True unending gospel hope is centered squarely and firmly on Jesus' active obedience – activated solely by our passive faith – apart from depraved human obedience. It is IM-possible for believers to **EVER** be lost!

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

In Proposition_1, Robert only operated with individual verses interpreted by his non-negotiable human-centered philosophy. Robert disregarded all Bible that contradicted his deeply held creed. Never once did he try to align his philosophy with the major doctrines of the Bible.

By contrast, I started Proposition_2 with a bird's-eye sketch of theology that tests the consistency, coherence, comprehensiveness and congruity of individual verses. I then examined the verses within the overarching framework of major biblical doctrines. Here, Systematic theology combines the bird's-eye sketch with the individual verses to ensure that the proposition stands the tests of logic. The interpretation of individual verses align with the whole integrated Bible.

GREEK PERFECT TENSE

Three of my verses utilized the power of the Greek Perfect Tense, which describes “an event that, completed in the past, has results existing in the present time” and denotes “the continuance of completed action” (Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 573).

Heb10:14 forcefully extends continuance to “forever.” Col2 widens continuance to infinity (“all”). Romans5 stretches continuance to the final hope of glory. The qualifying words make the continuous results permanent. The permanent results of the historic acts can only be stopped by some following direct statement. But there is no such statement in these contexts because believers cannot **EVER** be lost.

The GPT powerfully affirms Proposition_2.

OUR DEPRAVITY; JESUS' SUFFICIENCY

Sin and rebellion must be taken seriously. Our depravity is a death sentence. In Adam all die (1Cor15:22a). Any attempt to please God on the basis of our righteous deeds is but filthy rags (Isa64:6). But in Jesus, the second Adam, all shall live (1Cor15:22b). Jesus is our sufficiency.

ye are complete in him. Col2:10

Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. 1John5:5

The essence of Christianity is found in the work and person of Jesus. This is why my chosen verses are so potent. They condemn Robert's Proposition_1 as a gospel of death and affirm the biblical gospel of life in Jesus and the absolute security of God's children.

DESTINY VS REWARDS

Common sense tells us that physical life has two components: birth and growth. Our physical DOB is an unrepeatable past event. We are born as humans. We will never again enter our mothers' womb. We will never cease being a human. Nothing we do in life, not even death, affects our DOB or our human status.

This applies to the spiritual world as well. Heb10:14 teaches that spiritual life has two components: a spiritual DOB followed by spiritual growth via obedience. Jesus Himself used the term “born again.” Our spiritual DOB is an unrepeatable past event. We are born as spiritual children of God. Believers will never again be “born from above.” Believers will never cease being God's children. Nothing we do in life, not even death, affects our spiritual DOB or our spiritual status. Our spiritual DOB and status depend only and entirely on the sufficiency of what God did for us in Jesus.

Heb10:14 is powerful. Spiritual DOB by faith in what God did for us through Jesus determines unchangeable **DESTINY**. Spiritual growth via obedience to The Law determines changeable

REWARDS. The two concepts are as distinct as DOB is from growth. **DESTINY** is by obedience to the gospel (faith in Jesus). **REWARDS** are by obedience to The Law (Rom3:31).

GOD

In Proposition_1, Robert's human-centered Christ-denying legalism made an unwitting castigation of God as an abnormal unloving Parent.

In Proposition_2. **God is LOVE** (1John4:8). He does not cast away His children. God accepts all filthy believers for Jesus' sake. The word picture of Joshua in Zechariah 3 is relevant. Joshua was filthy. God, not Joshua, took away the filthy garments. God, not Joshua, provided the change of raiment.

For His name's sake, God forgives us (Psa25:11) and saves us (Ps79:9). He redeems us for His mercies' sake (Psa44:26). He does all this "that in the ages to come He might show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph2:7).

God's love is active and mighty. God **MILITANTLY GUARDS** His children (1Pet1:4). The KJV used "reserved," which can be wrongly thought of as a wimpy breakable restaurant reservation. But the Greek uses **τηρέω**, "which implies a fortress or full military lines of apparatus." (Strong's G5083).

The point is that the God of the Bible is dramatically opposite from and antithetical to the unloving God that Robert painted in Proposition_1. God is a loving Parent, Who does not cast away His children. His love **MILITANTLY GUARDS** His children.

SUMMARY

Robert supported his Proposition_1 via a human-centered interpretation of verses without any systematic testing for consistency, coherence, comprehensiveness, and congruence. By contrast, this GRACE-alone approach of Proposition_2 weaves theological doctrines with individual verses that boldly declares the impossibility of believers to **EVER** be lost.

Since it is clearly proven that believers have continuous permanent unbroken spiritual life, then so is Robert's woefully inadequate definition. My God is categorically above Robert's false god. My God **MILITANTLY GUARDS** His children. It is not possible for a child of God to **EVER** be lost.

If Robert wants a genuine debate, he must now answer on the level of an integrated system. However, readers by now know Robert's history of verse-by-verse distortions by his ingressed non-negotiable creeds. So far, Robert has put loyalty to his man-made creeds over the Bible. He has not shown the ability to respond at any level beyond his non-negotiable creeds, which effectively eliminate the possibility of responding with Bible in **CONTEXT** in an integrated logical system.

Thank God! Believers are permanently secure within God's militant guard. Believers can know they have eternal life (1John5:13), even with DEAD faith (1Cor3:15)!

Lloyd Olson

Waters' First Negative

That it is possible for a Christian to fall and be finally lost is abundantly clear from the passages used in my affirmative. Unfortunately, my opponent has been relentless in his effort to lead the reader away from the truth. The Bible WARNS about the possibility of a Christian's falling, it gives **examples** of some who did fall, it teaches what a Christian must endeavor to **DO to keep from falling**, and it says that **"if you do these things you will never fall."** Also, numerous clear passages use the word **"if,"** denoting a **CONDITION** that is required to continue in God's grace. Sadly, even though the proposition contains the phrase **"the Scriptures teach,"** my opponent ridiculed me for using scripture to affirm the proposition, asserted that I took every passage out of context, and urged the reader to accept his **"integrated system,"** which is not Bible language. Yet he has provided scripture (while in the negative) in his effort to persuade the reader to accept the idea that a Christian is totally passive, that there are no conditions for remaining saved, that it is **IMPOSSIBLE** to fall, and that even a **"dead faith"** saves.

Regarding Lloyd's notion that God does everything **FOR** those who want to be saved, I offered for consideration Galatians 3:27 and 1 Corinthians 12:13, which teach how to get into Christ—baptism. While, in a sense, the one being baptized is passive, because someone else is doing the baptizing, he nevertheless must determine to take this action, which is just **ONE** of the active conditions for being saved. I showed that if there are no **"conditions"** required for being saved then this rules out **"faith,"** which my opponent was forced to admit is indeed required. Thus, his proposition has already been disproved and his subsequent efforts are pointless. My task now is to explain his affirmative passages in such a way that it can be seen that they do not contradict the unambiguous passages that I used to affirm my proposition.

When plain scriptures are used to affirm something that is reasonable and logical, yet someone asserts that what is affirmed is merely **"human-centered philosophy,"** then one is reminded of Jesus' warning: **"And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved"** (Matt24:11-13; also 1John4:1).

Straw Man Tactic

I want also to remind the reader that after I explained my position regarding the Christian and sin, Lloyd completely ignored it and continued as if he were debating someone that holds a different position—one that I showed was an extreme position, which few hold and which I strongly oppose. My position is **TRUTH** and not Lloyd nor any man can defeat it.

Lloyd stated that he affirms: 1) Human depravity; 2) sufficiency of what God did for us via Jesus; and 3) that God is love.

(1) Indeed, we cannot earn salvation, but if we have no ACTIONS our faith is dead (Jas2:14,17) and cannot save us.

(2) Without a doubt, what God has done is sufficient. We do not need to look elsewhere for saving grace.

(3) God is love, and he would have “all men to be saved” (1Tim2:4), but those who choose to go back and follow Satan are in rebellion against God and certainly will not enter the kingdom of heaven (Gal5:19-21). God guards his faithful children, but, as with Israel, when they are rebellious, he rejects those who refuse to return to him.

Lloyd’s Seven Affirmative Arguments (the limit was supposed to be five)

I shall quote from some renounced scholars—not because they have any authority but because they explain the text exceptionally well.

#1 Romans 11:6

If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

The idea under consideration is whether one is saved by works ONLY or if grace is involved. Works ALONE will not save. One is saved by grace, but we have seen from other scriptures that to obtain grace one must meet certain *conditions*. Adhering to the *conditions* God has set, which include faith, does not nullify grace. Paul understood and taught *conditions*. Near the end of his life he said, “I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.” Compare this to Lloyd’s philosophy: “I have been completely passive, I have not been diligent to keep the faith, nevertheless there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.” (See Rev2:10)

Illustration

A jobless man approaches a farmer and asks him for work. The man states that he can cut wood to sell, but does not have a chainsaw. The farmer says that he does not have any work for the man but is willing to give him a chainsaw. The farmer states, “Walk over there and look in my pickup bed. You will see a chainsaw. Take it. It is yours.” Thus, by the grace of this farmer the man is given what he seeks. His having to WALK to the pickup and LOOK inside to see and actually take the chainsaw does not nullify the grace or make the chainsaw any less of a gift. He merely met the requirements for receiving it. But if he had followed Lloyd’s philosophy he would have thought that if he had to DO something it would be all wrong, and so he would reject the gracious farmer’s offer and go on his way without the gift. Or, he might go ahead and DO something but deny he was doing anything.

#2 Hebrews 10:14

“For by one offering He has perfected for all time those who are sanctified” (NASB).

I have no problem with the text, but Lloyd’s assessment of it is objectionable: “God has permanently perfected the believers.” The word “permanently” is neither found in the text nor is it implied.

For by one offering.

Jesus offered himself ONCE on the cross. There is no need to continually make offerings as was the case with the Jewish priests.

He hath perfected for all time.

“The sacrifice being ‘forever’ in its efficacy ([Heb 10:12](#)) needs no renewal” (JFB).

“For by one offering, that of the cross, he hath perfected forever. Given them perfect consciences free from a sense of the guilt of sin” (PNT).

There is no indication that the apostle meant this to apply to the individual and his eternal destiny. Rather, it expresses the idea that no one needs to offer sacrifices continually, as was the case under the Jewish dispensation. Our Saviour made one sacrifice and it was sufficient for the sins of the world.

Those who are sanctified.

Those sanctified were perfected, but this passage does not teach that one may not return to a life of sin like the washed hog that returned to the mire and became worse off than before (2Pet2:20-22).

#3 1 Corinthians 3:15

“He shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved.”

But he himself shall be saved - If he have sincerely and conscientiously believed what he preached, and yet preached what was wrong, not through malice or opposition to the Gospel, but through mere ignorance, he shall be saved; God in his mercy will pass by his errors; and he shall not suffer punishment because he was mistaken. Yet, as in most erroneous teachings there is generally a portion of wilful and obstinate ignorance, the salvation of such erroneous teachers is very rare; and is expressed here, yet so as by fire, i.e. with great difficulty; a mere escape; a hair's breadth deliverance; he shall be like a brand plucked out of the fire (Clark).

#4 John10:28

My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: ²⁸ And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any *man* pluck them out of my hand.

They shall never perish - Why? Because they hear my voice, and follow me; therefore I know, I approve of and love them, and give them eternal life. They who continue to hear Christ's voice, and to follow him, shall never perish. They give themselves up to God - believe so on Jesus that he lives in their hearts: God hath given unto them eternal life, and this life is in his Son; and he that hath the Son hath life, [1Jo 5:11](#), [1Jo 5:12](#). Now it is evident that only those who have Christ living in and governing their souls, so that they possess the mind that was in him, are his sheep - are those that shall never perish, because they have this eternal life abiding in them: therefore to talk of a man's being one of the elect - one that shall never perish - one who shall have eternal life - who shall never be plucked out of the hand of God, etc., while he lives in sin, has no Christ in his heart, has either never received or fallen away from the grace of God, is as contrary to common sense as it is to the nature and testimonies of the Most High. Final perseverance implies final faithfulness - he that endures to the end shall be saved - he that is faithful unto death shall have a crown of life. And will any man attempt to say that he who does not endure to the end, and is unfaithful, shall ever enter into life (Clark)?

#5 Romans 5:1-2

Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Yes, we are "justified by faith" but "**not by faith only**," according to James 2:24. Who should one believe, James or Lloyd?

#6 Colossians 2:13-14 (later)

#7 Zechariah 3 (later)

Miscellaneous

Lloyd: "Because of the past act of faith, we permanently stand."

RW: Notice Lloyd's slip above: "act of faith," a clear admission that man's salvation is not passive. This means it is active, and it is not limited to faith. And "dead faith," or "faith only," does not save. Additional actions are required, such as "confess" (Jas2:19; Jn12:42). I'm glad to see that Lloyd is learning. Oh, again we have Lloyd ADDING the word "permanently" to FORCE the text to support his proposition.

Lloyd: "Believers will never cease being God's children."

RW: The above is not the issue. We have seen that the Prodigal Son was sorrowful, repented, and came home and asked for mercy. The restoration would not have taken place had he chosen to continue his rebellious life.

Lloyd: "Robert's...made an unwitting castigation of God as an abnormal unloving Parent."

RW: No. In dealing with the Prodigal Son I showed the opposite and also showed how this parable defeats Lloyd's proposition and supports mine.

Lloyd: "Robert's SILENCE to these verses was a pleasant admission of defeat."

RW: I was silent because I was in the affirmative. Lloyd was not supposed to be making affirmative arguments. I said I would deal with them when in the negative. He added two arguments to his allowed five and contends that he broke no rules. But his affirmative arguments still add up to seven any way you slice it.

CONCLUSION

Lloyd said the "GRACE-alone approach...weaves theological doctrines with individual verses that boldly declares the impossibility of believers to EVER be lost."

The Bible contains NOTHING even similar to the above, but it does contain something applicable: "They that weave networks, shall be confounded" (Isa19:9). Lloyd needs to stop trying to weave the word of God and start actually using good hermeneutics so he can learn the truth.

Robert Waters

OLSON'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

PROPOSITION_2: THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST.

ROUND_1

As in Proposition_1, the first round sets the tone for the whole proposition. Subsequent responses added little to round one. The same is likely here.

In Proposition_1, Robert presented no integrated systematic theology. His human-centered legalism added works to grace. He was SILENT to depravity, Romans11:6, the sufficiency of what God did for us through Jesus, and the **DESTINY-REWARDS** contrast. He wanted only to proclaim a gospel of hopeless death. Robert's Proposition_1 was utterly defeated.

Here, in Proposition_2, Robert followed the same tactics. He is not interested in Bible truth. He has more loyalty to his works-centered philosophy than to the Bible. His legalistic gospel of death cannot provide a coherent consistent system of answers. Robert ignored key issues, made errors in simple theology, and dismissed truth with man-made creeds.

FAITH-ALONE

Robert never addressed depravity in Proposition_1. Here, Robert agreed with me: "Indeed, we cannot earn salvation." Thank you Robert. Unfortunately, you just forfeited the debate. Indeed! Our depravity is so desperately wicked, we cannot understand it (Jer17:9). If there were an act of obedience beyond faith that we needed to DO, then we would do it with impure motives and it would be counted as sin. The best of our righteous deeds are but filthy rags to God (Isa64:6).

Robert tried soothing his forfeiture saying: "if we have no ACTIONS our faith is dead" (James2:14,17) and cannot save us. This has two serious deficiencies.

In 1Cor3:15, the foolish believer lost everything in the fires of judgment. His faith was DEAD, yet he was still saved.

Paul contrasts faith and obedience to the law (Rom4:13-14).

Everything Robert suggests is denied by the Bible.

JESUS' SUFFICIENCY

Robert never addressed Jesus' sufficiency once in Proposition_1. Here, he agreed with me!

Without a doubt, what God has done is sufficient. We do not need to look elsewhere for saving grace. (Robert)

This is MY point. We can add NOTHING to what God has done for us in Jesus.

We are complete in Jesus (Col2:10)

Believers can never be condemned (Rom8:1). Nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ (Rom8:35). Robert destroyed his position and affirmed mine!

GRACE-ALONE

If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace.

But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

Rom11:6

Robert started: "One is saved by grace." Then, he added: "to obtain grace one must meet certain conditions." In Robert's illustration, a farmer graciously gave a man a chainsaw. But the man had to walk, then reach for and take the chainsaw. Robert thinks this string of conditions applies to grace. His illustration is flawed.

Rom11:6 CLEARLY declares that any condition of work nullifies grace. Since this disagrees with Robert's legalism, he dreamed up an illustration that unwittingly denies Rom11:6 and proclaims human-centered obedience that can at best be filthy rags to God (Isa64:6). A gracious offer of eternal life is by God's way of grace alone! Any other way is a way of works.

Robert cries "Grace!" But then he adds legalistic human-obedience creeds which unwittingly nullifies grace. Robert's comments are an abject denial of Romans11:6.

HEB10:14

"For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

This important verse cuts like a two-edged sword. In Proposition_1, "**them that are sanctified**" denied that a child of God could be "finally lost" through any condition. In Proposition_2, "**hath perfected forever**" affirms the permanent security of God's children.

Robert didn't see the word "permanent." Apparently, Robert doesn't know that "forever" and "permanent" are synonyms.

Robert's poor English also caused him to think that "**perfected forever**" modifies the "**one offering**." He came by this by way of two scholarly quotes ripped from their original contexts. Robert passed them off as one connected truth. This is a deceptive lie.

Robert's quotes are not comprehensively linked to the entire verse. JFB is right only in the limited context of the sacrifice and never right in the context of the entire verse. PNT is right only in limited context of the effect on our consciences and never right in the context of the entire verse.

Robert snubbed, and his scholars ignored, the underlying Greek grammar because it destroys Robert's deceptive lie.

μι ἓν ἕνα προσφορῆς **τετελείωκεν** εἰς τὸ διηνεκῆς τοῖς **ἀγιαζομένοις**
one for by sacrifice has perfected to forever those being sanctified

Τετελείωκεν is a perfect indicative; **ἀγιαζομένοις** a present participle. First semester Greek teaches that **participles** are dependent on **main verbs**. Even though the sacrifice is forever perfect (JFB), the main verb of this verse is NOT a modifier of the sacrifice. If the main verb modified the sacrifice, then the participle would be forced to function as the main verb. It does not.

The phrase “**εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους**” is one connected thought. The preposition “**εἰς**” (to) is connected to “**διηνεκὲς**” (forever) and “**τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους**” (those being sanctified).

We must know and trust the specifics of God’s Word or risk being deceived by quotes ripped from their contexts. Imperfect humans (in the process of sinning, failing, rebelling and stumbling) are **perfected forever** by Jesus’ forever perfect sacrifice. Eternal life is “permanent,” “forever,” and “**εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς.**”

1COR3:15

“He shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved.”

Robert’s scholarly quote says

But he himself shall be saved - If he have sincerely and conscientiously believed.

The quote continues by crediting the believer for something. This denies 1Cor3:11-15, which shows that the believer lost everything. Nothing remains to be credited to the believer. This is a great example of how legalism denies Romans11:6 and adds works to grace.

JOHN10:28

“And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.”

Since Robert embraces a false philosophy, truth is hard for him to see and use. He commonly avoids key issues. The first part of Robert’s answer is a quote that says believers never perish because “they hear my voice.” But this is assumed in the definitions and is not relevant. The quote continues by wrongly making final faithfulness a CONDITION for perseverance.

Perseverance is a false Calvinistic idea that depends on works: the exact same condition for Robert’s legalism. But since this debate is not about errant Calvinistic works-righteous perseverance, Robert’s comment is not relevant.

Robert should have addressed the Greek grammar: the double negative plus subjunctive. This structure has the force of a categorical and super emphatic denial of possibility. It is not **EVER** possible to think of believers perishing.

ROM5:1-2

“Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.”

Robert used James2:24 without understanding that James2:24 points to Gen22: Abraham and Isaac at Mt. Moriah. Once again, Robert is not talking about the debate proposition. He wants to talk about his cult’s process of justification. Here, in this debate, we are supposed to be discussing the security of believers.

Robert ran from the grammar of Romans5:1-2 because it so decisively affirms Proposition_2. Since he had nothing of substance to say about Romans 5:1-2, he ran tuck-tailed to his church creeds. The two Greek Perfect Tenses loudly proclaim the IM-possibility for believers to **EVER** be lost!

This isn't much of a debate. Robert hasn't yet addressed any key issue with biblical truths.

ACT OF FAITH

Robert THINKS he caught me in a slip. He thinks that an "act of faith" is "a clear admission that man's salvation is not passive." What he doesn't realize is that he just told the reading audience that he is not a theologian.

This relates to the FAITH-ALONE discussion above. Faith is active. Justification is passive. The activity of faith is only the look to Jesus. Anything beyond this look to Jesus is filthy rags (Isa64:6). With one look of faith to Jesus, God justifies believers. Believers, with no active works beyond FAITH-ALONE, passively receive the gift of eternal life.

Robert stumbles over easy words: faith, grace, active, and passive. He can't understand or teach Bible truths because he doesn't know basic beginning theology.

THE PRODIGAL

Robert THINKS he already answered this in Proposition_1. There, he wrongly thought that the son obeyed "CONDITIONS" of repentance before he returned to the Father. Let's revisit this.

The son was a son even when he demanded his inheritance. Because this wished his Father was dead, Pharisees would have disowned the son right there. The Father did not. The son was still His son! This theme is repeated and expanded until the son is in the pig sty. Even there, he was fully conscious of his sonship. Once a son; always a son!

This truth is verified by the other two "lost" parables in Luke 15: the lost coin and the lost sheep. The prior chapter ended with a discussion on discipleship (**REWARDS**). All three parables relate to **REWARDS**.

The "lost" sheep always belonged to its shepherd – even when out of sight. It never repented in order to be found. The shepherd searched for and recovered what was always his.

The "lost" coin always belonged to the woman – even when out of sight. It never repented in order to be found. The woman searched for and recovered what was always hers.

There were no CONDITIONS for the sheep or coin.

The three parables say the same thing. Hence, there was no CONDITION for the son to return. Lost does not mean "finally lost." In these parables, "lost" means being out of fellowship (no **REWARDS**) with God. Robert is deplorably wrong about this parable.

NEW VERSES

Robert said I started with seven arguments. So I'll only add three new verses.

2Cor1:22

Who sealed us and gave us the Spirit in our hearts as a down payment.

Seals are sign and proof of a completed transaction, ownership, and security since only an authorized person could break the seal. A down payment is the buyer's pledge to purchase and pay the full price for the house. The Holy Spirit is God's personal pledge and guarantee that believers will receive the gift of eternal life. God's promise is maximum security!

John5:24

He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but IS PASSED from death unto life.

"**Shall not come into condemnation**" crushes Robert's Proposition_1 again. "**IS PASSED**" is another Greek Perfect Tense stressing the believer's unending eternal life.

Col3:3

For ye are dead, and your life is hid (κέκρυπται) with Christ in God.

This verse is a triple delight. First, "**is hid**" (κέκρυπται) is another Greek Perfect Tense declaring unabated security. Second, believers are doubly hidden in Christ and then in God. Third, κέκρυπται is also a passive voice showing believers DO nothing to stay in Christ and God. This is grace-alone and faith-alone completely apart from works, obedience and conditions.

CONCLUSION

Robert isn't interested in genuine debate. He wants only to proclaim a legalistic GRACE-plus-WORKS philosophy that elevates human-obedience above the sufficiency of God's work for us through Jesus. It doesn't matter to him that he openly denied Rom11:6.

Robert was SILENT on:

Col2:13-14 and Zech3 (promised later),
Greek grammar,
the DESTINY-REWARDS contrast (Heb10:14), and
how God militantly guards His children (1Pet1:4).

When Robert spoke, he forced the Bible to submit to his human-centered Christ-denying legalism. He spent 302 words denying Romans11:6, violated the context of James2:24 and added CONDITIONS to **FAITH-ALONE**. None of his arguments was reasonable, consistent with the Bible, or faithful to context.

Robert's legalistic answers are bankrupt, expunged and obliterated. His legalism couldn't defend Proposition_1 and hasn't successfully challenged anything in Proposition_2. Worse for Robert, there are three new powerful legalism-killing eternal-security verses clearly declaring: IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST.

Grace to you!
Lloyd Olson

Waters' Second Negative

In his second affirmative, Lloyd began with words that indicate he is now in the negative. He wrote, "In Proposition_1, Robert presented no integrated systematic theology." Okay, but whether I'm guilty or not, this does not help him prove his proposition. Lloyd needs to learn and use good hermeneutics, which is "the science of interpretation, especially of the Scriptures" (Dictionary.com). This involves the use of RULES, which Lloyds does not like. The rules include: 1) Get all the scriptures on a subject and study them carefully in seeking truth, which will allow harmony of the Scriptures, BEFORE drawing a conclusion; 2) explain obscure passages in light of plain ones; and 3) do not draw a conclusion that is illogical or which has consequences that are not acceptable in light of God's character or morality. Lloyd, these are rules one USES, not presents. If you had actually used good hermeneutics (applying the rules) you would see that your proposition cannot be sustained.

Lloyd asserted that I "added works to grace" and was silent on Romans 1:6. But the truth is, my reply to Romans 11:6 was more than 300 words, and I did not "add" works to grace; but GOD did add **conditions**.

Lloyd said, "He has more loyalty to his works-centered philosophy than to the Bible." Lloyd's favorite tactic in debate seems to be to tell untruths about his opponent. He knows full well that my "philosophy" is CHRIST centered. He even quoted me saying, "Without a doubt, what God has done is sufficient." And he quoted: "Indeed, we cannot earn salvation," but then he went on to try to persuade the reader that I believe the opposite. Lloyd, you really need to abandon your efforts to defeat the *straw man* you have fabricated and respond honorably to the person you are actually debating.

Lloyd: Paul contrasts faith and obedience to the law (Rom4:13-14).

RW: Okay, that is a fact worthy of note, which underscores what I've been emphasizing. Works of the LAW do not save, but this has nothing to do with *actions* required of God that are *conditions* for receiving his grace.

Lloyd: "We can add NOTHING to what God has done for us in Jesus."

RW: My opponent is totally missing the point. First, "**all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.**" Second, man cannot save himself. Third, Jesus is the ONLY way—in him and him alone can one be saved. But does this mean one can save himself by WORKS? Thinking people can see that it does not. The point of "Jesus' sufficiency" is that he can accomplish what we need, but obviously this does not apply to those who refuse his conditions. Lloyd has said there are NO conditions and that man is completely passive, but he slipped and stated that even **faith is an act**. We are not going to let him out of the corner he is in.

Lloyd's Proof Texts

Col2:13,14

This debate is not about whether we are forgiven—we are if we “walk in the light.” But Lloyd’s proof text in no way teaches that it is impossible for a Christian to turn from God and be lost.

Lloyd: “Therefore, no one can condemn the believer!”

RW: God can, if the person ceases to be a believer.

Lloyd: Nothing can separate us from God!

RW: People can by their rebellion, as did the Jews (Isa59:2).

Lloyd: “Once a child of God; always a child of God!”

RW: Israel was still God’s people even after being divorced (Jer3:8). The final reward is referred to as an inheritance (1Pet1:4). Often a deceased person’s legal will specifies CONDITIONS, such as “if you do these things,” etc. Thus, if one does not meet the conditions, though he is a son, he may be “disqualified” (1Cor9:27 NASV) and therefore disinherited.

Zech3

Lloyd: “God, not Joshua, took away the filthy garments.”

RW: Someone might disagree with Lloyd’s argument, but I do not know anyone who would—except for his unfounded conclusion.

The Gracious Farmer

There can be no doubt that Lloyd and virtually every reader understands this illustration. It shows how a person may give a gift yet require that certain conditions be met. It was a very simple illustration that most third graders could easily comprehend. Lloyd’s reply: “Robert thinks this string of conditions applies to grace.” Now how does stating what I **think** disprove the illustration? Let’s review what Lloyd basically ignored:

The **jobless man** was in need. The **farmer** had what the man needed and by *grace* met his needs. The farmer set some simple, reasonable, and logical conditions that the homeless man was happy to meet. And his having met them in no way destroyed the *grace* offered by the farmer.

Lloyd: “Rom11:6 CLEARLY declares that any condition of work nullifies grace.

RW: No, it declares that if one is saved by grace then it is understood that he cannot be saved by works alone, but this is not to say that man is totally passive in his salvation—that God does EVERYTHING. The biggest problem with Lloyd’s notion is that it contradicts

numerous clear passages; and, it is not even reasonable or logical. Suppose the **gracious farmer** had said, "I have a chainsaw that you can have," **but said nothing else?** Suppose he did not tell the jobless man where the chainsaw was or that he could GO, LOOK, and TAKE it from the farmer's pickup. The jobless man might go on his way and tell others about the gracious farmer who gave him the needed saw; but he **never got the saw!** That is what happens to those who follow Lloyd's teaching. They are going around telling people about God's grace that offers salvation, but they insist God did not tell them what to do to get it and that they did nothing to get it. And so, they don't have it!

Lloyd: "Eternal life is by God's way of grace alone! Any other way is a way of works."

RW: Lloyd is speaking of the ONE way, which is through God's grace. My contention is that following the conditions for receiving that grace IS NOT **another way**. But if people today think they can reject God's grace and be saved by works (without grace), as some Jews in Jesus' day thought, then they are deceived.

Lloyd says I add "legalistic human-obedience creeds which unwittingly nullifies grace." The honest reader knows this is not so. I have used the Scriptures to show that God has given CONDITIONS for receiving grace, and I've provided a simple illustration to help in understanding it.

The Prodigal

This parable, which Lloyd tried to use as an affirmative argument when in the negative, turned out to be devastating to his position. His only argument is: "The son was still His son!" I noted that the son (whom the father received back) was sorrowful, penitent, and took action, but Lloyd denies all this. His reply proves nothing. The son had free will and chose to return, and the result was that the father received him back. The lesson, which anyone who does not hold to Lloyd's definition of a theologian, can easily get, is that a Christian who turns to the world MUST do what the son did—RETURN! Lloyd says such a person will be saved even if he dies in rebellion. This is NOT *integrative* theology. It is false doctrine.

Lloyd: "This truth is verified by the other two 'lost' parables."

RW: Indeed, the parables were about being lost and found, with emphasis on the importance of being FOUND. Lloyd's philosophy is that it does not matter whether a Christian who is lost is EVER found.

Lloyd: "Lost does not mean 'finally lost'."

RW: Okay, but if the son had not chosen to return, would he have been *finally lost*, Lloyd? Yes or no, please.

Lloyd: "...'lost' means being out of fellowship (no REWARDS)."

RW: Okay, but again I remind you, Lloyd, HEAVEN is a reward.

“Act of Faith”

Lloyd: Robert THINKS he caught me in a slip. He thinks that an “act of faith” is “a clear admission that man’s salvation is not passive.” What he doesn’t realize is that he just told the reading audience that he is not a theologian.”

RW: A true theologian is one who believes in God and respects and uses the Scriptures as the basis for learning truth. It appears Lloyd thinks being a theologian authorizes him to disregard good hermeneutics and believe and teach what is most comforting—like the devil’s comment to Eve, “**You shall not surely die.**” Of course, it was OPPOSITE to what God had said, just as most of what Lloyd is saying is opposite.

Lloyd: “The activity of faith is only the look to Jesus.”

RW: Remember the illustration of the **farmer** and the **jobless man**? One of the conditions for grace was for the man to “LOOK” in the pickup. But if all he did was “look,” would he have benefited from the grace? Yes or no?

Lloyd: “With one look of faith to Jesus, God justifies believers. Believers, with no active works beyond FAITH-ALONE, passively receive the gift of eternal life.”

RW: The “**devils believed and trembled**” and “**the chief priests believed, but...would not confess him.**” Lloyd, your doctrine has the chief priests saved, but the implication in the Bible is that they were NOT saved.

Question #1: Did the *chief rulers* of the Jews believe in Jesus (Jn12:42)?

Question #2: What action did Jesus note that the chief rulers did not do?

Question #3: Is *confession* of Jesus a required action?

Question #4: In Rom10:9-10, does Paul tie *belief* and *confession* together with the conjunction “and”?

Lloyd’s New Verses

Lloyd says his three proof texts **clearly declare** that, “IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST.” Compare them to passages in my affirmative arguments that indeed clearly teach otherwise.

2Cor1:22

“Who sealed us”

Barnes notes that *sealed* is “*used in the sense of setting a mark on anything, or a seal, to denote that it is genuine, authentic, confirmed, or approved...*” “As a seal makes a will or an

agreement sure.” But agreements often have *conditions*, which when not met unseal the deal. Barnes continued to note that what the Holy Spirit does “Consists of the ordinary operations of the Spirit on the heart, producing repentance, faith, hope, joy, conformity to God, the love of prayer and praise, and the Christian virtues generally; and these things are the evidences that the Holy Spirit has renewed the heart, and that the Christian is sealed for the day of redemption.”

Yes, the Christian is sealed, but this does not support “once saved always saved.”

John5:24

He that heareth my word...shall not come into condemnation.”

The key to understanding this passage, which allows harmony with other passages on this subject, is to note the meaning of the word “heareth.” Barnes says:

“To ‘hear,’ in this place, evidently denotes not the outward act of hearing, but to receive in a proper manner; to suffer it to make its proper impression on the mind; to obey. Many persons outwardly hear the gospel who neither understand nor obey it.”

Lloyd, are you among those who insist that one who “hears” yet does not understand or obey becomes a child of God?

Col3:3

“Your life is hid with Christ in God.”

What a stretch of imagination one must have to “see” anything in this passage that supports Lloyd’s proposition! I provided several clear passages that support my proposition. Lloyd SAYS his passages clearly support his proposition, but they clearly do NOT.

Conclusion

When I said “Indeed, we cannot earn salvation,” Lloyd said “you just forfeited the debate.” Really, Lloyd? The honest reader will weigh the arguments and determine which arguments are sound and which are not, as well as what statements may or may not amount to forfeiting the debate.

Robert Waters

OLSON'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

PROPOSITION_2: THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST.

ROBERT'S FAILURES

Robert has failed, with every verse presented, to show any genuine Bible-based error. But conversely, Robert has managed to:

- deny Rom11:6 by adding CONDITIONS to grace,
- ignore Heb10:14, 1Cor3:15, John10:28, Rom5:1-2,
- ignore the **DESTINY-REWARDS** distinction,
- ignore the underlying Greek in the majority of my verses,
- reuse already debunked arguments from Proposition_1,
- confuse the act of faith-alone in Christ-alone as CONDITIONS for legalistic human-centered obedience, and
- parrot legalistic human-centered Christ-denying creeds.

WHY?

Why didn't Robert ever

rightly use Bible in a Bible debate?

have a genuine Bible-based answer to anything so far?

present his views as an integrated system that aligns with the Bible?

once address the power of the Greek Perfect Tense?

BLIND LOYALTY!

Robert is a twentieth century Pharisee. He has the honor of teaching the same self-righteous system condemned by Jesus. Human-centered Christ-denying legalism is zealously uplifted above the Christ-centered human-denying Bible.

Robert is so blind he thinks his answers are solid and honest. But what is really happening is that he shreds the Bible, reinterprets it by human-obedience creeds, and forces it to bow the knee to 20th century legalism.

Robert is a prisoner to his false-gospel. He simply cannot be a

debater.

He isn't interested in a genuine debate. He never answered my challenges to Proposition_1. In Proposition_2, he tries to be on the affirmative: running tail-tucked from my supporting verses and talking about legalistic tangents. He wants only to talk about legalism.

Bible scholar. He cannot rightly use Bible truth because his system is based on the lie of self-sufficiency. So he will never discuss the underlying Greek grammar or use **CONTEXT** to rightly understand a verse.

theologian. Where the Bible makes salvation depend on what God gracious actions for us, Robert makes salvation depend on what human-obedience to **CONDITIONS** we must do to please God.

Where the Bible is an integrated coherent consistent system, Robert can only use legalism to confuse **DESTINY** with **REWARDS**, violate the **CONTEXT** of verses, redefine faith as works, and add works (conditions) to grace.

Robert is a prisoner to human-centered legalism.

VERSE-by-VERSE

How has Robert responded so far?

Rom11:6 **If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.**

Robert was totally **SILENT** on this powerful verse in Proposition_1.

IN Proposition_2:

LAO_1st_Aff: The Bible makes GRACE and WORKS incompatible and antithetical. There is no possible **COMBINATION** of GRACE and WORKS.

RW_1st_Neg: One is saved by grace, but one must meet certain conditions.

LAO_2nd_Aff: This is two-faced. One cannot reasonably cry "GRACE!" and then add legalistic human-obedience which unwittingly nullifies grace.

RW_2nd_Neg: God added the **CONDITIONS**.

Robert's remarks clearly show blindness in two areas:

1. Grace is God's domain. God alone is gracious in offering a costly plan of redemption as a free gift. No **CONDITION** is laid upon God. Neither is there anything involving human activity beyond the look of faith that passively receives God's free gift. Robert has forced active human obedience into the divine.

2. The distinction between **DESTINY** and **REWARDS, DESTINY** is by faith-alone in Christ-alone. The gift of eternal life is passively received by the sole act of faith in Jesus. This is the new birth. **REWARDS** is where active human obedience begins. This relates to spiritual growth. Robert simply does not honor the natural distinction between the new birth and spiritual growth.

This one verse completely obliterates Robert's grace-plus-works false gospel.

Heb10:14 **For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."**

This verse is so powerful that it cuts two ways.

In Proposition_1, Heb10:14 denied the new birth as a process of human obedience. **DESTINY** and **REWARDS** are distinct. Believers are forever secure even as they continue sinning and rebelling. Robert was **SILENT** on this powerful passage throughout Proposition_1.

In Proposition_2:

LAO_1st_Aff: The main verb ("He hath perfected") is a Greek Perfect Tense showing the unabated security of God's children.

RW_1st_Neg: Robert denied this by ripping two scholarly quotes out of their **CONTEXTS** and putting them together in a deceptive lie. He tried to make us believe that the verb "perfected" acted as an adjective modifying the sacrifice.

LAO_2nd_Aff: The underlying Greek structure links the participle ("them that are sanctified") to the main verb ("He hath perfected"). The main verb is not an adjective that modifies the one offering.

RW_2nd_Neg: **SILENCE.**

1Cor3:15 **"He shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved."**

This is another powerful verse that cuts two ways.

In Proposition_1, it denied CONDITIONS for security. We see a believer who disobeyed every possible CONDITION beyond faith-alone, yet was still saved.

In Proposition_2

LAO_1st_Aff: 1Cor3:15 affirms faith as the only condition for keeping eternal life.

RW_1st_Neg: Robert's quote actually agreed with me! Then it tried to credit the believer for something.

LAO_2nd_Aff: The fires of judgment burned everything. Nothing remains to be credited to the believer.

RW_2nd_Neg: **SILENCE.**

John10:28 “And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.”

LAO_1st_Aff: The underlying Greek double negative with subjunctive has the force of a categorical and super emphatic denial of the possibility of ever thinking that believers will perish.

RW_1st_Neg: Believer’s hear and follow. Final perseverance implies final faithfulness.

LAO_2nd_Aff: Robert’s argument was a rabbit trail. It never addressed the power of the underlying Greek.

RW_2nd_Neg: **SILENCE.**

Col2:13-14 having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us and took it (ἔρκεν) out of the way.

LAO_1st_Aff: The underlying Greek shows that the legal document of our sins was permanently taken out of the way (“ἔρκεν”) another Greek Perfect Tense).

RW_1st_Neg: **SILENCE.**

LAO_2nd_Aff: My argument stands uncontested.

RW_2nd_Neg: The debate is not about whether we are forgiven. We are forgiven if we “walk in the light.”

Robert’s response was the loyal pig returning to its legalistic sty since his “walk in the light” argument was demolished in Proposition_1. He was wrong because he ignored **CONTEXT**. 1John relates to fellowship – not losing eternal life. **REWARDS** have CONDITIONS of obedience to The Law. **DESTINY** does not.

Only forgiven people can go to heaven. If there is a CONDITION undone, then heaven is not possible. The fact that God has accomplished perfect obedience for us through Jesus is a major point of my theology. Since believers’ sins are totally irreversibly forgiven at the moment of faith, then it is impossible for them to **EVER** come into condemnation. No believer can **EVER** be lost!

Romans5:1-2 “being justified by faith we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.”

LAO_1st_Aff: The Greek words behind “we have” and “we stand” show the permanency of security. It is IM-possible for believers to **EVER** be lost!

RW_1st_Neg: Loyal Robert returned to James2:24, which was debunked in Proposition_1.

LAO_2nd_Aff: The **CONTEXT** of James2 is 20 years after Abraham’s justification by faith-alone and relates to **REWARDS**. Robert

simply does not understand the distinction between birth and growth.

RW_2nd_Neg: **SILENCE**

2Cor1:22 Who sealed us and gave us the Spirit in our hearts as a down payment.

LAO_2nd_Aff: Seals are proof of a completed transaction. Only an authorized person can break a seal.

RW_2nd_Neg: “A seal makes an agreement sure.” But agreements have conditions. The Christian is sealed, but this does not support OSAS.

Robert ignored that we humans are not authorized or capable of breaking God’s seal. Instead he preached his legalistic demand for CONDITIONS unwittingly denying that all CONDITIONS were met by Jesus’ obedience. Jesus’ perfect righteousness is imputed to me at the moment of faith (Romans4). My sins are also completely forgiven Col2:13-15 at that moment.

Robert’s remark is yet another demonstration of adding human works to God’s grace. In the name of human-centered obedience Robert rejects the sufficiency of what God has done for us in Jesus.

John5:24 He that hears and believes has everlasting life and “IS PASSED from death unto life.”

LAO_2nd_Aff: **IS PASSED** is another Greek Perfect Tense stressing unending eternal life.

RW_2nd_Neg: Robert addressed only the act of hearing in the process of salvation.

Robert was **SILENT** to the power of the Greek Perfect Tense. He totally avoided the security of **PASSING** into eternal life.

Col3:3 your life is hid (κέκρυπται) with Christ in God.

LAO_2nd_Aff: This is a triple delight. “Hid” is another Greek Perfect Tense declaring unabated security. Believers are doubly hidden in Christ and in God. The verb is passive. We have no condition to obey.

RW_2nd_Neg: Robert could only say, “What a stretch of imagination.”

Robert was again **SILENT** to everything of substance.

Robert’s second negative was a dismal failure.

The major description of his response is **SILENCE**: the inability of a deceptive man-made human-centered false-gospel to respond to the simple truth of what God has done for us in Christ. In a genuine debate **SILENCE** is an unwitting forfeiture.

ROM10:9-10

In spite of his **SILENCE** to my points, Robert had the arrogant foolish audacity to ask questions as if he were on the affirmative. However, the answer to one question gives an important insight into both his failures and a reason behind his failures.

Robert asked, "In Rom10:9-10, does Paul tie belief and confession together with the conjunction 'and?'" This is a well-known Hebrew chiasm that Robert's cult doesn't honor.

- R1 If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and
D1 shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead,
 thou shalt be saved.
D2 For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and
R2 with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

Robert has yet again stumbled over the crucial Heb10:14 **DESTINY- REWARDS** distinction.

DESTINY

innermost pair (D1-D2)

depends only on one's heart belief.

unto righteousness

eternal life

REWARDS

outermost pair (R1-R2)

depends on obedience and confession.

about (εἰς) salvation

fellowship

Salvation is the heart of this chiasm. **DESTINY** is directly linked to salvation and depends on faith-alone; NOT on works or conditions. **REWARDS** depends on both **DESTINY** and obedience. There can be eternal life without rewards (the foolish believer of 1Cor3:11-15) but no rewards without eternal life.

Again note well how every one of Robert's responses is nothing but blind loyalty to his human-centered legalism. Robert has violently wrenched a verse from its proper **CONTEXT**, twisted it by his vile human-centered conditions, and forced the chiasm to bow its knee to his legalistic creeds.

Robert's question gives the reader a pivotal and vital insight as into how cults abuse everything. Robert's cult freely and unashamedly adds conditions to grace even though the Bible declares that any work nullifies grace. Whereas the Bible makes **DESTINY** and **REWARDS** antithetical, Robert's Christ-denying creed joins them.

Robert's question is also a clear demonstration that his blind cultic loyalty is NOT interested in either a genuine debate or a right understanding of the Bible. What a truly useful and enlightening question!

CONCLUSION

In a genuine debate, Robert's failures would be a convincing defeat.

Robert's many failures are driven by his blind loyalty to a legalistic system that denies the sufficiency of what God did for us through Jesus. Robert's only goal is to raise human-centered obedience above the gospel of God's gracious all-sufficient provision through faith in Jesus.

In his blind loyalty to cultic creeds, Robert isn't concerned about his **SILENCE**. It only matters to him that he gets a chance to preach humanism.

Col3:3 showed that blind loyalty to legalism is real true blindness! Robert saw nothing in what I saw as a triple delight.

Rom10:9-10 shows how cults commonly violate **CONTEXT** and redefine verses to fit their Christ-denying creeds.

As noted several times before, Robert has the honor of embracing the exact same human-centered, Pharisaical, Christ-denying system that Jesus condemned and warned us about.

Thank God – salvation doesn't depend on any condition beyond faith in Jesus.

Thank God – salvation depends on everything God did for us.

Lloyd

Waters' Third Negative

Because Lloyd has no scriptural support for his proposition and was/is therefore unable to answer the arguments I have presented, he has become exceedingly and increasingly negative—using much of his allotted word count to express his frustrations. Therefore, I'll have more space to press the points that have contributed to his state of mind.

Lloyd wrote, **“Thank God – salvation doesn't depend on any condition beyond faith in Jesus.”** It is good to give God the thanks for all he has done for us, but Lloyd's comment illustrates his reasoning: Dream up how you want it to be, assert that it is so, keep on asserting it with all the authority you can muster, and demonize anyone who dares to show the truth from the Scriptures. We have to wonder WHY Lloyd would agree to affirm or deny any proposition that begins with “the Scriptures teach.” He simply dismisses clear scripture and acts as if it does not exist or that he does not believe it. For example, **“IF”** and **“DO”** are common Bible words that clearly teach CONDITIONS. Such teaching makes it impossible for Lloyd to sustain his proposition and convince any sincere truth seeker to accept his position.

The reader has to be truly astounded at the verbiage coming from my opponent. He wrote, **“Robert's cult freely and unashamedly adds conditions to grace even though the Bible declares that any work nullifies grace.”** First, I belong to the Lord's church and have no affiliation with any cult or even any denomination. Second, I have added NO conditions for grace but have supplied more than enough passages proving there are indeed *conditions* for receiving God's grace. Third, Lloyd DID NOT and CANNOT supply the passage that says that **“the Bible declares that any work nullifies grace.”** If such a passage existed, Lloyd would have provided it already; and it would be the delight of the atheist because it would be a genuine contradiction to passages that encourage “works.”

If Lloyd has ANY hope of convincing the honest reader to believe that a Christian cannot be “finally lost,” no matter what, he needs to prove that the Scriptures do not give conditions for being saved and/or being continually saved. But in my affirmative I showed several clear passages that affirm that our salvation is indeed dependent upon conditions—passages so clear that denying them is as ludicrous as asserting that the moon does not revolve around the sun. In my second negative, I presented evidence, which we shall now revisit, that upset Lloyd's theological applecart.

The Jobless Man

When Lloyd said, **“The activity of faith is only the look to Jesus,”** I replied, “Remember the illustration of the **farmer** and the **jobless man**? One of the conditions for grace was for the man to 'LOOK' in the pickup. But if all he did was 'look,' would he have benefited from the grace? Yes or no?” This is devastating to Lloyd's position, which explains why he did not answer. The illustration clarifies how grace works, namely that the GIVER (God) may require CONDITIONS, and that such does not destroy the grace or even give the RECEIVER of grace the idea that he EARNED what was actually given to him.

The Prodigal

When Lloyd replied that “**Lost does not mean ‘finally lost’**,” I said, “Okay, but if the son had not chosen to return, would he have been *finally lost*, Lloyd? Yes or no, please.” We are still waiting on the answer.

Then Lloyd tried another quibble. He said that “**‘lost’ means being out of fellowship (no REWARDS)**.” I then reminded him that **HEAVEN IS A REWARD**. Thus, his quibble that implies that all one loses if he is lost (while on earth) is “reward” is seen for what it is.

Previously, Lloyd stated that he does not believe any part of Calvinism. Yet when I made the point that the Prodigal had *free will* and HAD to RETURN, Lloyd’s answer to this conundrum is that the son would be saved **even in rebellion**. The parable (which Lloyd actually tried to use as an affirmative argument) teaches reconciliation based on sorrow, repentance, and seeking of forgiveness. Lloyd’s idea of an *integrative system* to interpret the Bible does not allow him to be consistent with the picture of *reconciliation* that God painted.

Questions Lloyd Did Not Answer:

[The answers to the questions are clearly given in Scripture—third grade stuff. And they are devastating to Lloyd’s proposition.]

Question #1: Did the *chief rulers of the Jews* believe in Jesus (Jn12:42)?

That the chief rulers believed in Jesus is clearly stated, but they failed to be saved because they would not meet God’s *CONDITIONS*. Lloyd asserts that **THERE ARE NO CONDITIONS**. Who are you going to believe? Verse 43 tells us **WHY** they would not make the confession: “**They loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.**”

Question #2: What action did Jesus note that the chief rulers did not do?

They “**did not confess him.**”

Question #3: Is *confession* of Jesus a required action?

It evidently is because it was the reason the chief rulers were not saved. Yet Lloyd insists that all one must DO is believe. And even this is devastating to him because he has asserted that one does not need to DO anything—that such would destroy grace.

Question #4: In Rom10:9-10, does Paul tie *belief* and *confession* together with the conjunction “and”?

Lloyd’s reply: “This is a well-known Hebrew chiasm that Robert’s cult doesn’t honor.”

My opponent asserts that *belief* is all that is involved in being “finally saved.” However, Paul ties another condition to salvation. He does this with the word “**and**,” which is “*Used to connect words of the same part of speech, clauses, or sentences, that are to be taken jointly.*” Here is the text: “**That if thou shalt confess...Jesus, and shalt believe...thou shalt be saved.**” TWO words in this passage, “IF” and “AND,” wreak havoc with Lloyd’s teaching. Lloyd, you get an “E” for effort on

number four, but everyone knows what “and” means. Referring to the “Hebrew chiasm” does not help Lloyd with the dilemma he faces.

“ROBERT’S FAILURES”

- “ignore the DESTINY-REWARDS distinction”

rw: No, I showed that heaven is a reward, and one that can be lost if one rebels and refuses to repent.

- “ignore the underlying Greek in the majority of my verses”

rw: I’m good with accepting what the trusted versions say in English. This is what a great majority of the readers expect and appreciate.

- “confuse the act of faith-alone in Christ-alone as CONDITIONS for legalistic human-centered obedience”

rw: Lloyd makes this comment even though he not only has failed to meet the challenge to provide the passage that teaches “faith alone” but has been shown that justification is “not by faith only” (Jas2:24).

- “parrot legalistic human-centered Christ-denying creeds”

rw: Again, I remind the reader, and Lloyd, that the only creed to which I subscribe is the New Testament. In addition, I have made it abundantly clear that not only do I NOT deny Christ, but I emphatically affirm that it is through him and him alone that one may be saved. Since I’ve been consistent in this, one has to wonder why Lloyd continues to make these ludicrous charges.

Lloyd’s Proof Texts

Rom11:6 “If by grace, then is it no more of works”

When I explained that GOD gave the conditions for grace, Lloyd replied, “**This is two-faced. One cannot reasonably cry ‘GRACE!’ and then add legalistic human-obedience which unwittingly nullifies grace.**” To note the conditions that GOD has clearly stated is not the same as adding “legalistic human-obedience” as Lloyd sees it. He views “works,” “obedience,” and “fruit” as being separate from grace—something one does to **save himself apart from Christ**, which, if TRUE, would indeed nullify grace.

I explained this text in my second negative, but Lloyd had no rebuttal other than to continue his baseless assertions, make false charges regarding my position, and offer circular reasoning. Thus, Lloyd’s effort to prove his proposition with this text failed.

Heb10:14 "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

I am satisfied with the explanation of this text that I presented in my second negative. But Lloyd had no reply of substance. He now argues that “**He hath perfected**” is a Greek Perfect Tense showing the unabated security of God’s children.” It so happens that I believe the child of God can have the security of which this text speaks. But according to the apostle John, to be continually saved the Christian must “**walk in the light**” (1John1:7). Let’s take a look at Lloyd’s attitude toward this passage, which demonstrates his attitude toward the word of God. He said, “**Robert’s response was the loyal pig returning to its legalistic sty since his ‘walk in the light’ argument was demolished.**” Dear reader, the text is clear regarding what is required to continue receiving the benefits of the blood of Christ, but if my argument was demolished then Lloyd demolished the text; and now, according to him, a Christian does not need to “**walk in the light.**” I remind the reader of Paul’s admonition to “**Believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world**” (1John4:1 ASV).

Lloyd replied, “**He tried to make us believe that the verb ‘perfected’ acted as an adjective modifying the sacrifice.**” Lloyd now has another problem. He has continually asserted that man does NOTHING to be perfected—that it is ALL Christ. Well, which is it, Lloyd? Does “perfected” modify man’s effort, or does it modify the sacrifice Christ made?

Col2:13-14 "having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us and took it (ἔρκεν) out of the way."

Lloyd argued: “**The legal document of our sins was permanently taken out of the way.**”

I was previously silent on this text because nothing in it could possibly support Lloyd’s proposition. Clearly it was the Law, not man's sins, that was permanently taken out of the way. Lloyd needs the passage to say it was “the legal document of our sins,” but this is NOT what it says nor would that make any sense. Now, man’s sins (when forgiven) are forgiven permanently, but this does not include all FUTURE sins of one who refuses to “**walk in the light**” and turns from God to serve Satan.

Lloyd wrote: “**Only forgiven people can go to heaven. If there is a CONDITION undone, then heaven is not possible.**”

First, I agree that only forgiven people can go to heaven. But the second statement suggests that Lloyd is confusing “conditions” with “perfect obedience.” John teaches that “**if we walk in the light**” we are cleansed by the blood of Christ. The word “walk” refers to our manner of life—and therefore precludes the idea that sins of inadvertence, weakness, and ignorance automatically cause one to be lost. Yet, as we have seen, “confession” is a condition, and if it is “undone” it will keep one from going to heaven, as was the case with the “chief rulers.”

Romans5:1-2 “being justified by faith we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.”

Okay, the text is true, but the condition (noted in the text) is “faith”; and one can lose his faith.

2Cor1:22

Lloyd argued that **“Only an authorized person can break a seal.”** Really? Were those whom Paul said fell from grace “authorized” to break the “seal” they broke (Gal5:4)?

John5:24

Everlasting life relates to the quality of life that comes from God. It is by nature eternal. But this does not prove or suggest that we cannot lose it.

Col3:3 “your life is hid.”

Well, I suppose Lloyd thinks something that is “hid” cannot be “unhidden” or revealed.

One thing for sure, it has been revealed that Lloyd has not been to sustain his proposition.

Robert Waters

OLSON'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

PROPOSITION_2: THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST.

PIVOTS

This entire debate has pivoted around:

Romans11:6

**And if by grace, then is it no more of works:
otherwise grace is no more grace.**

**But if it be of works, then is it no more grace:
otherwise work is no more work.**

Hebrew10:14

For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.

IDEOLOGIES

The pivotal verses are interpreted by two markedly different ideologies:

Robert: human-centered, Christ-denying.

Lloyd: Christ-centered, human-denying.

Robert has the dubious honor of teaching the exact same Pharisaical system that Jesus condemned and warned us about: legalism. Jesus faced this legalism in John 6:28. The crowds saw Jesus miraculously feed 5000 people. Jesus left when they tried to make Him a king. The next day, the crowds found Jesus and asked Robert's legalistic human-centered philosophy: What should WE DO? Jesus denied their human-centered question with a Christ-centered answer: "believe on ME" (v29 paraphrased)! This ideological contrast is seen many times.

Romans11:6

Robert: grace plus works.

Lloyd: grace alone.

Romans4:13-14

Robert: faith plus works.

Lloyd: faith alone.

Hebrews10:14

Robert: perfection is a process of sanctification.

Lloyd: perfection is distinct (and mutually exclusive) from sanctification.

LEGALISTIC IDEOLOGY

Robert started with a list of human-centered things that we must **DO** lest we lose our salvation and be finally lost. While he believes in grace, he also denies Heb10:14 and believes that we must comply with various CONDITIONS in order to stay saved. Bible is used only as it supports this legalistic manifesto.

Legalistic blindness is why Robert never answered my challenges in Proposition_1 with Bible truth. His false-system is not based on truth. He can only respond with human-centered lies.

Jer17:9 and Heb64:6.

These verses reveal our depravity. If there were some CONDITION for us to do beyond faith, we would always fail. The best Robert's legalism can produce is certain death – everyone becomes “finally lost.”

Romans11:6.

Robert believes in grace and works but cannot keep them distinct. He uses deceptive word trickery to avoid denying this powerful Bible verse. Instead of “works,” he says “CONDITIONS.” By using a different word, Robert thinks he follows the Bible even as in reality he denies the Bible.

God's grace does not use human depravity. God's grace is seen in what Jesus did for us. Grace is antithetical to works and conditions. Any view that uses human-centered obedience automatically denies what God graciously did for us via Jesus. Robert's *grace-plus-conditions* automatically denies God's grace.

Col2:10: We are complete in Jesus.

This affirms Rom11:6. Our sole sufficiency is what God graciously did for us through Jesus. Additions to grace nullify grace. The Bible affirms Christ's obedience for our sufficiency and denies any CONDITIONS.

In Proposition_1, Robert listed things he thought were CONDITIONS. In every instance, I showed how his legalism ignored **CONTEXT** and twisted the verses to support human-centered obedience. His Proposition_1 ended in flames. Not one condition survived honest Bible scrutiny.

Robert used the same tactic in Proposition_2. He ignored every Bible verse or argument that did not comply with his human-centered legalism. Instead of answering my pivotal verses, he repeated busted Pharisee arguments.

ILLUSTRATION

Consider Robert's false illustration of the gracious farmer. The farmer (God) had a chainsaw (Jesus), which is what the jobless man needed (for righteousness and obedience). The farmer told the jobless man to go a wagon and get the chainsaw. Robert claims conditions are needed: going to the wagon, reaching to get the chainsaw, and then doing some task with the chainsaw. But what Robert has presented is only an example of his **faith-plus-works** humanistic manifesto.

The true gospel illustration of the gracious farmer is quite different. The jobless man still needs a chainsaw (Jesus) and still needs righteousness and obedience. But the good news of the Bible is

that God has done everything needed. The jobless man didn't need to go to any wagon or reach for anything. The gospel shows that God is graciously pursuing us! God wants to give everyone the gift of eternal life. All the jobless man needs to do is believe in what God has done for him through Jesus. At that moment of faith-alone he receives all spiritual blessings in heavenly places (Eph1:3) – without doing a thing!

This contrast between the **legalistic what-must-we-do** and the **biblical look-what-God-did-for-us** ideologies is the real crux of this debate.

ROMANS11:6

Robert's loyalty to false human-centered deception blinds him to Bible truth. In his third negative, Robert actually stated:

Lloyd DID NOT and CANNOT supply the passage that says that "the Bible declares that any work nullifies grace." If such a passage existed, Lloyd would have provided it already.

DUH! Robert's spiritual blindness is so deep he doesn't realize I used Romans11:6 in every response! Let me show the verse again!

**But if it be of works, then is it no more grace:
otherwise work is no more work. Rom11:6b**

Robert, a 20th century Pharisee, is not interested in a debate. He cavalierly dismisses biblical truth and adds human-centered self-righteousness conditions to God's grace.

CONDITIONS

Robert even dared say that he proved that salvation is indeed dependent upon conditions. This was his Proposition_1. However, I showed that his every proof verse was ripped from **CONTEXT**, redefined by his false human-centered ideology, and forced to bow the knee to his cult's creeds. Human depravity (Isa64:6, Jer17:9) is the death blow to Robert's human-centered legalism.

Robert denied depravity by claiming Israel was disobedient to CONDITIONS and was overthrown in the wilderness. But he didn't consider Moses who disobeyed, was judged, stripped of leadership and denied entrance into Canaan. Yet Moses was at The Transfiguration proving that Israel's judgment was of temporal rewards not eternal judgment!

HEBREWS10:14

Robert's Rom11:6 quote ended with:

It (a passage that declares work nullifies grace) would be a genuine contradiction to passages that encourage "works."

Robert doesn't honor the crucial Heb10:14 **DESTINY-REWARDS** distinction. Robert's only attempt to answer this was with two scholarly half-quotes ripped from their contexts. I refuted his deception with the underlying Greek grammar. Robert sees salvation as a process of "works." The Bible says salvation is:

Not of works, lest any man should boast. Eph2:8-9

Robert's legalism claims truth but doesn't honor biblical truth. Robert only honors his spurious counterfeit legalistic interpretations of the Bible.

Heb10:14 shows the two parts of theology. **DESTINY** relates to "being perfected forever" (eternal life). We passively receive this gift by faith in Jesus apart from any work. Any one work or condition nullifies/cancels the gracious offer (Rom11:6). **REWARDS** relate to "while they are being sanctified" (works).

Robert has wrongly suggested that heaven is a reward. Heaven is our **DESTINY**: the gift of eternal life. Our works are our "**REWARD** in heaven" (Matt5:12). Robert's legalism prevents him from seeing that one can get to heaven without works (rewards). This is why the foolish believer of 1Cor3:11-15 so demolished Robert's feeble human-centered view and affirms biblical Christ-centeredness. Heaven can be one's destiny even without any works. Heaven is not the reward. The reward in heaven is our fellowship with the Father. As always, Robert has the wrong view of everything.

THE PRODIGAL

Robert devoted a lot of words to the Prodigal. Unfortunately, he only repeated one view: namely, that reconciliation is based on CONDITIONS: (sorrow, repentance, and seeking forgiveness.) Robert completely ignored my third affirmative where we see this parable in a trilogy. The other two parables (lost coin and lost sheep) have no conditions. Neither the coin nor the sheep have the ability to sorrow, repent or seek forgiveness. Being lost is not Robert's "finally lost." The lost coin always belonged to the woman. The lost sheep always belonged to the shepherd. Lost in this parable means being out of fellowship with God.

Note well! Robert had no Bible response. He simply repeated an already debunked argument. This is the common pattern with cults. They have no real truth to proclaim. We saw from Proposition_1 that since Robert's system does not honor human depravity, then the best his system can produce is a hopeless gospel of death. Isa64:6 clearly shows that the best of our righteous deeds are filthy rags. Jer17:9 showed that our heart is so desperately wicked that even we ourselves do not realize how depraved we really are. We simply cannot save ourselves.

If works (or conditions) were really required, then we could not comply. Even if there was some simple task to do such as water baptism (**WATER BAPTISM IS NOT REQUIRED TO BE SAVED. I say this only for argument's sake.**), then we would be water baptized with impure motives. Inner depravity would corrupt our outward actions and would be considered as sin. Our depravity is so desperately wicked (Jer17:9) that we need help from the outside. The good news of the gospel is that God has graciously completed every work (condition) needed to receive the gift of eternal life through Jesus.

The only thing undone is "**Believe in JESUS!**" **John6:29.**

THE GREEK PERFECT TENSE

Robert ignored the power of the Greek Perfect Tense throughout Proposition_1. He waited until his third negative in Proposition_2 just to say he wasn't interested in biblical Greek. This only affirms what I've been saying throughout the debate. Robert is no

debater Else he would have addressed my arguments.

Bible scholar Else he would be interested in biblical Greek.

Robert, a 20th-century Pharisee, is only interested in how he can manipulate the Bible to comply with his human-centered legalistic creeds.

Robert doesn't care that the Greek Perfect Tense declares the unabated permanent security of the believer. Robert is only concerned with promulgating his legalistic ideology of death.

ROM10:9-10

Robert's blindness is more than simple ignorance. It is aggressive demonic loyalty to the Christ-denying legalistic gospel of self-righteousness.

In my third affirmative I laid out the Hebraic chiasm that affirms the crucial Heb10:14 **DESTINY-REWARDS** distinction. The innermost pair of statements relate faith to **DESTINY** distinction. The outmost pair of statements relate confession to **REWARDS**. The foolish believer of 1Cor3:15 only faith is needed for salvation. Phil2:12 encourages works; not for heaven as a destiny, but for rewards in heaven.

Robert's response was to repeat an already debunked argument that ignored the very clear Bible teaching on the **DESTINY-REWARDS** distinction. A person truly interested in the Bible would learn. A person only interested in promulgating legalism simply ignores the truth and repeats old arguments.

Dear reader: these past few verses and arguments have been the pattern and characterization of this entire debate.

This debate has never really been a genuine debate.

In Proposition_1, Robert failed to defend any demand for conditions. The Bible explicitly says: **"Not of works" Eph2:9**. In Proposition_2, Robert didn't even have his first line of legalistic lies to propagate. He never took the first Bible step to answer any of my given verses. In a genuine debate, Robert is whipped. But he doesn't care as long as he can parrot his ideology.

This debate was not about the Bible.

If it were, then Robert would have given Bible answers to the Greek Perfect Tense as an example. He would have discussed the foolish believer of **1Cor3:15** who was saved **without conditions**. He would have used Bible to understand **Heb10:14**. Instead of Bible, Robert dreamed up an illustration that elevated impossible human obedience to conditions above the clear biblical illustrations of grace.

The cross is the clearest of these illustrations. No human but Jesus was on the cross. No life but His pleased the Father. No sacrifice but His was perfect. Robert would have us all on a cross to "finish" what Jesus started. This is why Robert can only preach a gospel of death.

Robert never truly participated in Proposition_2!

Perhaps this debate may help someone who reads this understand the evil perniciousness of a human-centered gospel and the blind Christ-denying loyalty of those in bondage to legalism.

Blessings!

Lloyd Olson

Waters' Fourth Negative

My opponent has tried to prove that "THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR A CHILD OF GOD TO BE FINALLY LOST." In the first part of this debate I affirmed the opposite, i.e. that it is possible to fall and be "finally lost."

While my opponent's ability to effectively communicate has been impressive, and maybe even entertaining, his efforts at being scholarly have been a dismal failure. Instead of simply using good hermeneutics that include common sense rules for study and learning, Lloyd crowed THEOLOGY and an *overarching integrated system*. But he OVERARCHED and missed the truth completely.

Lloyd noted that I did not address "human depravity." In his last affirmative he wrote, "**Human depravity...is the death blow to Robert's human-centered legalism.**" First, the propositions do not mention human depravity. Second, I did make comments to the effect that man cannot save himself with his works, but needs the blood of Christ (1Jn1:7). There was no "death blow." In fact, Lloyd's comment is tantamount to a tacit admission that what I'm teaching is not dead but alive and well. However, while I seek to be "legal" (scriptural) in all I believe, think and do, my faith and hope is **CHRIST centered**. Lloyd's teaching is ILLEGAL and a little short of universalism.

From the very beginning of this debate I made it clear that **two extreme views** are taught regarding sin in the life of the Christian, and I noted that the truth is in the **middle**. Then I explained that one position is that a child of God automatically falls from grace any and every time he/she sins (which I strongly oppose), while the other view is the one Lloyd has attempted to affirm. No doubt those who would desire to see my position defeated were disappointed that **Lloyd totally ignored my actual position**, chose to attribute to me what I strongly oppose, and continued to debate the strawman he erected. Evidently, Lloyd saw that he was unable to defeat the truth and therefore went after a different doctrine and opponent. The doctrine that we BOTH oppose is devastating to the church. In my booklet "**Continual Cleansing Verses Perfectionism**" I note nine serious consequences to the perfectionist belief system. One that stands out is that these brethren are going to be less apt to admit a sin because to do so would be to admit (in their mind) that they were disinherited by the Lord and lost. Another consequence is that they can have no spiritual security unless or until they are confident they are living above sin. So they become proficient at deceiving themselves (1John1:8,10).

Those who teach perfectionism are on their own. They are not teaching "Church of Christ" dogma but are indeed teaching a doctrine of DEATH. But even after pointing this out to Lloyd, again and again, he ignored it. Thus, Lloyd cannot honestly claim victory in this debate because he never addressed my position.

Consequences of Lloyd's Extreme Position

Lloyd zealously sought to promote two doctrines that are high on the list of Satan's most effective tools. He taught that if one has faith he is, at that point, saved. Lloyd emphasized over and over that Jesus does it ALL and that man does NOTHING. Lloyd was challenged with the fact that his assertion leaves out repentance, confession and even faith, but he did not meet the challenge. Passages like "*Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father...*" (Matt7:21) were brought to light, which soundly

defeated his contention. We see that Lloyd's doctrine would have all who want to be saved coming short of it due to thinking they are already saved and therefore obedience to the gospel is not necessary (Rom10:16).

Second, Lloyd endeavored to persuade the reader that it matters not whether a Christian lives the life or not; he can even keep his hope while in rebellion, die, and be "finally saved." (Lloyd's teaching was soundly defeated with two passages [James2:19; John12:42].) I cannot imagine a doctrine that would benefit Satan more than "once saved always saved."

Two Passages that Devastated Lloyd's Position

I pressed two passages, neither of which Lloyd was able to deal with effectively: One, **1 John 1:7**, which clearly gives a condition for being continually cleansed by the blood of Christ, says, "*If we walk in the light...the blood...cleanses us of all sins.*" Lloyd tried to convince the reader that the word "if" does not imply a condition ("walk in the light") and that we cannot trust the translation. So he expects everyone to believe we should hear HIM because of his ability to interpret the Bible with his *overarching integrated system* AND for his ability as a Greek scholar, even though what he says is contrary to what the real Greek scholars have said. The second passage was **2 Peter 1:5-11**, where Peter listed qualities to ADD to faith and said "*if you do these things you shall never fall.*" Lloyd asserted that I ripped every passage from its context, but this passage was intended to address the very matter we are debating. It clearly establishes what I affirmed, which Lloyd unsuccessfully sought to defeat throughout the debate, which is that the words "**IF**" and "**DO**" imply conditions necessary to be "finally saved."

But these two texts ALSO destroy the perfectionist's position, which Lloyd has been debating from the beginning. While the proposition I agreed to affirm says the Christian may be "finally lost," it does not say he falls from grace any and every time he sins. While I know men who believe "any sin" causes one to be lost, my diligent efforts to conduct a formal debate with a fair proposition has been unproductive. Those who hold to this doctrine will not agree to a proposition that actually reflects what they believe and teach. They need to make it look like I believe the other extreme, as Lloyd has attempted to do, in order to have an advantage. But integrity is lost when a debater builds a strawman and continues to debate him. Perhaps Lloyd had no idea what he was getting into—that he was going to be debating someone who can defeat BOTH extreme positions.

"LEGALISTIC IDEOLOGY"

Lloyd wrote, "**Robert started with a list of human-centered things that we must DO lest we lose our salvation and be finally lost.**" We have seen a LOT of verbal gymnastics from Lloyd, but the above statement is a departure from that category and goes into the realm of **disbelief**. That "list" (2Pet1:5-10) was not MY list—it was GOD'S! Yet Lloyd rejected every item in it as well as the promise that one will not fall if he adds those attributes to faith.

My opponent sought to twist John 6:28 to make it appear I am teaching "the exact same Pharisaical system that Jesus condemned." He noted that after the people asked, "**What shall we do?**" Jesus said to *believe* on him. Lloyd denies the fact that *believing* is DOING and also that *believe* is used

comprehensively to INCLUDE meeting conditions. Therefore, he errs by insisting that this text teaches one is saved at the point of faith.

Jobless Man Illustration

Lloyd got off the reservation when he argued:

“The jobless man didn’t need to go to any wagon or reach for anything. All the jobless man needs to do is believe in what God has done...” At that moment of faith-alone he receives all spiritual blessings... (Eph1:3) – without doing a thing!”

My opponent gets an “E” for effort in dealing with the jobless man illustration. But the relevant question **“Would he have received the grace (the saw) if he had done nothing?”** gave him much difficulty. Obviously, the answer is NO, but Lloyd deviates from the illustration and says the man just needs to believe in God. The gracious farmer set the conditions. It was then up to the jobless man to accept or reject—meet the requirements or go away without the gift. Part of that process was the *faith* he would demonstrate in the farmer by COMPLYING. Noncompliance means NO FAITH. This clearly illustrates the Bible’s teaching regarding salvation and being “finally saved.” And, just as the jobless man could say, “Look what that gracious farmer gave me,” one who meets God’s conditions can still say, **“Look what God did for me.”**

Romans 11:6

“But if it be of works, then is it no more grace...”.

The above text is Lloyd’s most hopeful passage to sustain his proposition. However, it does not SAY what he insists it says. I challenged: “Lloyd DID NOT and CANNOT supply the passage that says that ‘the Bible declares that any work nullifies grace.’ If such a passage existed, Lloyd would have provided it already.” He responded by continuing to pervert the text. I showed that this passage merely condemns the idea of one’s saving himself by works alone, which if one were able to do then it would be *“no more grace.”*

Lloyd wrote, **“If there were some CONDITION for us to do beyond faith, we would always fail.”** This would be the case IF one tries to save himself by his **works** without looking to **God**. The *gracious farmer gave conditions*, and the *jobless man* would fail only if he did not meet the conditions—same thing with God.

Lloyd wrote, **“Robert believes in grace and works but cannot keep them distinct.”** Oh, they are separate, but the answer to keeping them distinct is not to totally dismiss works as important to being “finally saved.” This is what Lloyd has done.

It is quite obvious that the text does not say what Lloyd insists it says. Thus, his most hopeful passage does not even come close to helping him.

Ephesians 2:8-9

The point of the above text is not that works has no part in our being “finally saved” but that salvation is *“not of yourselves.”* Rather, *“it is the gift of God.”* As the gift of the chainsaw to the

jobless man had *conditions*, but did not destroy the grace, or give reason to boast, so meeting God's conditions does not destroy grace or give man reason to boast. Repenting, making a confession, and being baptized are conditions, but someone else actually does the work in baptism.

Destiny and Rewards

With his "destiny rewards" argument, Lloyd sought to get around the passages that clearly teach there are *conditions* for salvation. But he made this all up and is hopelessly confused. He wrote, **"Robert has wrongly suggested that heaven is a reward."** But then he said, **"Our works are our 'REWARD in heaven' (Matt5:12)."** And, finally, he wrote, **"Heaven is not the reward. The reward in heaven is our fellowship with the Father."** Of course the Bible does not support this. The reward noted in the text involves ALL that is in heaven.

Lloyd suggested that since Moses lost his reward but nevertheless went to heaven, this defeats the idea that God rejected Israel. But Moses was NOT Israel. Moses made one mistake, and God's refusal to allow him to see the Promised Land, rather than eternal destruction, was his punishment. Israel, on the other hand, became rebellious and would not repent, resulting in God's divorcing her (Jer.3:8) and the true Israel's (the church) becoming the bride of Christ (Rom7:4; Rev21:9).

Conclusion

Eternal security is a subject dear to the heart of Christians. It is NOT based entirely on what Christ has done, but also on our continuing to live the life (1John1:7). Anyone who thinks he can save himself by his works, without Christ, is deceived. Christians whose security is based on their own ability to live completely above sin are also deceived. We NEED spiritual security, but just as it is not necessary to convince ourselves we are living above sin, so too it is not necessary to convince ourselves that we cannot be "finally lost."

Robert Waters