

2

after the good news?

Is it just a matter of timing that offends you or is it so much more with our (what we believe is the biblical) approach) Gospel presentation that you disagree with?

When we meet again (or hopefully when you meet our leader guide of F.O.M. ~~James~~ ^{James} ~~Merette~~ ^{Merette}) I'd ^{or sign wood} like to hear exactly more in detail what you or 'the story' believe.

Questions 1 Who is God?

2) Would you consider Jesus God?

3) How does one get to Heaven? Your take on the gospel?

4) Is the Christian faith restrictive or inclusive? Your opinion!

In other words do you believe that we all believe in the same God ^{but} only by a different name - in Christianity God is Jesus; Islam - Allah, Buddha in Buddhism, new age - we are all gods etc. etc.?

5) Are all religions the same in essence, and they'd all get us to heaven (or whatever) as long as we have Christian virtues such as being good, loving and helping others and even loving God wherever He (or maybe even she) is - that's sufficient to get us to Heaven on the basis that a moral virtuous life equates to the same or even is as 'accepting Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour'?

That salvation is not so much an acceptance of a person, but more (in your ^{possible} opinion perhaps) an acceptance of virtue or a positive lifestyle girded in a belief of some unique supernatural being - but not necessarily Jesus or the God of the Bible?

Can a dedicated Muslim go to heaven in your opinion, who portrays a good moral lifestyle?

Remember if one could get to heaven any other way or in addition to Christ then it was unnecessary for Jesus to die for our sins. Right?

Nevertheless if I suspect from our conversation that to lead people ^{to} a personal relationship ^{to Christ} we can skip sin, judgement, personal repentance, hell (negatives); instead, get people to realize their worthiness and realization of the Divine (whatever that is) we have to disagree with you, for that's not

①

Harry De Boer
May 26, 2012

Dear Nathan:

(In reference to our conversation ^{tri-cord} ^{this} ^(me) on Sunday - Melissa, Harry + yourself)

It was most interesting and informative to be at 'The story', and you may have a point as to how we approach people with the gospel or tactic being used, yet it is something I'll be pondering and praying about, with the thought in no wise should the gospel message be toned or watered down, but as you related to me we might be scaring people off before they hear the good news. You rightly stated ~~out~~ we (Fishers of Men) do tell people of first sin, judgment and hell which is the purpose to convict to lead one to Christ, but as you stated to me in our tri-cord conversation you see it as driving or scaring people of too soon, before hearing the good news. Do I understand you correctly on that point?

In other words should it only be a ~~be~~ difference of tact (or approach), but not one of substance?

In other words on theology + doctrine we see eye to eye?

On to put it this way if we agree on the fundamentals of the gospel as I suspect you would (or at least should) if you were a true adherent to Bethel Pentacostal, ^{doctrine} then you would have to agree that sooner or later an unbelieving individual has to be confronted with the 'Truth' of the gospel of one's sin; need for repentance from sin (see my booklet 'the most prevalent delusion of mankind especially the part of change of heart, attitude, mind and intentions; and trusting Jesus alone to salvation. If we are in agreement on that point (of either sooner or later) then you should have no objection if we reverse the order of sharing the so called 'positive loving' news first and then speak of sin, hell, judgment etc right

(3)

But if I'm wrong or that my suspicion are unwarranted, I now sincerely apologize.

So hopefully we are on the same page doctrinally and spiritually - one in Christ as brothers in the Lord - who is Jesus Christ!!!

If only a difference of strategy, personally I'm going to consider ~~ing~~ for practical reasons to within the span of 5 minutes to articulate the positive side of the gospel first - salvation then close with the sin or 'so called' negative side. I can see the point of that, as people are walking by many of them hear only the bad story and as you said not being able to hear the gospel - good side. Nevertheless there's really not a big difference, ^{is the above} so that admittedly we as F.O.M still believe its only right and biblical to confront humanity of their sin on the soon side, not first (as you propose) to 1st build up a relationship (5 year period or so) and somehow automatically those you disciple will become christians - or as you stated the Holy Spirit will see to that, without them (the disciples) ever hearing the need of repentance and the reality of hell etc.

Now it is true the Holy Spirit does make the change but not in a vacuum (except for very rare occasions); but mostly He uses us as His spoke persons to declare the oracles of God in truth which includes the whole gospel of sin, hell to salvation - the whole bit - not a wishy washy make me feel good gospel leaving out the unpleasant truth.

Furthermore for very practical reasons the gospel must be given as soon as possible, for as Bible ^{says} now today is the acceptable time for salvation - for we don't know if we'll have a tomorrow due to death ^{and} unprepared to meet our maker. So time is of the essence. Then Nathan consider is it really going to make a difference whether one hears the bad news sooner or later? If they don't receive the truth now, 5 years or so will likely not make a difference - their hearts will still be hardened. Time doesn't necessarily change things - only God does! If one doesn't accept 1st call - its not likely he or she will accept calls later on. Plus consider the deceptiveness of your approach using or

