

Be, he said, they insist that because I believe in limited atonement that they won't recommend me. Well, it makes me wonder-- I did not argue with him at all. But he thought he could come to us and maybe we could find him a place. But it made me wonder how he's been expressing his belief. Whether he's be taking an attitude like this. It's sad.

Neher: We're left now with a sort of existing terminology which everybody is used to as far as the Five Points of Calvinism is concerned.

AAM: That is very unfortunate. How did it get started? How is it so strong? You say we are left with it. There is ~~this~~ group of Reformed Baptists. They are very <sup>it</sup> strong. They are the <sup>most</sup> strongest, ultra in emphasizing these things. But I'm just wondering just how widespread is that terminology which is ~~arecent~~ terminology and not a correct terminology. How widespread is it? If it's so well established <sup>that</sup> there is nothing we can do about it, we'll have to face the fact. But <sup>perhaps</sup> if we can bring out the fact that it is not a proper terminology and do something about it that way. <sup>That's</sup> That's a matter of strategy <sup>(?)</sup> As you see, <sup>(3)</sup> I'd like to know where it started? How wide spread it is? It's no use making an attack on the terminology if it's so widely used that you won't get anywhere. On the other hand, if it is possible to clarify it I think good would be done. I wish people wouldn't use it. I am against the Five Points of Arminianism, but to say I'm a Five Point Calvinist is not a proper picture of Calvinism.

There is a book called the Five Points of Calvinism (which J. Green got out which) no, I don't know if that's the one he got out which is made up -- I was thinking of another one--Steele and Thomas, a book he got out it may have been called the Five Points of Calvinism-- It has various authors from the Puritans.