

# Eight [Silly] Reasons Why Calvinists Believe in Evangelism

By Matthew Murphy

Most Calvinists that I've read or listened to have only been able to provide two reasons as to why a Calvinist should evangelise. The two most common reasons being:

1. God ordains both the means and the end, and
2. Because God has commanded evangelism.

But one article I came across [here](#) gave eight reasons [the two above reasons were among the eight given]. The article in which I found the reasons is reproduced, followed by a point-by-point response showing that no matter what way you slice it, evangelism is irrational within the context of a Calvinistic worldview.

---

## **"EIGHT REASONS WHY CALVINISTS BELIEVE IN EVANGELISM**

**1)** Because God has commanded it. The gospel is to be preached to every creature (Mark 16:15). This is why Calvinists have been to the forefront of missionary endeavour. The man acknowledged as "the Father of Modern Missions" was William Carey... and William Carey was a Calvinist. If a missionary (strictly speaking) is someone who leaves his homeland to preach the gospel elsewhere, then John Calvin qualifies as a missionary. Spurgeon said of him: *"John Calvin...is looked upon now, of course, a theologian only, but he was really one of the greatest of gospel preachers. When Calvin opened the Book and took a text, you might be sure that he was about to preach 'Through grace are ye saved, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.'" (MTP 14:216)*. Even if we had no other reason, we would still evangelise...because it is a clear command from God.

**2)** Because we believe that God has ordained the means of bringing many sons to glory as well as the end. Hyper Calvinists believe He has ordained the end but not the means, non Calvinists/Arminians believe that He has ordained the means but not the end... Calvinists alone consistently take the balanced view that He has ordained both. If we don't evangelise...someone else rightly will. Calvinists believe as much in man's responsibility as they do in God's sovereignty.

**3)** Because God has done something wonderful for the whole world and wants every one to know about it. *He is not willing that any should perish and that all should come to repentance (2 Peter 3:9) He has no pleasure in the death of the wicked*

*(Ezekiel 33:11) He would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Timothy 2:4) He invites the 'Whosoever will' to come and drink of the water of life (Revelation 22:17) How can we not evangelise? Surely when we bear these things in mind, we must (if applicable) reproach ourselves and say: We do not well: this day is a day of good tidings, and we hold our peace: if we tarry till the morning light, some mischief will come upon us: now therefore come, that we may go and tell the king's household. (2 Kings 7:9)*

**4)** Evangelism gives Calvinists the glorious opportunity to praise the God whom they believe unconditionally elected them to salvation. We love to preach the gospel in all its fullness. Just to recount the old, old story of Jesus and His love thrills our soul and leads us to praise His name. We glorify God when we proclaim the gospel.

**5)** Evangelism gives us the opportunity to unburden our souls for the lost. We cannot be silent while souls around us are bound for hell. We believe the gospel ourselves and therefore we speak (2 Corinthians 4:13) Many of us were brought savingly to Christ because someone else was burdened for us and prayed for us and witnessed to us. Any man who names the name of Christ, Calvinist or not, should have the burden to win others. It is an evidence of grace when we want others to experience it for themselves. If there is no burden for the lost, we are left to wonder, does the professing Christian (of whatever school) believe there is a Day of Judgement...an immortal soul and an eternal hell?

**6)** Evangelism gives us an opportunity to serve God. The fields are white unto harvest and yet the labourers are few. There is a great reward awaiting for soul winners (Daniel 12:3) ...but even if there wasn't, we would still labour just for the sheer joy of being in God's work and spreading His word.

**7)** Evangelism gives us an opportunity to bear reproach for the name of Christ. Paul witnessed to the gospel with much contention (1 Thessalonians 2:2) and whilst such is irksome to the flesh, yet the spiritual man rejoices every whit. Such were the Apostles (Acts 5:41). Obviously we do not set out to annoy, but we recognise that the natural heart is going to kick hard against the message of Christ. If we have to bear reproach in our evangelism...then amen! "So be it"

**8)** Far down our list, but there nevertheless, we evangelise because it nails the lie often uttered against us that Calvinism kills evangelistic endeavour. Why should it? The doctrine of predestination is the only grounds of evangelism. If God did not predestine folk out of their sins to be saved, then no one would be saved. The non Calvinist says that if there were no faith, then there would be no predestination because the latter (which is God's work) is totally and absolutely dependent on the former which is due ultimately to man's decision. The Calvinist says that if there were no predestination, then there would be no faith because the latter (which is man's responsibility) flows from the former. Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God (Romans 10:17) and the word of God comes to sinners through gospel preachers (Romans 10:13-16)."

---

**Point-by-point response:** [note: ellipses (...) indicate a mid-sentence comment - not an omission]

“1) Because God has commanded it. The gospel is to be preached to every creature (Mark 16:15).”

But this doesn't actually provide a *reason* for evangelism. It is a bit of a red herring – an argument used to divert attention away from the real issue. The issue at hand is that evangelism is inconsistent with the teachings of Calvinism. Once you say, “Because God has commanded it”, the question immediately takes a step backwards to, ‘Why does God command us to preach the Gospel to every creature?’ Saying, “Because God has commanded it” doesn't solve the problem – evangelism is still inconsistent with Calvinism. In other words, the real issue has been evaded.

According to Calvinism, there are two classes of people – the ‘elect’, and the ‘reprobate’. Calvinism teaches that in eternity past, God foreordained certain individuals to eternal life, and foreordained others to eternal destruction [Westminster Confession of Faith [WCF], Ch.3(3)]. Furthermore, this decree is immutable – it cannot change [WCF, Ch.3(1)]. According to Calvinism, none of the reprobate could possibly be saved, nor could any of the elect possibly be lost. As the Westminster Confession states:

“These angels and men, thus predestinated, and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished” [WCF, Ch.3(4)]

The natural conclusion of such teaching is this: if we evangelise, the elect will be saved, and the reprobate will be damned; conversely, if we *don't* evangelise, the elect will be saved, and the reprobate will be damned. So what is the difference? According to this teaching, evangelism will not affect the final destiny of either the elect or the reprobate.

If the elect are foreordained to eternal life no matter what, and the reprobate are foreordained to eternal destruction no matter what, the command of God to preach the Gospel to every creature is rendered useless. For an argument to be considered rational, it must be internally consistent. So when a Calvinist argues that we should evangelise because God has commanded it, they are making an argument that is not consistent with the teachings of Calvinism. The Calvinist is therefore providing an irrational argument.

“This is why Calvinists have been to the forefront of missionary endeavour. The man acknowledged as ‘the Father of Modern Missions’ was William Carey...and William Carey was a Calvinist.”

This proves nothing...except that once again, the actual issue has been evaded. As shown above, evangelism in a Calvinistic worldview is irrational and inconsistent. The

fact that Carey was a Calvinist and an evangelist does not even come close to resolving the issue. As shown above, the natural consequence of Calvinism is that evangelism will not, in any way, affect the final destiny of anyone.

*“If a missionary (strictly speaking) is someone who leaves his homeland to preach the gospel elsewhere, then John Calvin qualifies as a missionary.”*

But this is the same argument as above. How does the assertion that Calvin was a missionary resolve the fact that if Calvinism was true, evangelism plays no part in the salvation of man?

*“Spurgeon said of him: ‘John Calvin...is looked upon now, of course, a theologian only, but he was really one of the greatest of gospel preachers. When Calvin opened the Book and took a text, you might be sure that he was about to preach ‘Through grace are ye saved, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God’”(MTP 14:216).”*

So what?

The issue has again been evaded. In case it has been missed, the issue is that evangelism is inconsistent with the teachings of Calvinism. The fact that Spurgeon believed Calvin to be a great gospel preacher is irrelevant to the issue at hand.

*“Even if we had no other reason, we would still evangelise...because it is a clear command from God.”*

Agreed: evangelism is a clear command from God. But if Calvinism was true, this command would be rendered useless.

Why would a Calvinist evangelise when *consistent* Calvinism means that preaching the gospel will never save anyone – considering the fact that the elect cannot possibly be lost, and the reprobate cannot possibly be saved?

The very fact that God has commanded that the gospel be preached to every creature is proof that salvation is not only available to a select group, but to all mankind. Otherwise, God wouldn't have commanded all men everywhere to repent.

*“2) Because we believe that God has ordained the means of bringing many sons to glory as well as the end.”*

But in Calvinism, evangelism is not the 'means to an end'. A.W. Pink says:

“The elect were ‘children’ from all eternity and decreed to be so unto all eternity. They did not lose their sonship by the Fall, neither by any corruption derived from that Fall in their nature. ‘Children’ they continued, though sinful children, and as such, justly exposed to wrath. Nevertheless, this relationship could not be revoked by any after-acts in time: united to Christ from all

eternity, they were always one with Him.” [Pink, *Spiritual Union and Communion*]

The natural conclusion of Pink’s teaching is that the elect will be saved *no matter what*. They can deny the existence of God, they can live in unrepentant sin, they can reject the gospel, and yet they will be saved. Why? The answer has nothing to do with preaching the gospel, but has everything to do with God’s election of them in eternity past.

In Calvinism, once a person is a member of the elect, that’s it – their fate is sealed. The ‘means to the end’ is God’s election. There is no need for the gospel to be preached.

“Hyper-Calvinists believe He has ordained the end but not the means...”

Incorrect. Consistent Calvinism teaches that the means of salvation is God’s election in eternity past, and nothing can change that. The Hyper-Calvinist sees this, and practices what he preaches. He sees that if Calvinism is true, then evangelism plays no part in bringing a lost soul to saving faith. It is precisely because the Hyper-Calvinist believes in an ordained means and an ordained end that he doesn’t evangelise, and thus, is labelled a ‘Hyper’ Calvinist. Hyper-Calvinism is *true* Calvinism – it puts the teachings of Calvinism into practice.

“...non Calvinists/Arminians believe that He has ordained the means but not the end...”

Incorrect. I believe that God has ordained both the means and the end, but just not in the same way that Calvinism teaches. For example:

**“For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe.”** [1 Corinthians 1:21]

Here we have both the ordained means and the ordained end. The means is believing the preached gospel; the end is salvation for **those who believe** (not those who were supposedly unconditionally elected in eternity past). God does not determine who will make use of the means (believing the gospel) to get to the end (salvation); He simply ordains what the means and the end is. The reason is this: salvation is conditional – the ordained end is conditioned upon the individual application of the ordained means. God does not want conscripts, He wants volunteers. He has given us the freedom to choose for or against Him [Josh 24:15; Prov. 1:28-29; Isaiah 1:2-4; 56:4; 65:12; John 17:7; 2 Thess. 2:10-11]. Each of us has a choice.

“...Calvinists alone consistently take the balanced view that He has ordained both.”

Incorrect. As shown above, a Hyper-Calvinist and an Arminian also believe in an ordained means and an ordained end.

“If we don’t evangelise...someone else rightly will.”

So what? It won’t make any difference. If one *consistently* holds to the teachings of Calvinism, they can’t escape the fact that the elect will be saved regardless of whether they believe the gospel or not, and that the reprobate will be damned regardless of whether they believe the gospel or not. As the above quote from A.W. Pink made clear, the elect were saved in eternity past, and nothing they do can change it.

Also, ‘someone else *rightly* will’? How can a Calvinist say ‘rightly’? According to Calvinism, man does not have a free will, so how could any man’s actions be deemed ‘right’ or ‘wrong’? Where there is no freedom of choice, there can be neither sin nor righteousness, as both have to be voluntary. In a consistently Calvinistic worldview, God determines all things – even sin:

“God moves the tongues of men to blaspheme.” [Franciscus Gomarus, *The Other Side of Calvinism*, p. 254]

“Sin is one of the ‘whatsoevers’ that have ‘come to pass’, all of which are ‘ordained’” [W.G.T. Shedd, *Calvinism: Pure and Mixed*, p. 32]

“Nothing comes to pass contrary to His decree. Nothing happens by chance. Even moral evil, which He abhors and forbids, occurs ‘by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.’” [W.G.T. Shedd, *Calvinism: Pure and Mixed*, p. 38-39]

“All things including even the wicked actions of wicked men and devils – are brought to pass in accordance with God’s eternal purpose.” [J.G. Machen, *The Other Side of Calvinism*, p. 254]

“It is even Biblical to say that God has foreordained sin.” [Edwin H. Palmer, *The Five Points of Calvinism*, p. 82]

If one holds to Calvinism *consistently*, they can’t escape the fact that if no one preached the gospel, they are not in the wrong – they are simply fulfilling the decree of God. Conversely, if a man was to preach the gospel, he is not in the right – he too, is simply fulfilling the decree of God.

“Calvinists believe as much in man’s responsibility as they do in God’s sovereignty.”

But it is irrational for a Calvinist to believe in man’s responsibility, as the natural consequence of Calvinism is that man’s responsibility is destroyed.

In any case, there is nothing special about believing in man's responsibility as well as God's sovereignty – neither one cancels the other one out. It's an irrelevant point – the Arminian also believes in man's responsibility as much as they do God's sovereignty. So this statement is totally irrelevant to resolving the issue at hand.

There still hasn't been a rational reason given as to why a Calvinist should evangelise. The issue seems to be getting evaded quite a lot.

*"3) Because God has done something wonderful for the whole world and wants every one to know about it."*

Curious...what is this wonderful thing that God has done for the whole world?? Ever wondered what the 'L' in 'TULIP' stands for? According to Calvinism, He did not send His Son to die for the whole world but for the elect alone.

To use this a reason for evangelism is very irrational indeed.

*"He is not willing that any should perish and that all should come to repentance (2 Peter 3:9)"*

According to Calvinism,

*"By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death." [WCF, Ch. 3(3)]*

*"The sole cause why some are saved, and others perish, proceeds from His willing the salvation of the former, and the perdition of the latter." [Martin Luther, as quoted in *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 106]*

How can the god who unconditionally predestines people to eternal destruction for His own good pleasure be *genuinely* willing that none should perish? Consistent Calvinism can make no sense of 2 Peter 3:9. It is completely irrational to be professing Calvinism on the one hand, while on the other hand using this verse as a reason to evangelise.

*"He has no pleasure in the death of the wicked (Ezekiel 33:11)"*

Would the God of the Bible (the One who takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked) unconditionally predestine people to eternal destruction for His own good pleasure? Again, it is completely irrational to profess Calvinism while using this verse as a reason for evangelism.

*"He would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Timothy 2:4)"*

Would the God who would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth unconditionally predestine people to eternal destruction, without a hope of being saved, for His own good pleasure?

“He invites the ‘Whosoever will’ to come and drink of the water of life (Revelation 22:17)”

[SIGH] Would the God who makes the water of life available to ‘whosoever will’ unconditionally predestine people to eternal destruction, without a hope of drinking the water of life, for His own good pleasure?

Profess Calvinism + use this verse as a reason to evangelise = irrational.

“How can we not evangelise? Surely when we bear these things in mind, we must (if applicable) reproach ourselves and say: *We do not well: this day is a day of good tidings, and we hold our peace: if we tarry till the morning light, some mischief will come upon us: now therefore come, that we may go and tell the king’s household.* (2 Kings 7:9)”

Of course, with these verses in mind we should evangelise, but that’s not the point. The point is this: with these verses in mind, how could anyone be a Calvinist?

Once again, the real issue has been evaded. The issue is not that we should evangelise; the issue is not that God commands evangelism. The issue is that **if Calvinism was true, there would be no rational reason to evangelise.**

“4) Evangelism gives Calvinists the glorious opportunity to praise the God whom they believe unconditionally elected them to salvation.”

I can appreciate the obvious attitude of gratitude, but I have a couple of things against this statement:

1) Ironic as it is, the natural conclusion of such thinking provides reason for boasting. The Calvinist will say, ‘God’s election was unconditional. That means that God did not elect me based on anything good He foresaw in me. Therefore, Calvinism excludes any reason for boasting.’ But such reasoning will only hold up if God’s unconditional choice was arbitrary. Think about it: was not God’s choice grounded in the ‘most wise and holy counsel of His will’?

a) If so, it was an infinitely wise and holy choice. That provides (but does not necessitate) a reason to boast.

b) If not, then we must conclude that God’s choice was arbitrary. This doesn’t really provide much reason to praise God.

2) The second thing I have against the statement is this: if Calvinism were true, there could be no such thing as an *opportunity*. Think about it: an opportunity, by nature,

can only be used or neglected. But this implies freedom of choice, which in turn, implies free will. Calvinism does not allow for free will or chance:

“It has already been proved beyond all controversy that free-will is nonsense...free-will is simply ridiculous.” [C.H. Spurgeon, *Free Will - A Slave*]

“All things turn out according to divine predestination; not only the works we do outwardly, but even the thoughts we think inwardly...there is no such thing as chance” [Phillip Melanchthon, as quoted in *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 15]

If one holds to Calvinism *consistently*, they can't escape the fact that God has unchangeably predetermined the 'who, what, where, when, and why' of absolutely everything. As far as man is concerned, there is no such thing as an opportunity.

[SIGH] Once again, the real issue has been evaded by use of an irrational argument.

“We love to preach the gospel in all its fullness.”

No you don't, if Calvinism is anything to go by. According to Calvinism,

“All things turn out according to divine predestination; not only the works we do outwardly, but even the thoughts we think inwardly...there is no such thing as chance” [Phillip Melanchthon, as quoted in *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 15]

Therefore, our Calvinist friend only 'loves' to preach the gospel in all its fullness because God predetermined that he would. And without freedom of choice, there is no such thing as real love.

By the way, I wonder which gospel our friend 'loves' to preach:

1) The gospel according to the Scriptures is that God loves all of mankind so much that He sent His only begotten Son to die for all the sins of all mankind [John 3:16], so that salvation is therefore available to whosoever will come [Rev. 22:17], on the condition of repentance and faith in God through Christ Jesus [Romans 10:9-13].

2) The gospel according to Calvinism is that God loves only the elect, and sent Jesus to die for only the elect, and that the rest of mankind won't be saved, not because they were sinners who refused to repent, but because God didn't want them in Heaven:

“The sole cause why some are saved, and others perish, proceeds from His willing the salvation of the former, and the perdition of the latter.” [Martin Luther, as quoted in *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 106]

“Just to recount the old, old story of Jesus and His love thrills our soul and leads us to praise His name.”

True perhaps, but irrelevant. How does that resolve the issue of evangelism being irrational when viewed in light of Calvinism?

Okay, our friend loves to tell of Jesus and His love. His *love*? In the words of Dave Hunt, what love is this? What love is this that sends possibly countless billions to eternal destruction for no other purpose but God's pleasure?

"We glorify God when we proclaim the gospel."

God is not glorified when the gospel according to Calvinism is proclaimed.

"5) Evangelism gives us the opportunity to unburden our souls for the lost. We cannot be silent while souls around us are bound for hell."

Regardless of the fact that there is no such thing as an opportunity in Calvinism, who are you, O man, to reply against the sovereign, eternal decree of God? If it pleased God to unconditionally send possibly billions to Hell, why should it not please us? If a Calvinist is not pleased that possibly billions of souls are bound for Hell, as God supposedly is, then they are not pleased by what pleases God, and are thus, rebelling against Him.

According to Calvinism, the elect are not, nor will ever be, bound for Hell, and the reprobate have always been bound for Hell because God wants them to be. Nothing can change it, so keep silent, or proclaim the gospel at the top of your lungs – it won't make any difference.

According the teachings of Calvinism, we *can* be silent while souls around us are bound for hell. So why should a Calvinist bother evangelising?

"We believe the gospel ourselves and therefore we speak (2 Corinthians 4:13). Many of us were brought savingly to Christ because someone else was burdened for us and prayed for us and witnessed to us."

According to Calvinism, no one was saved because someone else was burdened for them, or prayed for them, or witnessed to them. According to Calvinism, the elect were saved because God chose them before they existed. According to Calvinism, being burdened for someone changes nothing; prayer changes nothing; and witnessing changes nothing because the god of Calvinism has foreordained absolutely everything with an eternal, immutable decree.

"Any man who names the name of Christ, Calvinist or not, should have the burden to win others."

Notice the inconsistency here. If Calvinism were true, nobody could be won. The elect are already 'won'. In fact, they have never been lost – they were saved in eternity past. Conversely, the reprobate have no chance of being won to Christ – they were damned in eternity past, and nothing can change that fact.

To say that any professing Christian *should* have a burden for the lost is to imply moral responsibility; and for a man to be responsible for his actions, he must have the freedom to commission an action, whether good or bad. Yet according to Calvinism, free will is simply ridiculous. If a man does not have the freedom of choice, he simply cannot be held responsible for 'his' actions. So the Calvinist is being irrational according to his own professed worldview when he says that anyone *should* do anything.

According to Calvinism,

“All things turn out according to divine predestination; not only the works we do outwardly, but even the thoughts we think inwardly...there is no such thing as chance” [Phillip Melanchthon, as quoted in *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 15]

Therefore, if a man has a burden for the lost, it is only because God foreordained it. Conversely, if anyone does not have a burden for the lost, it is only because God foreordained it. It's not up to individuals as to whether they will have a burden for others – it's up to God as to who He will predestine to have the burden.

“It is an evidence of grace when we want others to experience it for themselves.”

But again, who are you, O man, to reply against the sovereign, eternal decree of God? If it pleased God to unconditionally send possibly billions to Hell, why should it not please us?

It is very irrational for the Calvinist to say on the one hand that God has unconditionally foreordained certain individuals to Hell, and there's nothing that can change it, while on the other hand saying that we should have a burden for them. God obviously doesn't want them in Heaven; He doesn't have a burden for them. So why should anyone else?

“If there is no burden for the lost, we are left to wonder, does the professing Christian (of whatever school) believe there is a Day of Judgement...an immortal soul and an eternal hell?”

According to Calvinism,

“All things turn out according to divine predestination; not only the works we do outwardly, but even the thoughts we think inwardly...there is no such thing as chance” [Phillip Melanchthon, as quoted in *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 15]

Again, if a man has a burden for the lost, it is only because God foreordained it. Conversely, if anyone does not have a burden for the lost, it is only because God foreordained it. It's not up to individuals as to whether they will have a burden for others – it's up to God as to who He will predestine to have the burden.

The same goes for whether anyone believes that there is a Day of Judgement, an immortal soul, and an eternal hell – it's up to God as to who He will predestine to believe such things.

These sentiments of gratitude, while admirable, do not provide a reason for evangelism that is consistent with the teachings of Calvinism.

"6) Evangelism gives us an opportunity to serve God."

As already shown, if Calvinism were in fact true, there could be no such thing as an opportunity.

"The fields are white unto harvest..."

But if Calvinism were true, there is no harvest. The elect were saved in eternity past; the reprobate were damned in eternity past – and nothing can change that.

"...and yet the labourers are few."

So what? According to Calvinism, can any of the elect be lost? Can any of the reprobate be saved? The decrees of God are immutable, so even if there were no labourers at all, the elect would still be saved, and the reprobate would still be damned.

"There is a great reward awaiting for soul winners (Daniel 12:3)"

Which actually disproves Calvinism, because in Calvinism, there can be no such thing as a 'soul winner'. According to Calvinism, the souls of the elect have never been lost, and the souls of the reprobate have no chance of being won.

Also, the idea of a reward is meaningless if there's no free will. Should a robot be rewarded for doing what it was programmed to do?

"...but even if there wasn't, we would still labour just for the sheer joy of being in God's work and spreading His word."

But as has already been shown, the natural conclusion of Calvinism is that spreading God's word is a pointless exercise – it won't bring anyone to salvation. If this Calvinist wants to continue doing that which is pointless, so be it.

"7) Evangelism gives us an opportunity to bear reproach for the name of Christ."

But in Calvinism, there can't be such a thing as an opportunity.

"Paul witnessed to the gospel with much contention (1 Thessalonians 2:2) and whilst such is irksome to the flesh, yet the spiritual man rejoices every whit. Such were the Apostles (Acts 5:41). Obviously we do not set out to annoy, but we recognise that

the natural heart is going to kick hard against the message of Christ. If we have to bear reproach in our evangelism...then amen! 'So be it'"

Irrelevant. This doesn't provide a reason for evangelism within a Calvinistic worldview. Calvinists can evangelise all they want, or bear as much reproach as they want, but it won't change the fact that their own doctrine destroys any rational grounds for such actions.

"8) Far down our list, but there nevertheless, we evangelise because it nails the lie often uttered against us that Calvinism kills evangelistic endeavour."

But this completely misses the point of the charge against Calvinism (that it 'kills evangelistic endeavour'). The point of the charge is this: evangelism is not rationally consistent with the other teachings of Calvinism; it (evangelism) is a pointless exercise if the other teachings of Calvinism are anything to go by.

One cannot 'nail the lie' by evangelising – the issue isn't that Calvinists don't evangelise. The only way to 'nail the lie' is by demonstrating how evangelism is rationally consistent with the other teachings of Calvinism. The issue is not with the practice of Calvinists *per se*, but rather with the philosophy of Calvinism. The issue has never been about whether Calvinists do or don't evangelise. The issue is that within a Calvinistic worldview, evangelism is irrational, as it is inconsistent with the other teachings of Calvinism.

Calvinists can do all the evangelising they like, but it won't 'nail the lie' – it won't change the fact that evangelism is without foundation within the Calvinistic worldview.

"Why should it?"

Calvinism 'kills evangelistic endeavour' not in the sense that Calvinists don't evangelise, but rather in the sense that within a Calvinistic worldview, evangelism is pointless. One wonders if this Calvinist has even thought about the natural consequences of his belief.

"The doctrine of predestination is the only grounds of evangelism."

This is patently false, as has been shown throughout this refutation. The doctrine of predestination, as defined by Calvinism, destroys any rational grounds for evangelism. In Calvinism:

- There is no field white unto harvest;
- There is no such thing as a soul winner;
- There is no chance of the gospel having any affect on the souls of anyone.

"If God did not predestine folk out of their sins to be saved, then no one would be saved."

Case closed. Think about it: the Calvinist is admitting that salvation only depends on predestination. In Calvinism, evangelism plays no part in the salvation of souls. I rest my case.

“The non Calvinist says that if there were no faith, then there would be no predestination because the latter (which is God’s work) is totally and absolutely dependent on the former which is due ultimately to man’s decision.”

If by this it is meant that without faith there will be no predestination *for the faithless person*, then I agree.

“The Calvinist says that if there were no predestination, then there would be no faith because the latter (which is man’s responsibility) flows from the former.”

But for this, there is no Scriptural support. There is not one Scripture verse which says, or even implies that an unsaved person has been predestined to salvation, nor is there one which says or implies that predestination comes before faith. The Scriptures *always* put faith before salvation and predestination, no exceptions.

“Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God (Romans 10:17) and the word of God comes to sinners through gospel preachers (Romans 10:13-16).”

True, but irrelevant. The issue at hand is this: evangelism is not rationally consistent with the other teachings of Calvinism.

---

So our Calvinist friend had eight chances (yes, there is such a thing as chance) to provide a reason as to how evangelism is a rationally defensible exercise within the context of a Calvinistic worldview, yet he could provide **none**. Every single argument that was put forward...

1. Was irrational, when viewed in light of the other teachings of Calvinism, and
2. Evaded the real issue.