

## Why can't you Christians just accept that everyone has the right to choose their own way to God!?

The above “question” is one of the best ones I have found to depict the present aversion of our culture to the exclusivity of Christ.

On YouTube, a celebrity vehemently attacked Christianity with the above “question,” as she danced across the stage, waving her arms and shouting. Of course, this was an attack, not a question. She was not interested in answers.

I thought about this for several days and concluded that the statement embodies presuppositions about God and man that are themselves exclusive, woefully unrealistic and easily refuted.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Hidden assumption**

The question assumes that God would be pleased with a variety of ways to approach him. On what basis can we assume that he wants to be approached at all?

The assumption that God wants to be approached is indeed central to Christian thinking. However, Christianity is precisely what the question challenges. To use that as a platform to refute Christianity is circular reasoning.

### **Separation problem**

Wishing God to provide a variety of ways for humanity to approach him is like asking a doctor to provide wheelchairs for the dead.

The Bible makes it emphatically clear that without the grace of God, people are dead in their sins. Not weak. Not debilitated. DEAD.

*Death* is one of several metaphors used to describe a sinner's total inability to will or do anything to further their salvation. Other metaphors are *blindness*, *deafness*, and *hardness of heart*.

Yes, we all have a mind and a will. Without a special work of God's grace, we are under the control of sin. Without this grace, a person has no ability to find God and is deluded to suppose he does.

This makes the question meaningless. What does it matter if there is one way or a thousand ways if people cannot respond to any of them?

Although people reject the Bible as ultimate authority, they generally agree that everyone has sinned and fallen short of what God requires. <sup>1</sup>



So if a sinner has the insight to know what is spiritually good and right, why did he sin in the first place?

I noticed the word "right" in the question. The right to choose and the ability to choose correctly are different.

## **Autonomy**

Surprisingly, we agree on one part of the above question. Mankind in general is separated from God. It would be pointless to discuss ways to come to God if no such separation existed.

What is the cause of this separation? The Christian answer lies in the word *autonomy*, which comes from two words: *auto*, "self," and *nomos*, "law. It means to be a law unto oneself; an illegitimate form of independence. There are legitimate forms of independence, but not in relation to God. He is ultimate authority.

The question presupposes autonomy as a starting point. It assumes we have an inherent right to choose how to come to God, while at the same time rejecting God's right as ultimate authority to reveal how we should come. If God is supreme authority, then autonomy is not a legitimate starting point.

If God were to provide a variety of ways for us to approach him, that would make us autonomous, and he will never tolerate that.

Logically, autonomy from God is the ultimate sin because all other sins flow from it. This sin is a platform on which people build their lives, and the whole thing is destined for God's judgment.

So it turns out that saying God has a variety of ways to come to him is asking him to approve of our favorite sin. That's not going to happen.

## **Identity**

Imagine five men standing before us, all claiming to be messengers from God. They represent different versions of God and contradictory messages. They can't all be right. How do we choose? We might say, "I choose number two because mom likes him. Or, "Number four makes me feel good, so he must be right."

Such a response would be superficial at best and bigotry at worst. This is how some perceive Christians. They see us as bigoted because we choose one, Jesus of Nazareth, over others.

Let's change the scenario. Of the five who claim to be messengers of God, let's say that one of them is actually God himself in human form. What would that make the other four? False messengers, of course.

That is why Christians hold to Jesus as exclusive of all others. He is more than a messenger. He is the message itself, incarnate. He said *The Father and I are one.*

2

It makes little sense to say, "I prefer another way to God than God himself." If a person has that attitude, it is not God he is seeking. Jesus is Lord of all or not Lord at all.

## **Why Christianity must be excluded**

If a person creates a list of ways to approach God, they must remove Christianity. Why?

The founder of Christianity, Jesus, said: *No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him. And I will raise him up on the last day. And he said, "This is why I told you that no one can come to me unless it is granted him by the Father."*<sup>3</sup>

Two of his key followers echoed this. Peter said, *And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.*<sup>4</sup>

Paul, the writer of most of the books of the New Testament said, *For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, 1 Timothy 2:5*

If Jesus was wrong about being the only way, then this excludes Christianity altogether.

God is not in the business of providing religions. In fact, we can even say he did not give Christianity either. Why?

When we say that Christianity is true, we mean that God has simply described what exists, both in the physical and spiritual realms. The term "Christianity" is not found in the Bible. We have invented the word to summarize God's description of reality. Instead of the word "Christianity," the Scriptures use another term: TRUTH.

## **Where is truth found?**

A final presupposition is that truth in religion is merely a matter of personal perspective, relative to the individual and therefore not absolute. Christians reject this premise, not because they are Christians, but because they are rational. If truth is merely a matter of personal perspective and not absolute, then what about the statement that truth is merely a matter of personal perspective? Is that absolute?

If the source of truth is in man, where does that put God? It puts him out the window. Ironically, the question posed is really atheism in disguise. The question is irrational at its root.

## **Where does all this lead?**

Fortunately, all this is not the end of the story.

*But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which he loved us,<sup>5</sup> even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ—by grace you have been saved... For by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God,<sup>9</sup> not a result of works, so that no one may boast.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Romans 3:23

<sup>2</sup> John 10:30

<sup>3</sup> John 6:45,65

<sup>4</sup> Acts 4:12