

## THE LIE OF TOTAL INABILITY

*And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir. And, behold, the word of the LORD came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he [Abram] **believed in the LORD**; and he [the Lord] **counted it to him for righteousness**.*

*Genesis 15:3-6*

*I will pass through all thy flock to day, removing from thence all the speckled and spotted cattle, and all the brown cattle among the sheep, and the spotted and speckled among the goats: and of such shall be my hire. **So shall my righteousness answer for me** in time to come, when it shall come for my hire before thy face: every one that is not speckled and spotted among the goats, and brown among the sheep, that shall be counted stolen with me.*

*Genesis 30:32-33*

Tonight, I'm going to discuss the issue of righteousness. As I've said before, righteousness is the *least* understood subject in Christianity. Everyone thinks they understand it—but they don't. One reason, maybe the *biggest* reason, they don't understand it is because they are walking under the influence of John Calvin's false doctrines. I know people get tired of hearing me condemn John Calvin; but if they only realized how much this one man has poisoned the *entire* Protestant Church; if they only realized how much responsibility this one man bears for the destruction we see happening all around us in the churches; they would be ranting and raving against this heretic too.

Most people think John Calvin was a "hero of the faith". They think he was just one of the "Reformers" who delivered us from the bondage of Rome. What the average Christian doesn't really understand is that, first of all, the Reformers were just Roman Catholics who were slowly—very slowly—being delivered from the false doctrines of Rome. Even though many of them were *intellectual* giants, spiritually they weren't much more than *baby* Christians. They did not know how to rightly divide the Word of Truth in many areas. They were getting spiritual light on many important issues, but they had a long way to go before they would have enough experience and wisdom to tackle the more subtle issues of salvation.

Before they had a chance to grow in knowledge of the Word and mature spiritually, the Reformation started to break apart over disagreements between its leaders. John Calvin saved the Reformation single-handedly by writing a gigantic theological treatise called "The Institutes Of The Christians Religion". In that work, he defined and codified the *theology* of the Reformation. A council was called and the leaders of the Reformation put their stamp of approval on his work. From that point on, "Institutes" became "the Bible" of the Reformation. So when Reformation pastors and church-goers talk about "Sola Scriptura", as if they conform their lives *strictly* to the Scripture, they are only deluding themselves. They stopped following the Sola Scriptura when Calvin wrote his thesis. From that point on, all Protestant leaders followed Calvin's "Institutes" much more than they did the Scripture.

The result was, the leaders of the Reformation never matured in their revelation or understanding of the Scripture. What Calvin wrote in “Institutes” became the *fount* of all wisdom, all truth and all doctrine for hundreds of years. The destruction you see taking place right now in the churches is *the result* of the influence of Calvin’s on Protestant Christianity. The doctrines and concepts he taught—most of which are a direct contradiction of the Scripture—have spread through the entire denominational world like poison and waste discharges from a broken sewage pipe. His theories *defile* every truth of the Scripture and create a “god” that is totally foreign to the Bible.

And this is just his *doctrines* I’m talking about. The man himself was even worse. He was pompous liar who didn’t hesitate to have his opponents murdered. He became the leader of the city of Geneva and ruled that city with an iron fist, having dozens of people killed and many more exiled. The more you learn about the “Pope of Geneva” and the errors he propagated, and the more you understand the destruction his errors have wrought in the body of Christ, the more you will *despise* him and the more you will warn people about his heresies too.

Have you ever heard of the phrase, “Total Depravity”. Total Depravity is a vital part of Calvin’s theology and it’s as false as can be. Yet it’s part of the very foundation of the entire Protestant system. Calvin taught that the Adamic man—that is, the fallen human race—is totally depraved. He didn’t teach that we have the potential to *become* totally depraved as we progress through life. He said we are *born* totally depraved. According to him, mankind, in his fallen state, cannot desire righteousness, cannot pursue righteousness, and cannot walk in righteousness. Neither can we respond to God or obey God. That’s what Calvin wrote in “Institutes”, and that’s what Protestant Christian leaders have been teaching people ever since.

So I’m going to take a few minutes and look at what *the Bible* actually says regarding the Adamic man. Let me start off with a question. Can anyone tell me in *three* words or less what the fundamental difference is between the Old and the New Covenants? The difference is “*the new man*”.

*That ye put off concerning the former conversation **the old man**, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; And that ye put on **the new man**, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.*

*Ephesians 4:22-24*

*Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off **the old man** with his deeds; And have put on **the new man**, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.*

*Colossians 3:9-11*

In the New Testament, Paul continually contrasts two spiritual entities. One entity he calls the “old man” and the other he calls the “new man”. The old man is the Adamic man. The new man is “Christ in you”. The old man is usually associated with evil. Paul said we should put off the old man which is corrupt according to deceitful lusts, and put on the new man which is created in righteousness. So Christians living

under the New Covenant have these *two* natures. However, under the Old Covenant, this was not the case. Whether you were a saint or a sinner, you only had one nature—the Adamic nature. There was no new man until the establishment of the New Covenant. The concept or the reality of “*Christ in you*” didn’t exist until after the death and resurrection of Jesus. Until that point, all mankind was stuck with his original fallen nature and God had no choice but to work within the framework of that fallen nature.

*What shall we say then that Abraham [before the Law] our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were **justified** by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and **it was counted unto him for righteousness**. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that **justifieth** the ungodly, **his faith is counted for righteousness**. Even as David (during the Law) also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God **imputeth righteousness without works**, Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven whose sins are covered. . . And he [Abraham] received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness **might be imputed** to them also.*

*Romans 4:1-7 & 11*

According to the Scripture, the saints of all ages have been justified “by faith”. Before the Law was given, Abraham was justified by faith. During the Law, King David was justified by faith. After the Law, we are justified by faith. The same thing is true of forgiveness and imputed righteousness. Before the Law, Abraham received forgiveness and imputed righteousness by faith. During the Law, King David received forgiveness and imputed righteousness by faith. After the Law, we receive forgiveness and imputed righteousness by faith. God's people have always received forgiveness, justification, and imputed righteousness by faith.

Paul emphasized this truth in the book of Romans and Galatians when making his argument against trying to be justified “by works”. There was never a time when people could be justified by anything other than faith. It was never possible to *earn* justification, forgiveness or imputed righteousness by being good, or by obedience to any law or commandment. The reason it’s important to understand that forgiveness, justification and imputed righteousness have always been available to people by faith is because Christian religious leaders have been teaching for hundreds of years that *this* is what being saved is all about. *This* is what gets you your a ticket to heaven.

But you see, if forgiveness, justification and imputed righteousness are what salvation is all about, and if these things have *always* been available to people by faith, then *why* was it necessary to establish a *new* covenant? If these things are our ticket to heaven, what more do we need? The reason a new covenant had to be established is because forgiveness, justification and imputed righteousness are *not* the central issues of salvation. They are absolutely necessary for salvation because they are the *foundation* of redemption. But they are not the central issue of salvation, nor do they constitute *the totality* of redemption. The central

issue of redemption under *both* covenants is sanctification—and sanctification *means* righteousness. Sanctification means righteous living. It means walking in righteousness. The difference between the two covenants has nothing to do with forgiveness, justification or imputed righteousness. It has everything to do with righteousness. The two covenants are designed to bring forth two different *kinds* or *levels* of righteousness in us. This all has to do with our *experience*. It all has to do with what kind of righteousness we can actually *manifest*. It has nothing to do with our legal position. The legal position is the same for everyone in every age who walks by faith.

Since there was only *one* man (the Adamic man) until the resurrection of Christ, there is no way *that* man could ever manifest the righteousness that was accredited to his account, for the righteousness that's accredited to his account is the very nature of God. So even though the saints who lived before the New Testament received precisely the same forgiveness, justification and imputed righteousness we do, it was impossible for them to actually experience or demonstrate that righteousness because they had no “new” man. Even though God's nature had been reckoned to them, they were unable to manifest that nature to the world. The only kind of righteousness the Adamic man can experience or manifest to the world is HUMAN righteousness.

Can you see the problem, yet?

If Calvin was right, if we are all born totally depraved, you might as well cut the Old Testament out of your Bible and pitch it because God repeatedly calls people righteous in the Old Testament—and 95% of the time, when God calls somebody righteous, He's not talking about imputed righteousness (which is an invisible legal position); He's talking about actual righteousness. He's talking about righteous living, righteous motives and righteous desires. One example of this was Noah. The Lord told Noah he was righteous: “*And the LORD said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation*” (Gen. 7:1).

Pray tell—how can a totally depraved man who is totally incapable of choosing righteousness and totally incapable of producing righteousness *be* righteous? How can such a man be righteous *without* being born again? How can a man who is totally incapable of responding to God, walk with God, hear God's voice, and obey God when God tells him to build a boat? How did Abraham, or any of the Old Testament saints, walk with God and obey God *without* a “new man” and being in a state of total depravity?

*He brought me forth also into a large place: he delivered me, because he delighted in me. **The LORD rewarded me according to my righteousness: according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me.** For I have kept the ways of the LORD, and have not wickedly departed from my God. For all his judgments were before me: and as for his statutes, I did not depart from them. I was also upright before him, and have **kept myself from mine iniquity.***

*II. Samuel 22:20-24*

This passage is very interesting. It's part of a song of praise that King David sang when God delivered him from King Saul. Please notice what David says. He says: “The Lord rewarded me according to *my*

righteousness” and the “cleanness of *my* hands”. My righteousness? Oh my! Don’t look now, but the great King David just *stole* the glory from God! He just established *his own* righteousness. What he should have said was: “The Lord has rewarded me according to *his* righteousness”.

But it gets worse. He then has the audacity to say he has *kept himself* from his own iniquity! There he goes again, stealing the glory from God. How can he take the credit for keeping himself pure? What’s wrong with this guy? What he should have said was: “God has kept me from my iniquity” or “God has caused me not to sin” or at the very least, “God has helped me to not give in to my iniquity”.

*Say ye to **the righteous**, that it shall be well with him: for they shall eat the fruit of **their doings**. Woe unto **the wicked**! it shall be ill with him: for the reward of his hands shall be given him.*

*Isaiah 3:10-11*

Throughout the Old Testament, God talks to the “righteous” and the “wicked” through the prophets. This is basically what He says every time. It will go well with the righteous but it will go ill with the wicked. The righteous will eat the fruit of their doings, just as the wicked will eat of the fruit of their doings. When God talks about the righteousness of the righteous, He’s not talking about imputed righteousness. He’s not talking about an invisible legal position. He’s talking about *actual* righteousness. He’s talking about what people *do* and how they *live*. If they live righteously, if they do righteousness, they will be rewarded according to *their* righteousness.

*The word of the LORD came again to me, saying, Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously, then will I stretch out mine hand upon it, and will break the staff of the bread thereof, and will send famine upon it, and will cut off man and beast from it: Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord GOD. . . Or if I send a pestilence into that land, and pour out my fury upon it in blood, to cut off from it man and beast: Though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, as I live, saith the Lord GOD, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness.*

*Ezekiel 14:12-14 & 19-20*

Notice that in this passage, God says when He brings judgment upon the land because of its sin, only the *righteousness* of the righteous will save them. It’s their righteous living that will save them, not God’s imputed righteousness. So you see, in the Old Testament, it *wasn’t* wrong to establish your own righteousness. That’s what God expected. He expected people to choose righteousness and turn away from iniquity. It was their responsibility to do so, and they had the ability to do so. Therefore, when they did so, it *wasn’t* wrong for them to take the credit for what they did.

Of course, it wasn’t *their* righteousness that justified them or saved them. It was the *imputed* righteousness of God that justified and saved them. Salvation only comes through the imputed righteousness of God. But

the saints of the Old Testament weren't pursuing righteousness in order to be justified. They were pursuing righteousness to please God because they loved Him and/or because of the material and temporal blessings which came with a righteous life. God *blessed* the righteous materially. It's only imputed righteousness that saves people and imputed righteousness always has and always will come *by faith*, not by walking in righteousness. However, this does not take away the fact that God still expected the Adamic man to pursue (human) righteousness because he was capable of doing so.

Once we get to the New Testament, everything changes. Even though we are still justified and saved by imputed righteousness, just like before, God no longer commands us to walk in HUMAN righteousness. He now commands us to walk in DIVINE righteousness because now it's possible to do so. Now, through the NEW MAN, it's possible to manifest the very nature of God. What has been credited to our account *legally* can now be *experienced* and demonstrated to the world.

Under the New Covenant, God no longer allows us to establish our own righteousness. Now, we are to submit to the righteousness of Christ in our "new man". This radical change is what threw the Jews. For 2000 years the Jewish people were allowed to establish their own righteousness in order show their love for God and receive the *material* blessings of God (not salvation). Then, practically over night the whole religious order they had been familiar with for so long was turned on it's head. Now it's just the opposite. Now, the only righteousness that God will accept or bless is HIS OWN righteousness—the righteousness that comes from our "new man", which is the righteousness that was imputed to us. As we learn how to hear the voice of God in our new man, as we learn how to yield to the leading and wisdom and checking of the new man, we begin to manifest the very character and nature of God.

Under the Old Covenant, this was not possible because there was no new man. The only righteousness that was available to experience and manifest was *human* righteousness—which is Adamic righteousness—and the Bible is *full* of examples of people who did exactly that. So it's pretty clear that John Calvin was a *idiot* when it came to theology. He had no idea what he was talking about, especially when it comes to the Adamic man because the Adamic *is* capable of pursuing righteousness, and of walking in righteousness, and of knowing God, and of loving God, and of obeying God.

I've taken the time to explain all this because it has very much to do with what's going on between Apostasy Watch and myself. I've been trying to warn people for a over year now that Mr. Lumbley is very much under the influence of Calvinism, and that he has been incorporating many (though maybe not all) of Calvin's *errors* into his teachings. I have said over and over again in my chat room that most preachers and Bible teachers, both inside and *outside* the Religious System, are under Calvin's influence; and my teachings have directly contradicted the teachings of Apostasy Watch on a consistent basis.

I *have* been trying to warn the ones who were still listening to both of us, without coming right out and naming Mr. Lumbley because I didn't want the situation to come to what it now has. Unfortunately, some people are not able to put 2 and 2 together. So I finally had to come right out and say that Mr. Lumbley and I are not teaching the same thing and that he is in fact teaching Calvinistic error. Whether or not he realizes what he is doing is beside the point. He is under the influence of Calvin's error and his doctrines strongly reflect that influence. Of course, all Mr. Lumbley has to do is *deny* that he's teaching Calvinism and his followers will accept that statement without question. But that's not my problem. I'm not responsible to make people accept the truth. I'm only responsible to present the truth to them.

It is my conviction that Mr. Lumbley is walking under the influence of a deceiving spirit and quite frankly, I don't want that spirit in my chat room—which means I don't want anyone in my chat room who is walking *under his spirit*. I was hoping the people who were still listening to us both would eventually *discern* the difference between what the two of us are teaching, and then quietly choose which one they think is speaking the truth. But I've come to realize that the deception he is propagating is so subtle, some people will never “get it” without help. Therefore, I felt it was time to *explain* that difference very clearly so everyone can make an intelligent choice. If you believe Mr. Lumbley is teaching the truth, then do us all a favor and stay away from *my* room. Thank you.

I began exposing the error of Apostasy Watch last month by showing how wrong Mr. Lumbley's approach is to the problem of overcoming sin. I gave some quotes from his message on the works of the flesh in order to show that while explaining how to deal with sin, he made some statements that were very dangerous and unscriptural. One of them—which I did not quote at that time—was that if we will just walk in the Spirit, we won't have to “use our wills to resist sin”. The idea he was promoting is that God want's us to get victory over sin by “believing” His promise that He will sanctify us *by grace*. God wants us to get the victory over a sin by waiting for Him (in faith) to *remove* the desire for sin from our hearts.

The idea is, God doesn't want us attempting to get victory over sin by resisting that sin “with our own wills” because that's doing things “by the power of flesh”. It's an attempt to gain the victory over sin by *personal effort* instead of allowing God to give you the victory by grace—that is, by removing the desire for that sin. In this view, exercising personal effort in the battle against sin is not only useless because it does nothing to remove the desire for that sin—which is the root of the problem—it actually *interferes* with getting to the root because only God can remove that desire, and as long as you are exerting your own personal effort, you are blocking or hindering the work of the Holy Spirit in removing that desire.

In Mr. Lumbley's mind, personal effort is the same as trying to establish your own righteousness. Personal effort is the same as you trying to produce spiritual fruit by your own power. Personal effort is the same as you trying to perfect yourself *without* the help of the Spirit. Personal effort is the same as you trying to be conformed to the image of Christ *without* the help of Christ. What he said in that message was that the only thing we can do to overcome sin is believe and yield. Believe that God will deliver you from sin—that is, “rest” in the promise that He will eventually deliver you—and “yield” to the work of the Holy Spirit in your life so He can deliver you (ie: by removing the desire for it). He said very clearly that the whole sanctification process is: “*all of God and none of you*”.

I brought this out and tried to show what he was really teaching but of course, he *denied* that this is what he's teaching. Upon further examination, we find that he's not *really* saying God has to do it “all”. He's just doing a poor job of explaining what he believes—or if you see things from *his* perspective, the problem is that people just aren't hearing what he's saying “by the Spirit”. It's not his communication skills that are the problem; it's that people aren't hearing him correctly.

In a follow up message he articulates himself a little better by explaining that when he says we can't do *anything*, he's not using the word “anything” in its most narrow sense because in reality, there are *few* things we have to do. *We* have to believe; *we* have to walk by faith; and *we* have to yield to the work of the Spirit in us. So when he says we can't do anything, he actually means we can't do anything *except* believe. We can't do anything *except* walk by faith and yield to the work of the Spirit.

Well, I would certainly never express myself that way. I would never say “we can’t do anything” if I really believed there are a few things we have to do. To me, that’s double talk, and double-talk produces nothing but confusion. However, now that he has explained his position a little better, we understand that he doesn’t really *mean* we can’t do anything when he *says* we can’t do anything. Still, might there be a *reason* he keeps saying “we can’t do anything”—even though technically speaking, he admits there are some things we must do? The answer is “Yes”, there *is* a reason he keeps expressing himself this way. The reason he keeps saying we can’t do anything is because in his mind, even the few things that we have to do, must actually be done *by the Spirit* in us.

You see, God has to *cause you* to believe. God has to *cause you* to walk by faith. God has to *cause you* to yield to the Spirit. God has to *cause you* to want to do His will and God has to *cause you* to do His will. If God were not causing you to do all these things, you would never do them. In Mr. Lumbley’s mind, if you can do anything that wasn’t caused by God, you would be stealing the glory from Him. You would be establishing your own righteousness. So when you get right down to it, guess what? He really *does* believe we can’t do anything! He really *does* believe we have no responsibility in our own salvation because even the few things which *appear* to be our responsibility (ie: believe, walk in faith, yield), these things must actually be done by the Holy Spirit in us.

Did you ever have the “desire” to get rid of something in your life, or to stop engaging in some practice that you felt was displeasing to the Lord? Well, if the desire to get rid of that thing or stop engaging in that practice didn’t come from God, then whatever you did was a work of the flesh. Whatever you did was an attempt to establish your own righteousness. God must be *the cause* of everything you do in the realm of righteousness and choosing good over evil or else it’s just your old stinking flesh (which wants to steal God’s glory) that’s doing it.

What I’ve just described is point # 1 of John Calvin’s T.U.L.I.P. theory. It’s called “*Total Inability*”. Total Inability is the belief that our Adamic nature is so fallen and so totally corrupt, we are incapable of doing righteousness or choosing righteousness. Both before *and* after our conversion, we remain totally incapable of walking in any kind of righteousness, or responding to God, or obeying God. God must *cause us* to do everything. In short, we are “elect robots”.

Oh yes, Mr. Lumbley gives lip service to the idea of us having a choice—just like he gives lip service to a lot of things he *doesn’t* really believe. He says we can choose to yield to the Spirit or we can choose to resist the Spirit. But what he really believes is that unless God were *causing us* to yield to the Spirit, we would *never* “choose” to yield to the Spirit. Unless God were causing us to obey Him, we would *never* “choose” to obey Him. The bottom line is this: he believes that *if* we could actually choose to obey God or yield to God *without* God causing us to do so, and if we did choose to obey or yield, we would be establishing our own righteousness. We would be coming forth in righteousness *without* God’s help. In his mind, anything you do that’s not being caused by God is a “work of the flesh”.

Do you remember the other week when brother Hugh got on the mic and shared how he had just discovered that Calvinists believe God must regenerate a person *involuntarily*, before that person can then *voluntarily* choose to accept the gospel? That’s Calvin’s doctrine of “Total Inability”. According to Calvin, man’s fallen condition is so total and complete, we cannot respond to God when He calls us or convicts us of our sins. He must first *give us the ability* to respond before we can respond.

As I said that night, the Calvinist position is very simple: “a dead man can’t choose life”. Only a *living* man can choose life. Since we are spiritually dead before salvation, we could never accept the gospel or respond to the conviction of sin unless God first gave us the ability to respond. The way He gives us the ability to respond is by *sovereignly* regenerating us. He regenerates us first, without our permission, so we can then voluntarily choose life. He saves us first, then He offers us salvation! He saves us in order to save us. In this way, the ability to accept salvation comes directly from Him. You can’t take any credit for responding to Him because without Him *causing you* to respond, you would never respond because you are totally *incapable* of responding.

I’m not even going to bother going through the Scripture to refute this absurd teaching. Just let me say that all *unsaved* people are born with a *conscience*. That conscience is *not* the Spirit of God, nor does it belong to God. It’s not something we can lose if we don’t stay in union with God because we are not in union with God when it first operates in us as children. It’s *our* conscience—and it’s capable of letting us know the difference between right and wrong in many areas of life.

In addition, all unsaved people are born with *their own* will. *Their* will has the capability of interacting with *their* conscience. When their conscience tells them something they are doing is wrong, they have the ability to choose between obeying or disobeying what their conscience is telling them. There are still quite a few unsaved people in this world who live by the dictates of their conscience and they are very *moral* people. In fact, some of these people know the difference between right and wrong much better than the average Western Christian does because the average Western Christian thinks he can violate what his conscience tells him because he is under the “grace” of God.

Now don’t misunderstand what I am saying. I’m *not* saying we can be saved by following our conscience. I’m just pointing out the fact that every person who has ever been born into this world, has been born with *their own* conscience and *their own* will which has the power to obey or disobey that conscience. What this shows is that when it comes to the unsaved, choosing between good and evil or righteousness and wickedness does not directly involve God. God is not *causing* the conscience of the unsaved to function. Neither is He *causing* the will of the unsaved to choose to obey or disobey their conscience. In other words, Calvin’s doctrine of “Total Inability” is a lie and a deception. When God draws people or convicts them of their sin, they have the ability to respond. God doesn’t have to “save” them first, before they are even capable of responding. The ability to respond to the Creator is *within* the creature.

*Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ,  
(by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit  
together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:*

*Ephesians 2:5-6*

Satan took this verse of Scripture, and others which state the same truth, and *twisted* its meaning in the mind of Calvin. Satan took a *truth* of God’s Word—which is that the unsaved are dead spiritually, as opposed to being alive spiritually—and he put a *slant* on that truth which turned it into a lie. The *twist* that turned a vital truth of Scripture into a demonic lie is that because we are spiritually dead before we come to Christ, we don’t have the ability to respond to the conviction of the Holy Spirit. Because we are spiritually dead, we don’t have the ability to choose Christ when He calls us.

In Calvin's mind, God has to *cause us* to choose Him because we are totally incapable of choosing Him on our own. And when I say "on our own", I'm *not* talking about us going after God. I'm not talking about us seeking after Him. He must seek after us. He must call us and convict us. What I'm talking about is *our response* when He calls. I'm talking about our response when He speaks. I'm talking about our response when He convicts us. Calvin taught that we are *incapable* of responding unless God first causes us to respond. The way he *causes us* to respond is by saving us without our permission. He regenerates us so we are no longer "dead". Then, after we have been made spiritually alive, He offers salvation to us because only a *living* man can choose to accept salvation. A dead man can't choose anything.

Well, Duh! Who wouldn't choose Christ after they have *already* been regenerated? Who wouldn't choose Christ *after* He has already saved them? Ah, but you see, that's the whole point. That's why point # 4 in the T.U.L.I.P. theory is called "Irresistible Grace". Nobody who has already been regenerated by God is going to reject the salvation He then offers them. It's an irresistible deal.

It's very easy for Satan to take a *truth* of Scripture and totally pervert it. He doesn't have to blatantly deny that truth. He just has to put a little twist on it and that *twist* will turn it into a lie. You know, God's people just don't understand how powerful Satan really is in the realm of deception. They are always watching and warning others about false religious "experiences". But Satan is deceiving just as many people with *the Bible* as he is with bogus spiritual experiences. He has all kinds of ways to use the Bible against us. He is not relegated to just denying the truth or twisting the truth. All he has to do is *over-emphasize* a truth in someone's mind and the effect will be that other vital truths become minimized and obscured. The effect will be an unbalanced and unstable Christian.

You may recall that about 6 months ago I started another war with some women who were coming to the chat room. That war began when I gave a message called: "*Using Truth To Deceive*". The truth that was being used to deceive people was the truth of "death to self". The deception that was being propagated by that truth was that if we will die to self every day, we won't really have to directly face Satan, or battle him and overcome him. It wasn't easy to expose that particular deception without appearing to *minimize* the need of dying to self every day. But the issue wasn't whether or not we need to die to self every day. We certainly do. The question was, how does dying to self relate to confronting and overcoming the enemy. Their view was that dying to self is the way you overcome the enemy. But the Scripture says: "*Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you*" (James 4:7).

Submitting ourselves to God is dying to self. So if submitting ourselves to God were *the way* we overcome the enemy, James would never have gone on to say "resist the devil". You can't resist the devil by dying to self anymore than you can submit to God by resisting the devil. The command is to submit to the one and resist the other. You resist the devil by *resisting* the devil! Dying to self will never remove you from the battle against Satan—and that's precisely what these women were teaching.

Well, we have a similar situation with the deception that's being propagated by Apostasy Watch. Mr. Lumbley has incorporated Calvin's "Total Inability" concept into his view of sanctification. This puts a slant on a vital truth of the Scripture that turns it into a lie. The truth is, we cannot possibly come forth in the image of Christ without the help of the Holy Spirit. The deception is, all personal effort is a refusal of that help and an attempt to bring ourselves forth in that image by our own strength. Mr. Lumbley is saying all personal effort is an attempt to be sanctified *without* the help of God.

*I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for **without me ye can do nothing**.*

*John 15:5*

In his message last Sunday night, Mr. Lumbley quoted this passage as proof of the error he is teaching. I'm not going to take the time to quote him. I'm just going to explain his argument. Anyone who suspects that I'm misrepresenting him will have to take the time to listen to that message themselves. His point in quoting this passage was to show that we can't bring forth fruit (ie: become sanctified) without Christ. Then he said "those"—and that would be me—who say personal effort is required to be sanctified are preaching the same lie Satan presented Eve in the Garden of Eden—"ye can be as Gods". In other words, Mr. Lumbley is *defining* personal effort as an attempt to walk *independently* from God.

It's difficult to untwist this perversion without *appearing* like I'm saying something I'm not. But for the sake of the few who are still struggling over which one of us is preaching a false gospel, I'm going to *untwist* Lumbley's twist for you. The question is not—can we come forth in the image of Christ, or bear fruit, or be sanctified, or reach perfection *without* the help of the Holy Spirit. The answer to that question is clearly "No". And let me be very clear: I have never believed, or stated (publicly or privately), or even hinted that it's possible to be sanctified *without* the help of Christ. So if anybody is trying to present my teaching in that kind of light, they are a liar.

The question I have been asking is this: is personal effort the *antithesis* of believing, walking by faith and yielding to the Spirit; or is personal effort an *integral part* of our Christian walk? Does personal effort cancel out believing God's promises? Does personal effort cancel out walking by faith? Does personal effort cancel out yielding to the Spirit?

If the answer to these questions is "Yes"—if personal effort equals an attempt to establish your own righteousness; if it equals an attempt to reach perfection *independently* from God—then *Dan Mace* is preaching a false gospel of works and you need to avoid me like cancer.

If the answer is "No"—if personal effort does not necessarily equal an attempt to establish your own righteousness or reach perfection without the help of God—then *Steve Lumbley* is preaching a false gospel of grace and you need to avoid him like cancer.

The issue is not whether or not we can come forth in righteousness or be sanctified without the help of the Spirit. The question is whether all personal effort in the quest for righteousness equals a *denial* of the Holy Spirit's help. The question is whether all personal effort in the quest for righteousness equals an *independent effort* to obtain or establish righteousness.

In his message, Mr. Lumbley used what Jesus said about us not being able to bear fruit without Him, to establish the fact that personal effort is precisely an attempt to bear fruit without Him. When Jesus said we can do nothing without Him, in Mr. Lumbley's mind, that *means* personal effort is the *antithesis* of walking by faith and abiding in the Vine.

Well, I have a question for everyone who is hearing my voice. Do you think Jesus was required to do the same thing we are, when it comes to bearing fruit and walking in righteousness? Do you think He had to

depend on the Spirit to bear fruit and walk in righteousness, just like we have to depend on the Spirit to bear fruit and walk in righteousness? Do you think He had to “yield” to the Spirit just like we do? In case there is any doubt as to the correct answer, consider the following passages:

*Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, **The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do:** for what things soever he [the Father] doeth, **these also doeth the Son** likewise.*

*John 5:18-19*

***I can of mine own self do nothing:** as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.*

*John 5:30*

*As the living Father hath sent me, and **I live by the Father:** so he that eateth me, even **he shall live by me.***

*John 6:57*

*Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that **I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.***

*John 8:28*

*For **I have not spoken of myself;** but the Father which sent me, **he gave me a commandment,** what I should say, and what I should speak.*

*John 12:49*

*Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you **I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.***

*John 14:10*

I think it's pretty clear that when Jesus told His disciples to “abide in” Him, He wasn't telling them to do something He wasn't required to do himself. He had to abide in the Father. When he told the disciples that they could “do nothing” without Him, He wasn't telling them to do something He wasn't required to do himself. He could do nothing without the Father. The idea of abiding in God and not being able to produce spiritual fruit without God's help were concepts that Jesus taught *and* lived. So then, do you think Jesus ever tried to bring forth His own righteousness? Do you think He ever tried to produce spiritual fruit in His own strength? Do you think Jesus ever tried to sanctify himself by the “arm of the flesh”? Do you think He ever tried to obey God by His own power?

*For **consider him** that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have **not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.***

*Hebrews 12:3-4*

When referring to the struggle Jesus went through in the Garden of Gethsemane, the writer of Hebrews said: “consider Him”. Consider Him! Consider what the Scripture says of that struggle. I know I went through this last month; but people need to hear it again and *consider* what’s being said by the writer of Hebrews—especially as it relates to the deception that’s being propagated by Apostasy Watch. First of all, obeying God and walking in righteousness is not just a matter of God removing wrong desires from us. God didn’t “remove” the desire in Jesus to avoid going to the Cross. Jesus had to *overcome* that desire.

*Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, **My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.** And he went a little further, and **fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.** And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, What, could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak. He went away again the second time, **and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.** And he came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy. And he left them, and went away again, **and prayed the third time, saying the same words.** Then cometh he to his disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.*

*Matthew 26:36-45*

*Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, **strengthening him.** And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.*

*Luke 22:42-44*

The disciples give a very honest description of the struggle Jesus went through that night. But I wonder how many people in the Apostasy Watch religious group have considered that struggle. Maybe they are too mesmerized by seducing spirits to *really* consider the fact that there was a “desire” in Jesus to not “drink the cup” the Father had prepared for Him. Maybe they are too mesmerized to consider the fact that Jesus was in an intense struggle against a very powerful *temptation* to sin by choosing His own will over the Father’s will, and that He exerted a lot of personal effort to win that battle.

The Lord Jesus had His own will, and at that moment, His will was having a struggle. The desire to have that “cup” pass from Him was not a sin in and of itself. However, if Jesus would have *given in* to that desire, if He wouldn’t have gotten the victory *over* that desire, He would have sinned and we would all be on our way to Hell right now. So have you really considered that struggle? Have you really considered the fact that Jesus was resisting the temptation to sin with *all* His own strength that night?

Well, while you’re considering that, consider this: Jesus didn’t get the victory over that desire *simply by* believing the promises of God, or *simply by* becoming fully persuaded that God would perform those promises. He didn’t get the victory over that desire *simply by* getting his mind off of it, or *simply by* not considering that desire—like Abraham didn’t consider the fact that his body was now dead. He didn’t overcome that desire *simply by* giving glory to God for the victory before He had actually gotten the victory. Jesus didn’t get the victory over that desire *simply by* trusting that God would remove that desire from Him by grace. He didn’t get the victory over that desire *simply by* yielding to the work of the Spirit. Jesus got the victory over that desire by *overcoming* it.

How did He overcome it? Well for starters, He had to pray three times to overcome it. He had to pray three times get to the place where he would submit to the Father’s will. But that was just the beginning. In one account of those events we’re told that He was in such an intense struggle against the temptation to sin, He sweat great drops of blood. How much “personal effort” do you suppose a person has to be *exerting* in order to sweat drops of blood?

I don’t care what part the Holy Spirit played in that whole ordeal. I don’t care if the Spirit was helping Jesus 50% or 75% or 100%—Jesus was still resisting and striving against the temptation to sin with all His *own* strength, and with all His *own* will. There’s just no way around the fact that Jesus’ will was fully engaged in that battle. He was resisting the temptation to sin with all His *own* power. That’s why an angel had to come and “strengthen” Him. That’s why he sweat great drops of blood.

You see, just because we need the Lord’s help to win these kinds of battles; just because we can’t do it by our own strength alone, that *does not* mean God no longer requires us to *use* our own strength. It doesn’t mean that God no longer requires us to do our part. We are still responsible to fully engage our minds, our wills, our strength, and our determination to overcome sin.

Anyone who denies that Jesus was exerting personal effort in the battle to overcome sin that night is a filthy liar. Anyone who tries to *equate* Jesus’ personal effort with trying to do something *without* the help of God is a filthy liar. And anyone who tries to *equate* Jesus’ personal effort with trying to produce spiritual fruit by His own strength or trying to sanctify Himself by the flesh is a filthy liar.

Neither Lumbley or any of his deluded followers will ever be able to get around the fact, or explain away the fact, that the Lord Jesus did *much more* to overcome sin than SIMPLY walk by faith, or yield to the Spirit, or believe God’s promises, or become fully persuaded that God would perform His promises, or get His mind off the problem, or give glory to God before the victory was won, or trust that God would remove the desire he was resisting by grace. Neither Lumbley or any of his deluded followers will ever be able to get around the fact the Scripture states very clearly that Jesus exerted personal effort in His struggle against sin—and not just *some* effort. He gave that struggle *all* the effort He had in Him. All of His being—His mind, will, heart, emotions, and even His body—was engaged in that battle.

No, Jesus wasn't engaged in that battle *alone*. No, He wasn't trying to overcome sin through His human strength *only*. No, He wasn't rejecting the help of the Holy Spirit or trying to act independently of the Father. Certainly the Father was with Him and certainly the Spirit was helping Him. But whatever level of help the Father was providing, that will never take away the fact that Jesus had to put forth His own personal effort to win that battle. He had to resist and strive against the temptation to sin. That's not just the personal opinion of Dan Mace. It's a FACT that's plainly recorded in the Scripture. Those who don't want to live with the truth this fact reveals, will just have live in religious delusion.

If *Jesus* had to go through that kind of a struggle to overcome the temptation to sin, what in the world makes people think *they* won't have to do the same, and more, when they are faced with a strong temptation? And listen—I'm *not* saying we have to struggle like that against *every* sin. We shouldn't have to struggle with *every* sin like that. If we do, we aren't a Christian—we're just religious. I'm talking about a sin you just can't seem to overcome, even though you've *tried* to overcome it. I'm talking about a sin that just keeps returning again and again and keeps overcoming you! When we are up against *that kind* of kind of a temptation, what makes people think they won't have to do the same thing Jesus did when He faced a powerful temptation?

I'll tell you what makes them think they won't have to do what Jesus did—seducing spirits. And the reason people open themselves up to seducing spirits is because they are filled with pride and arrogance. It's the epitome of *pride* to read how Jesus strove against sin in the garden that night, and then turn around and tell people *all they* have to do to overcome sin is have "faith" that God will deliver them from the desire to sin by grace as they rest in Him and yield to the work of the Spirit. That's *passivity*; and it's just what lazy, carnal, Christians want to hear. God will do everything *for* me if I will just have faith and trust Him.

I'll tell you something else Mr. Lumbley and all his deluded followers will never be able to get around or explain away. They will *never* be able to explain away the fact that the writer of Hebrews used Jesus' personal effort against sin in the garden that night as an *example* to encourage us to *do the same*. That's right! He was using the example of Jesus' personal effort in overcoming temptation to encourage those in the Hebrew congregation (to whom he was writing) who were having a problem with sin, not to give up resisting and striving against that sin.

So to be quite frank, I don't care if Mr. Lumbley strings a *thousand* verses of Scripture together in order to support his error—Hebrews 12:4 exposes him as a false teacher. Actually, it's very sad to watch people choose the *words* of a self proclaimed Bible teacher over the *actions* of their Lord. Jesus did the *exact opposite* of what Mr. Lumbley is preaching, yet people choose this man's words over the example set by their Savior. Talk about putting your trust in man! Talk about trusting in the arm of the flesh!

Well, several weeks ago Mr. Lumbley gave another message to support his error, in which he stated the Scripture "seems to imply" that we are responsible to do certain things in order to be sanctified. But of course, we aren't really responsible to do any of these things. He then went through 4 or 5 passages which "seemed" to say we have to do something ourselves. But as he read each passage, he would then point the people to another passage nearby which talked about grace or faith. "*See*", he would say, *the Bible isn't really telling you to do these things. It's telling you to let God do them in you. You do them through grace. You do them by believing that God will do them in you*".

What took place that night was a repeat of what happened in the Garden of Eden 6000 years ago; and of course, the people in that room fell for it, lock, stock and barrel. “*Hath God said?*”—said the Serpent to Eve. “*Hath God said?*”—said Mr. Lumbley to his followers? Surely, when God told *you* to resist the devil, He didn’t mean that you should exert any personal effort to do so. What He really meant was that you should let Him resist the devil for you as you yield to the work of the Spirit. Surely, when God told *you* to flee youthful lusts He didn’t mean you should exert any personal effort to do so. What He really meant was that you should let Him *cause you* to flee. Better yet, if you are really walking by faith, God will *remove the temptation* before you even have to face it.

Those who are hearing my voice, please answer me this: do you think Jesus was “abiding” in the Father when He exerted personal effort to resist sin? Do you think Jesus was “yielding” to the Spirit when He exerted personal effort against sin? Well then, guess what? If Jesus could exert personal effort and still be yielding to the Spirit, so can you! If He could exert personal effort and still be abiding in the Father, so can you! If Jesus could exert personal effort to overcome sin and still be walking by faith, trusting God and believing God’s promises, so can you. If Jesus could exert personal effort *without* being guilty of trying to establish His own righteousness, or of trying to perfect Himself, or of trying to produce spiritual fruit by His own power, then so can you!

Personal effort does *not* equal resisting the Spirit or rejecting the help of the Spirit! It does *not* equal trying to walk independently of God! Nor is it the antithesis of walking by faith or yielding to the Spirit. This whole idea is a lie from the pit of Hell—and Mr. Lumbley is *functioning* as Satan’s mouth piece. It’s designed to produce *passive* Christians who can easily be overcome by Satan. The fact that this man has been able to seduce the kind of people he has, shows just how powerful Satan’s deceptions are right now.

In that same message, one of the passages Mr. Lumbley looked at was Hebrews 12:1—“*Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us*”. His point in quoting this passage was to show that even though it “seemed” like the writer of Hebrews was telling us to lay aside every weight and sin, even though it “seemed” like he was telling us to run the race with patience, that fact is, he *wasn’t* telling us to do these things because if we actually tried to do them, it would involve personal effort—and all personal effort is a rejection of God’s grace. All personal effort is a refusal to let the Spirit to do it *for* us. Then he referred the people to the very next verse and said this is *how* we are to lay aside these weights and sins. This is *how* we are to run the race with patience:

*Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.*

*Hebrews.12:2*

According to Mr. Lumbley, the way we obey the command to lay aside every weight and sin and run the race is by “looking unto Jesus”. When he says we are to look to Jesus, he means we are to simply believe that Jesus will accomplish this for us by grace as we yield to the work of the Spirit in our lives. No personal effort is necessary. Indeed, no personal effort is *allowed*. In Mr. Lumbley’s mind, personal effort is the *antithesis* of looking unto Jesus.

Well, I certainly don't have a problem with the fact that we must to "look to Jesus" to help us lay aside every weight or sin that besets us or to run the race. What I have a problem with is the idea that personal effort is the antithesis of looking unto Jesus. What I have a problem with is the idea that personal effort and looking unto Jesus are polar opposites, and that we will have to choose one or the other because one automatically cancels out the other. What I have a problem with is the idea that we can't possibly put forth personal effort *and* look to Jesus at the same time. The reason I have a problem with this idea is because it directly contradicts the clear meaning of the very next verse, which says:

*For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. **Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.***

*Hebrews 12:3-4*

Do you think there might be a connection between the exhortation to look unto Jesus in Hebrews 12:2 and the exhortation to consider the struggle He went through in Hebrew 12:4? Do you think it's possible that when the writer of Hebrews told us to look unto Jesus, he wasn't saying we should just believe we will overcome sin by grace, but that we should resist sin with all our might, just like Jesus?

See, what the writer of Hebrews is saying in verse twelve is: "*Hey, you may think you are doing a lot to fight against a besetting sin in your life, but just remember what Jesus had to do to overcome sin in the garden that evening. He had to resist and strive against the temptation to sin so hard He bled great drops of blood! So until you've resisted sin like that, don't think you've done all you can to overcome it.*"

He's not saying what Mr. Lumbley is saying. He didn't look at people in that fellowship who were having a problem with sin and say: "*Hey, you may think you are doing a lot to fight against some besetting sin in your life but all you are doing is walking in the flesh! Striving against that sin is personal effort and that isn't what God wants from you! He wants you to 'rest' in His promise. He wants you to just believe and walk by faith. Just yield to the Spirit's work in you and you will get delivered.*"

Listen people; either the writer of the book of Hebrews is a liar or Mr. Lumbley is a liar. If the doctrine being propagated by Apostasy Watch is true, then Jesus was resisting sin in His "flesh" that night! You need to understand that Mr. Lumbley is a *dangerous* man because of the very *subtle way* he twists the Scripture. He's dangerous because he's convinced his error is true. The most dangerous kind of deceiver is the one who is utterly convinced of his error. The deception that's taking place in that chat room is so subtle, most of the people in that group have absolutely no idea what's happening. The few who have seen the truth have separated themselves from that group.

The "grace" Mr. Lumbley is propagating is not the grace that's taught in the Scripture. It's a *counterfeit* grace that's designed to produce passive Christians that are food for the demons. The grace that's taught in the Scripture gives you the power to *overcome* the temptation to sin. Mr. Lumbley's grace *removes* the temptation to sin so there is nothing to overcome. That was the *whole point* of his illustration about throwing away his worldly music wasn't it? He threw his music out before the desire for that music had been *removed* from his heart, so it didn't work. That act was just a worthless "work of the flesh".

But somewhere along the way, God just removed the desire for that music from him. There was no struggle against the desire for that music. No personal effort was required to resist the temptation to listen to it. Apparently Mr. Lumbley didn't even feel the need to pray and ask God to deliver him from it. He just walked by faith and yielded to the Spirit every day and presto, one morning he woke up and the desire for that music was gone. God had removed it. It was "*all of God and none of him*".

I wonder if Mr. Lumbley was ever *convicted* by the Holy Spirit concerning his worldly music? He said he "got it in his head" at the very beginning that he should get rid of it, and then he blamed an unknown minister for putting that thought in his brain. Since he listened to a man and not the Holy Spirit, that whole effort was a "work of the flesh".

But I wonder—after he realized that throwing the music out didn't remove the desire for it, was he ever convicted of it by the Holy Spirit? I wonder if he was ever "conflicted" about the issue? Did the Holy Spirit ever try to tell him to get rid of that music; or was the whole thing a non-issue until the morning he woke up and realized the desire was gone.? Was he ever in a place where he *knew* God (not man) wanted him to give up that music, but the desire for it was still so strong in him he couldn't do it?

See, that's the way things work in the *real* world. God is continually convicting us of things that are displeasing to Him. God is continually convicting us of things that are hindering our union with Him. And the fact is, most of the time, the things He convicts us of are things we *desire*. Sometimes, the things He asks us to let go of are *so* important to us, we would rather die than let them go. In the real world of conflicting wills and desires—not in Mr. Lumbley's religious fantasy world—this is where the difference between the grace of the Bible and his counterfeit grace is revealed.

*For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was **in all points tempted like as we are**, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace **to help** in time of need.*

*Hebrews 4:15-16*

The writer of Hebrews said Jesus was tempted in all points like as we are. Since He was tempted just like us, and since He can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and since He is at the right hand of the Father behind the Veil, we are encouraged to go boldly to the throne of grace in order to "*obtain mercy and find grace **to help** in time of need*". In other words, when we are tempted to sin, we are to run to Jesus and ask for help! We are to ask Him to help us resist and overcome that temptation. The "help" we receive from the throne of grace is the power to overcome the temptation. The "help" we receive from the throne of grace is the power to turn away from that sin.

Mr. Lumbley's grace doesn't *help* you overcome the temptation you are facing. It *removes* the temptation from you so there is nothing to overcome. When you walk in Scriptural grace, *both* you and God are engaged in the battle, just as *both* Jesus and the Father were engaged in the battle in the Garden of Gethsemane. It's the sword of the Lord and of Gideon. Just as Jesus was resisting the temptation to sin with all His own strength that night, so we must resist the temptation to sin with all of our own strength. Just as Jesus needed "help" to win the battle, so we need "help" to win the battle.

True grace is God giving us the strength we are *lacking* so we can win. He is helping us win. He is not winning *for* us by removing the thing we are struggling against. There is a big difference between those two concepts. Scriptural grace makes you an *overcomer* because it strengthens you to gain the victory over all your internal enemies. Mr. Lumbley's grace makes you a *passive robot* because it removes all your internal enemies from you. There is nothing to fight, nothing to overcome.

*Let your conversation be without covetousness; and be content with such things as ye have: for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee. So that we may boldly say, **The Lord is my helper**, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.*

*Hebrews 13:5-6*

The Lord is our helper, said the writer of the book of Hebrews. Apparently, Mr. Lumbley doesn't know the difference between having someone *help* you do something and someone doing that thing *for* you. This is because his mind is filled with the errors of Calvin. You see, when you *start off* with a bad foundation, everything you build on *that* foundation is skewed. When you build your theology on the foundation of Calvin's "Total Inability" lie, then even though everything you build looks right, there's a fundamental *distortion* in all of it that makes it false. When you start off by assuming that our Adamic nature is incapable of doing anything good; that it's incapable of choosing to follow God or obey God; that it's incapable of walking in righteousness; then the rest of your theology is going to be warped and you will never, ever understand the issue of righteousness.

Those who listen to Mr. Lumbley may have noticed that he is obsessed with the (seemingly) noble task of making sure God gets ALL the glory for our redemption. He's obsessed with making sure that we don't take credit for ANYTHING we do. The reason for this is very simple. He believes that if we had any responsibility at all in the salvation process, and we carried out that responsibility faithfully, then God couldn't get all the glory. He would have to share it with us. If we actually had the power to make a righteous choice without God *causing us* to make that righteous choice, then we could rightfully take some credit for making that choice—not all the credit, mind you—but certainly the amount that's proper.

Calvinists have a "phobia" about people stealing God's glory. That's why Mr. Lumbley spits and fumes at the very thought of God allowing us to *share the responsibility* for our sanctification. That's why he says over and over and over again that our flesh want's to take the credit for what God does. If we were really responsible for *anything* in the salvation process, they could not keep propagating their "*it's all of God and none of you*" slogan.

Once you reject Calvin's "Total Inability" lie, it's very easy to understand that we *share* the responsibility for our own salvation, and that this in no way "steals" glory from God. You will understand that we *have the ability* to respond to the Lord in every area and at every stage of the salvation process. Whether it's our response to His initial call to repentance, or our response to His daily leading in the sanctification process, we have the ability to choose life or death. The fact that we can't be sanctified without the Lord's help does not mean we are helpless automatons who are *incapable* of doing anything that God isn't *causing us* to do. We have a "new man" and that new man leads us and guides us and empowers us. But we are *totally* responsible for whether or not we yield to the influence of that new man.

*For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels;  
and then **he shall reward every man according to his works.***

*Matthew 16:27*

*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give **every man according as his work shall be.***

*Revelation 22:11-12*

One of the things people don't understand about the Calvinist error Mr. Lumbley is teaching, is that it annuls the whole concept of rewards. If we are sanctified by "faith" in the same exact way we are justified by "faith" (as Mr. Lumbley asserts) then you will never receive a reward for anything you do because *you* didn't do anything! If it's really "*all of God and none of you*", then on what basis are you expecting to receive a reward? What have *you* done?

"Well", you may say, "I walked by faith". Oh really? Could you have walked by faith if God wasn't CAUSING YOU to walk by faith? According to Calvin and Lumbley, you are incapable of walking by faith.

Try again

"Well", you may say, "I believed God's promises". Oh really? Could you have believed God's promises if the Spirit wasn't CAUSING YOU to believe them? According to Calvin and Lumbley, you are incapable of believing God's promises.

Try again.

"Well", you may say, "I yielded to the work of the Spirit". Oh really? Could you have yielded to the work of the Spirit if the Spirit wasn't CAUSING YOU to yield? According to Calvin and Lumbley, you are incapable of yielding to the Spirit.

Sorry friend, this lie cuts both ways.

If you can't take any credit for anything you do, then neither can you be rewarded for anything you do. If God does it all, then He not only gets all the credit, He also gets all the reward. If it's "*all of God and none of you*", God can't possibly reward you for what He *alone* has done. In order for you to receive a reward you must *deserve* it. Nobody will ever receive any rewards through Mr. Lumbley's counterfeit grace because that grace says you will never *deserve* anything. God deserves all the credit and God deserves all the glory, so guess what—God gets all the rewards.