

Arminian Logic Fallacies

by

Roger Smalling, D.Min

Arminian fallacy one

God would not command us to do what we cannot perform.

God gave the Law to Moses, the Ten Commandments, to reveal what man *cannot* do, not what he *can* do without God and without grace.

The Law of Moses exposes sin to increase it so man would have no excuse for declaring his own righteousness. Romans Chapter Three declares that man does *no* righteousness.

Martin Luther said to Erasmus, “when you are finished with all your commands and exhortations from the Old Testament, I’ll write Romans 3:19-20 over the top of it all.”¹ Why refer to commands and exhortations from the Old Testament to prove free will when they were given to show man’s sinful inability to fulfill them?

God’s commands reveal what we *cannot* do rather than what we *can* do. Yes, God gave commands that mankind cannot obey. Therefore commandments and exhortations do not prove man’s ability or *free will*. The arminian assumption that a command to do a thing proves the ability to do it, is unscriptural.

There may be various reasons for commanding someone to do something. The purpose could be to show someone his *inability* to perform the command. This would underscore for that person his very need of help. From a mere command, therefore, *nothing* can be deduced about free will or human ability.

Arminian fallacy two

If not free, then not responsible

Arminians assume if we are unable to make a choice to the contrary, then our wills are not free. This is irrational because it assumes there is such a thing as moral neutrality.

The entire idea of neutrality of will is absurd. If the person’s *nature* does not determine the decisions of the will, in what sense do such decisions represent the person himself? How could be a decision be a truly moral one if it is morally neutral? Can morality be morality at all and be neutral?

According to Scripture, freedom is described as holiness. The *ultimate* freedom is *absolute* holiness. If that is true, then God is the most *free* being in the universe. Otherwise, we must say

God is the most *enslaved* being in the universe because he is the one least neutral on moral issues.

Likewise, if we assume that bondage of will eliminates responsibility, then the best way to avoid responsibility for our sins to be as bound by them as much as possible. The drunk bound by alcoholism is therefore not responsible for his actions. Should we encourage people to sin more, so they are no longer responsible?

Arminian fallacy three

For love to be real, it must have the possibility of being rejected

We often hear that God wants us to love him freely, not by compulsion. He is a gentleman and will not impose himself on anyone. They conclude that fallen man must have the *ability* to love God. He simply *chooses* to love other things.

Scripture teaches love for God is a product of His grace. (1Timothy 1:14) If grace is necessary to make us love God, it follows we were unable to love him before grace came. It also shows that grace is not given because we chose to love God. Grace takes the initiative. We chose to love God because grace is given, not because of a virtue or ability foreseen in man.

This premise is similar to fallacy one, that God would not command what we cannot perform. Does God give the saints in heaven an opportunity to hate him so to be fair? Did Jesus have some ability to hate the Father? Or was His love for the Father a reflection of what He really is?

Since faith is a gift of grace, should it be strange to think love must be also a gift of grace?

Arminian fallacy four

A person cannot be responsible or punished for what he cannot help

If this is the case, a Christian may not be rewarded for what his new nature, through the fruit of the Spirit, *compels* him to do. The nature of a person is not a thing he *possesses*. It is something he *is*.

Smalling's books are available for [KINDLE](#)

¹ Luther, Martin. Bondage of the Will.