

Jesus fulfilling around 300 prophecies from the Old Testament is a significant point for many Christians. It's seen as a demonstration of God's sovereign plan, showing how meticulously and precisely God has orchestrated the narrative of human history to bring about the salvation of mankind through Jesus Christ.

These prophecies include specific details about Jesus' birth, life, ministry, death, and resurrection, ranging from His birth in Bethlehem as foretold in Micah 5:2, to His suffering and death described in Isaiah 53. The fulfillment of these prophecies is not only proof of Jesus' identity as the Messiah but also as evidence of the Bible's divine inspiration and reliability.

This view encourages believers to trust in God's overarching plan and promises, affirming that nothing happens outside of God's knowledge and control.

Reconciling the concept of predestination with free will is indeed one of the more complex theological issues within Christianity. Determining which theological perspective on predestination and free will is the most logically consistent can be challenging, as it often depends on individual interpretations of scripture, philosophical inclinations, and theological priorities. However, I can provide a brief analysis of how each major view handles the logical consistency of divine sovereignty and human freedom:

1. **Calvinism:** Calvinism presents a strong logical framework where God's sovereignty is absolute, ensuring that all events occur according to divine decree. The logical strength here is in its systematic approach to God's control over all events, including individual salvation. This perspective emphasizes God's sovereignty and predestination, suggesting that God has preordained everything that happens, including who will be saved. Calvinists often refer to this as "unconditional election," where God's grace and selection are not based on any inherent merit or decision of the individual. This view is often seen as logically consistent in terms of divine sovereignty. It maintains a strong stance on God's control and initiative in all aspects of creation and salvation, ensuring that God's purposes are always fulfilled. However, critics argue that it struggles to account for human moral responsibility and the genuine offer of salvation to all people and it might be seen as logically inconsistent with the observable autonomy in human decisions and the moral responsibility attributed to humans in everyday life.

2. **Arminianism:** Arminians stress human free will. They argue that God's predestination is based on His foreknowledge of who would choose to accept salvation. In this view, while God's sovereignty is not diminished, human beings have the genuine capacity to accept or reject God's invitation to salvation. Arminianism is praised for maintaining a balance between God's sovereignty and human free will. It supports the logical consistency of a relational God who responds to human choices, which enhances the meaningfulness of human decisions and moral responsibility. Yet, some suggest it might diminish the absolute sovereignty of God by making His plans contingent on human actions. This perspective logically aligns with everyday observations of human decision-making and accountability. It suggests that while God is sovereign, He allows human choices to influence the future, which is consistent with our experiences of choice and consequences. However, from a strictly logical standpoint, it might seem to introduce a potential contradiction in how an omniscient God could be genuinely responsive to human actions without having predetermined them.

3. **Open Theism:** This more modern approach suggests that God has given humans free will to such an extent that He does not control or know the future in its entirety. Open Theists believe this allows for a more dynamic relationship between God and creation. This approach is seen as enhancing the logical consistency of human freedom and making sense of the problem of evil and suffering by positing limits on God's knowledge of future free will decisions. However, it's often criticized for potentially undermining traditional notions of God's omniscience and omnipotence. From a logical and analytical perspective, this view might appeal due to its consistency with the unpredictability and apparent randomness observed in natural and human systems. It posits that the future is not entirely determined, which aligns with principles in quantum mechanics and other areas where outcomes are probabilistic rather than deterministic. However, it challenges traditional theological views of God's omniscience.

4. **Molinism:** Molinism attempts to reconcile divine sovereignty and human free will by suggesting that God knows all possible outcomes in every possible scenario (called "middle knowledge") and thus sovereignly orchestrates history through those free will decisions. Molinism is arguably one of the more philosophically sophisticated attempts to reconcile divine

sovereignty with human free will, using the concept of middle knowledge. It allows for a high view of God's providence and detailed foreknowledge while affirming genuine human freedom. Critics of Molinism sometimes argue that the concept of middle knowledge is speculative and not explicitly biblical. Molinism might be the most appealing to a logic-driven analysis because it introduces a sophisticated solution—God's middle knowledge—that allows for a coherent integration of divine omniscience with genuine human freedom. It logically maintains God's sovereignty while upholding the reality of free will, avoiding direct causation of all human actions by God, thus sidestepping the problem of evil being directly attributed to divine will.

In a purely logical analysis, Molinism may present the most balanced approach by providing a structured way to reconcile divine foreknowledge with human freedom, reducing conflicts between God's knowledge and human agency. This might be why it could appear as the most logically consistent to an analytical or robotic mindset, as it systematically addresses the interaction between divine and human actions without reducing the reality of either.

Each of these perspectives tries to uphold the scriptural themes of God's sovereign control over history and the genuine responsibility and freedom of individuals. People often find themselves leaning towards the explanation that best resonates with their reading of Scripture and their experiences.

I believe that when it comes to salvation we should all be Calvinist, and I reject the notion that a Calvinistic perspective on salvation is an unloving forceful act. Here is why:

A profound aspect of Christian theology—is that God, in His mercy and love, intervenes in our lives, rescuing us from sin and **death**. This view emphasizes God's active role in salvation, illustrating it not merely as an offer but as a powerful act of redemption.

The imagery of God reaching out and pulling us into life vividly expresses the Biblical concept found in Ephesians 2:4-5, where it says, "But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which he loved us, even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ

—by grace you have been saved." This passage highlights that it's God's action, while we were still powerless, that brings about our spiritual revival.

In this perspective, the "Day of the Lord" and God's judgment are seen not only as fearsome because of His justice but also as the culmination of His plan for redemption for those who are in Christ. It's a dual-edged sword: a fearful reality for those who remain in rebellion against God and a day of ultimate vindication and joy for those who have been brought to life through faith in Christ.

Thus, the force of God's action is both just and loving—it's just because it rightly deals with sin and loving because it provides a way out through Jesus Christ, not based on our merit but solely on His grace. This duality of justice and mercy, wrath and grace, is central to understanding the complex character of God as depicted in the Scriptures.

Where I tend to stray from Calvinism is after salvation. I do not deny the reality of human free will, I equate it to obedience and disobedience, thus reaping reward or consequential wrath. After salvation, the process of sanctification (becoming more like Christ) involves human will interacting with divine grace. I recognize that believers are called to obey God's commandments and to live righteously. The choices made by a believer to follow God's commands are seen as evidence of their salvation and the work of the Holy Spirit within them.

While salvation is not earned by good works or lost by bad works, the New Testament does speak of rewards in heaven being tied to how we live out our faith on earth (1 Corinthians 3:12-15). Similarly, there are natural and spiritual consequences for disobedience, such as the loss of fellowship with God and disciplinary measures from God, though not loss of salvation.

While the ultimate destiny regarding salvation is secured by God's choice, individuals exercise free will in their daily decisions to follow God's will or to sin. The exercise of this will is what leads to the practical, temporal outcomes of obedience or disobedience. This approach tries to balance God's control over eternal destinies with a genuine call to ethical living and personal responsibility in the Christian life.