

The Sovereignty of God vs. The Myth of Autonomy

Introduction

The modern evangelical consensus often frames the relationship between divine sovereignty and human responsibility as an impenetrable “paradox,” suggesting that Scripture presents two equally valid, yet contradictory, sides of a coin. This posture, epitomized by [the document](#) at the bottom of this webpage, prioritizes ecumenical harmony over sound hermeneutics. By attempting to validate “Free Will” theology as a legitimate counterpart to the doctrine of election, this approach obscures the foundational biblical truth that salvation is a monergistic work of God—meaning it is initiated, sustained, and completed by Him alone, independent of human merit or the autonomous “will” of the natural man.

The Fallacy of the “Paradox”

The document argues that because Scripture contains commands to believe alongside statements of God’s decree, these must represent a “paradox” where both divine sovereignty and human autonomy coexist. This is a category error. While God is sovereign and man is responsible, “responsibility” does not imply “autonomy.”

- **Biblical Correction:** Paul’s argument in Romans 9:16 is absolute: “So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.” The document claims that human “will” is a factor in

salvation, yet Scripture declares the natural man is “dead in trespasses and sins” (Ephesians 2:1). A spiritually dead person lacks the capacity to choose spiritual life; therefore, the “will” referenced in Scripture as being active in salvation is the *regenerated will*, which acts only after God has performed the work of quickening.

The Distortion of Human Response

The [provided document](#) cites verses like 2 Peter 3:9 (“not wanting anyone to perish”) and Joshua 24:15 (“choose for yourselves”) to argue for a universal, resistible grace. This ignores the covenantal context.

- **Biblical Correction:** The “whosoever will” of the Gospel is not a challenge to divine sovereignty but an invitation to the elect. When Jesus laments over Jerusalem, He is expressing the righteous judgment of a King whose invitations were rejected by those who—by their own nature—hated the light (John 3:19). God’s “desire” for all to be saved, in the context of 1 Timothy 2:4, refers to the breadth of His salvific intent across all nations and classes of people, not a failed attempt to save every individual who has ever lived. The “resistance” to the Holy Spirit mentioned in Acts 7:51 is the pattern of the stiff-necked, not the frustration of God’s decree.

The Sovereignty of the Call

The document posits that the Great Commission assumes human

ability, and that without free will, evangelism is futile. This is a pragmatic argument, not a biblical one.

- **Biblical Correction:** Evangelism is not a negotiation with the dead; it is the proclamation of the Gospel—the “power of God unto salvation” (Romans 1:16). We preach because we do not know the elect, and it is through the hearing of the word that the Spirit brings the sheep to life (Romans 10:17). In Acts 13:48, the text explicitly links the response to the decree: “as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.” The belief is the *result* of the ordination, not the cause.
-

The Remnant and the Failure of Egalitarian Soteriology

The document suggests that choosing between “predestination” and “free will” is a matter of personal walk. This minimizes the gravity of the Gospel.

- **Biblical Correction:** The “remnant” theology of Romans 11:5 confirms that God’s saving work is always specific, never universal. By suggesting that God’s plan is “restricted” to the elect, we uphold the integrity of the Cross. If Christ died for every human being without exception, and some of those people perish, then the atonement is a failure. But if Christ died to secure the salvation of His people—the true Israel—then His work is complete, successful, and glorifying to the Father.
-

Conclusion

The “paradox” presented in the document is a human-made veil designed to preserve the dignity of the natural man. It is an unbiblical framework that subordinates God’s absolute decree to the “choices” of fallen, rebellious creatures. When we strip away the desire for human-centered comfort, we are left with the stark, glorious reality of Scripture: Salvation is not a product of human negotiation, but a sovereign inheritance granted to the remnant whom God foreknew, predestinated, called, justified, and glorified. [To rely on the autonomy of the human will is to reject the sufficiency of the Cross](#) and the reality of the New Covenant.

Predestination vs. Free Will

