

At the Synod of Dort they answered the Five points of Arminianism. So to call these the Five Points of Calvinism as if that ^{what was} was/important about Calvinism is without historical foundation. There are certain points at which Arminianism is denied by Calvinism but Calvinism has many points in it. To pick up these ~~5~~ five and the answers were stated by the Sy~~h~~od of Dort in rather strong language but it did not use this terminology which is used now. I don't know when that started. I'm just wondering. Since it was done in Holland originally and written in Latin and in Dutch, how did we come to get an English acrostic with the word TULIP? I just wish somebody could find when that thing started, because people talk about the Five Point Calvinists, and it is not a proper term. They should say, I deny the Five Points of Arminianism. I believe a proper presentation of Calvinism-- well, the Synod of Dort did not present them in this order in the first place. I don't think it's a logical order necessarily, and I don't think it arranges them inproper emphasis. When you say the atonement is sufficient for all and efficient for t he elect, all you are saying is that you believe in substitutionary atonement. Because if He was their substitute, they must be saved. You don't believe everybody is saved, so why make a big fight over it?

We had a man come in here yesterday (I certainly don't want this ^{quoted} in any public way) but this man came and he's a teacher in a fine Bible College which sends us quite a few students and he came here and he said, I'm looking for another position, and he said I'm a Five Point Calvinist. He said (because of that, Dallas Seminary from which I got a Doctor's degree will not recommend me.) He said, (They won't recommend me to other schools and churches because I'm a Five Point Calvinist. But, he said, (Their statement of doctrine doesn't say anything about the atonement), he said.