

No matter how much the wicked seems to be accomplishing if he is doing it with a heart that is antagonistic to God, there is nothing that can win God's favor. But I don't think the term "total depravity" conveys that idea". It conveys false ideas. Of course it is also true that the depravity that is a result of sin extends to every part of our nature. You have to explain that. The term total depravity doesn't give that to people.

Then you take the second one, Unconditional Election. I that is definitely misleading because Unconditional Election sounds as if God said, Let's grab a few here; these we will save; these we will dam. Of course that is an utterly unworthy idea of the character of God! God's election has conditions. He has reasons for what He does. He knows exactly what He wants to do and he does it not with blind unreasoning will, but with reasonable purpose involved. So what is meant when they said unconditional election is that it is not the result of any goodness in us, that God saves us. It is not because He sees something good in me, that I have sense enough to say yes. It is not because of what I do, but it is ^{because of} conditions in God's mind. ^{It is} a reasonable thing--^{DH} this election. That term gives an utterly false impression!

Limited Atonement I think is ^{an} utterly false ^{term} Dr. Buswell used to prefer Particular Atonement. Of course, but it seems to me if you believe in substitutionary atonement it is particular per se. If Jesus died for those who are saved, it is particular per se. I don't see why you have to make a specific term of it. I don't see there's anything gained by that. It was sufficient for all, so it's universal in a way. It is efficient for the elect. I don't think any Christian living that I know of believes it is efficient for everybody! So I don't see what's gained by using a term Limited there.