

Dear congregation , the following is a response we received from Rev. Guichelaar regarding the accusations set forth in the pdf file that was attached.

Please review , as Rev. Guichelaar wanted all to know his response to the accusations.

Regards, ray

Dear Ray,

Thanks for sharing with me those two pdfs. I skimmed through the one pdf entitled "A History of the Controversy" and was surprised to see a paragraph about me. I want you to know that when the article quotes from my sermon, it only quotes half of the significant material, and as a result, it quotes completely out of context.

I'm not going to go listen to my sermon on sermonaudio and get the words "word for word" but as my notes have it, and as I am sure I spoke it, the way I spoke it was like this:

"And the point I am making is this: If a person is regenerated, then that person shouldn't just make the blanket statement, 'I am totally depraved.' That's not proper. And really, it is refusal to acknowledge the wonder of God's transforming work of regeneration. And then you are on the path to becoming an antinomian. *A regenerated child of God may not make the simple, blanket statement, 'I am totally depraved.' What we have to say is this: 'I am totally depraved, by nature. Left to myself.' But you see: that's not all that I am. In fact, that's not ultimately how I must identify myself. I must, in the end, identify myself as a regenerated child of God, who has been engrafted into Jesus Christ. I have been made a new creature. I have been raised from spiritual death. I have been born again! I have been given a new heart!"* (The part underlined was left out of the quotation.)

What is in italics was left out of the quotation in the article, and by leaving it out, the quotation portrays me as one who teaches that a man is not totally depraved *by nature*. But I expressly state that very truth immediately after. The comments in blue that are given in the article that are meant to positively explain the truth of total depravity are absolutely no different than what I immediately go on to say in my sermon. What the article does is intentionally portray me as teaching against the truth of total depravity, and totally ignores the context of my words and the positive instruction I was giving concerning the truth of regeneration. This is a gross mistreatment of my sermon, and dishonest. That's not proper leadership or behavior in the church of Jesus Christ.

If this is what the article does with my sermon, I can only imagine that it is doing very similar things with other sermons, taking sentences out of context to paint a picture of unfaithfulness to Reformed doctrine. I would advise that you read that article with great discernment - and even skepticism. It did not give me an honest treatment of my preaching, or my teaching, but did the opposite.

I just read the words this morning: "Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." (1 Peter 2:23)

God give you much overflowing grace and strength to act uprightly in days of great dishonesty. May God give His sheep much wisdom and grace in Wingham.

In Christ,
Erik