

THE WHOLE NATURE OF GOD IN THE PREDESTINATION DILEMMA

Pangeran Manurung

Evangelical Theological Seminary of Indonesia – Surabaya
E-mail: Pangeranmanurung@sttii-surabaya.ac.id

Abstract

The problem in this paper lies in the polemic that arises in the understanding of double predestination, especially regarding the theological dilemmas in it. On the one hand, God is described as a cruel and inhuman God when only choosing some people to be saved, and on the other hand Christian doctrine recognizes that God does indeed choose some people to love. The purpose of writing this essay is to prove that a comprehensive approach can reduce theological dilemmas and conflicts when discussing the formulation of predestination. The research method used is literature study, by describing the core of Calvin's double predestination and reviewing it by involving the interrelated attributes of God. The results of this study prove that when the concept of predestination is reviewed by involving the attributes of God as a whole, it appears that God cannot be called an arrogant God when choosing humans in the project of salvation.

Keywords: *Dilemma, Predestination, Nature of God, Whole*

INTRODUCTION

There are theological dilemmas that arise when discussing predestination, especially double predestination. In a previous literature review, Leibniz [1] tried to examine and discuss the topic of predestination using the proper theological approach. As a result, he proves that the problem of double predestination must be approached by describing the attributes of God and His whole creation. He proposed a systematic theology approach and introduced the concept of "a God who is not only sovereign" in the process of

predestination. Although he had tried to approach the polemic of predestination by considering God's "moderate" principle, Leibniz's conclusion still gave birth to a theological dilemma that was felt to be unsatisfactory and needed to be developed.

The purpose of this essay is to clarify Leibniz's theory of the concept of "wholeness" of God when choosing sinful humans to be saved. In addition to considering Leibniz's ideas, this discussion also presents research on the concept of predestination from aspects of God's whole creation.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research method used in this paper is literature study. The intended literature study approach takes the form of a study of Calvin's version of the double predestination polemic in some previous literature by developing the "God-bound principle of many attributes" principle. Regarding the theological dilemma of double predestination, the middle ground proposed by the author uses the Leibniz approach which discusses the theological dilemma referred to as a description of logism. In the beginning, this paper will attach the theological dilemmas that arise in the conversation of double predestination, then describe the nature of God as a material consideration when studying the theological dilemma in question.

DISCUSSION

Discussion of the predestination dilemma in this paper covers aspects; First, the theological dilemmas arising from the idea of double predestination. Second, how Calvin's response to the theological dilemma was intended. Third, the study of predestination theological dilemmas using the approach described earlier.

MULTIPLE THEOLOGICAL DILEMMA PREDESTINATIONS

The main theological controversy on this issue lies in God's determination of the salvation of some people and the rejection of some, which indirectly gives rise to two things. First; God is arbitrary. Second; humans only live destiny. This led to the emergence of doubt the principle of "notio completa" or individual perfection, both in the sight of God and in terms of human existence. [2] Further questions from the two problems above will increase. Not only complex, the resulting dilemma also tends to be difficult to reconcile. It is difficult to reason, why a God of grace decides to choose and reject His own creation. Leibniz called these two things a "gift for some" [3]. The dilemmas that arise from the two outlines of the problem in question are as follows;

First, the dilemma of God's Will and the Fall of sin. In double predestination, God's will is the cause of everything and its relationship to Reprobation - the Fall of sin. For Calvin, Predestination and Reprobation are two things that are in the will of God. The will and determination of God is the sole cause of everything that exists. If so,

why is the responsibility of sin thrown to humans? [4] If sin is the responsibility of humans [5], does that not contradict the phrase "the decree of God is the cause of everything"? [6] Some cases in the Bible are ultimately difficult to solve if using this approach. [7]

Second, the dilemma of human predestination and will. Double predestination gave birth to 3 logistical choices of God which were forced to be chronological. The three forms of election are Supralapsarian, Infralapsarian, and sublapsarian. These three things have different emphases but together have the conclusion that God planned or fixed sin. If God determines sin, then naturally He is making people to sin. Questions that follow it; human sinful means out of consciousness or beyond human will. If so, how could humans be labeled sinful if the event was God's creation and project? This dilemma leads to the concept of judgment, "God justly punishes some innocent human beings". In predestination, human free will is ignored. But in the aspect of punishment, man's free will is the only reason from God. Double predestination is not consistent in positioning free will.

Third, the dilemma of partial

salvation and the wholeness of the Attributes of Allah. If God chooses or determines a portion to perish, then He is wanting destruction in His eternal plan. Part of the nature of God's holiness can be questioned in this section. If God only considers selection based on His willingness in the past, then the aspect of His omniscience for the things done by His creation in the future is also questionable. If God only emphasizes His glory, then the other qualities are not accommodated.

Fourth, the dilemma about God without consideration. Does God determine both groups of His choices by considering something? For example good and bad? If in His omniscience all humans sin, why does God consider the way of salvation. Why does God consider the existence of heaven and hell. Why in the creation there are certain considerations but in the selection there are no considerations presented? [8]

Fifth, the dilemma between predestination and faith. The relationship between Predestination - Faith - Guarantee of Salvation also leaves a theological dilemma. Calvin said that someone who talked about predestination was entering the "zone of faith". [9] Logic on one side;

predestination is a cause of faith. On the other hand; faith is needed to understand the secret of predestination. Is predestination two-way (understanding election by faith) or one-way (election is the cause of everything)? In other words, is the new provision of God really reliable at the end of one's faith journey?

In a simple question, does election depend on faith or does election produce faith or does election received / executed by faith? If faith is also a gift, how or in what ways do humans accept faith? Receive faith without faith? In relation to salvation, what is the most correct order (Election - Faith - Congratulations)?

Sixth, dilemma between Predestination - preaching the gospel - progressive sanctification. Predestination as Predestination makes the stage of sanctification of experience or "progressive sanctification" which should be a part of humans become unimportant or relevant. Predestination eliminates the human part because anything done by humans is only an encouragement from God. If predestination compels a person to believe, then the implications certainly extend to this aspect. Predestination also actually makes the position of faith and

preaching the gospel biased.

Seventh, the dilemma between partial salvation and creation. The double predestination believed that God planned to save some. So the question about, "If God wants everyone to be saved, why didn't God design Adam not to fall into sin"? become irrelevant. From the beginning, God was going to destroy some. So is the Trial Tree made by God in Genesis 3 an "absolute plan of God" in carrying out the vision of partial destruction?

The Predestination Dilemma: God's Unexplained Mysteries It

seems that Calvin's inability to answer some of the theological dilemmas above is covered by classical reasons, that humans are not able to understand the person and plan of God specifically. Thus, the predestination dilemma related to salvation above is referred to as unsolved theological mysteries. Such statements have been recognized by Calvin in his testimonies.

One of Calvin's ways of conveying the mystery of God in the concept of predestination is to explain the reasons or causes of salvation. Calvin concluded that there were four causes of salvation [10]. First; the will of God (God's will) which ensures that

His choice must be carried out (efficient cause). So anyone who is chosen must be saved. So "God's will" certainly gives birth to an "efficient cause". Second, the invisible effect of God's will gives birth to a "material cause" in Jesus Christ. Third; the application of the election of sinners is a gift (final cause). Fourth; The means to make gifts reach humans is through the preaching of the gospel (formal cause).

For Calvin, between Efficient Cause and Final Cause is still a mystery that can not be understood. The consideration of election as a guarantee of salvation for sinners is difficult to understand. The relationship between election which is an active act of God and salvation will give birth to the syllogism "because I was chosen, I am saved". Thus, the importance of Jesus Christ and the preaching of the gospel become insignificant in the process of salvation.

STUDY OF THE PREDESTINATION DILEMMA

As mentioned above, some theologians have tried to reconcile the theological conflicts of Calvinist Predestination and Arminius. The following discussion is one of the proposed middle ways.

First; Calvin only emphasizes God's election from one aspect; the choice of past or eternal aspects without considering the conditions of the creation which contain 3 dimensions; past, present, and future. Therefore, the concept of election only speaks from one angle of God's nature, namely eternal nature. This results in the conversation of predestination involving faith, the gospel, Jesus Christ, salvation, grace, and humans only from the past angle.

Second; Calvin only sees the predestination text without considering the logical side of God that is metaphysical and intact. The predestination texts do indeed contain the past (aoris), but the execution of God's eternal plan is certainly not only based on past considerations. God is bound by His attributes so that any decision He makes, must be based on reasonable considerations. The results of double predestination tend to emphasize some of God's attributes. If predestination texts are past, it is because the perpetrator is the eternal God. This approach will fill in the blanks of the two things in question.

The Sinus Source Dilemma: Between Establishing Sin and Providing a Solution to Sin

From God's aspect of self, it is necessary to see Him as a complete individual with perfect nature or character. God sees things from the point of view of the past - present - future. Likewise, God's creation is defined as a perfect individual. If seen from God's plan, human existence cannot be separated from aspects of the existence of "past - present - future".

God did not determine or force Adam to sin. Therefore, the test tree made by God is not a bridge to ensnare Adam into a fall. God who allows the fall of sin indeed at the same time has allowed the existence of condemnation or "time of corruption" as a result of the almighty nature inherent in Himself.

A God who is perfect in the nature of His love is in line with the nature of justice, thus providing salvation which is at the same time also referred to as "grace". Salvation and grace are inherent in Jesus and the Gospel. The just and omniscient nature of God is also in line so as to give birth to a punishment for a creation that rejects the path of salvation. Here is God's consideration of human acceptance and rejection. So that the salvation provided

by God is only suitable for those who want to receive it, and punishment is also suitable for those who reject it. This is the principle of "complete individual".

When did these things happen? In eternity. Is there an order? Because God works eternally, these things happen at one point. [11] In these events there is harmony between God's plan and human will. God's plan of salvation can be responded to by humans differently so that the list of chosen people by itself can be known. These events have two meanings. First; from the side of God has happened. Second; From the eternal side of man, it has not yet happened and is happening. Consequently, the term electoral (in the past) and the selection process (ongoing and ongoing) emerge.

The concept of a "whole" God like this can be a middle ground for the debate between supralapsarian and infralapsarian. God does all of His divine decisions not only in the order of time, but also in the order of nature or "*signation rationis*". In the law that he made, both the decision to allow the fall and the decision to punish or provide salvation occur simultaneously. This decree is total in nature so there is no stipulation containing "after or before".

The Dilemma of God's Sovereignty with Free Will

In the conversation about predestination, Augustine and Calvin rejected the existence of free will. But on the other hand believes there is free will in the topic of sin-punishment. [12] If using the author's approach, human free will is absolute [13]. That is consistent and in line with the full nature of God. In general goodness, God gives His creatures universally an opportunity to exercise their freedom.

Even when He knows that human freedom can lead to evil; with perfect wisdom, God designs humans with unique wills. Why is that? Because God can easily correct evil or provide solutions to sin. Then the uncivilized way [14] is not the best choice in the consideration of Allah. On the one hand God can not force people to only do what He wants, but on the other hand God also provides solutions to the damage caused by human free will.

Allah created man in a just condition. [15] The logical consequence, then God also gives justice in terms of providing salvation. If God permits sin [16], then God certainly allows humans to accept or reject solutions to sin. This does not justify that human free will dominates

God's will. But it shows the perfection and wholeness of God's nature. This idea actualizes the combination and relationship of God (metaphysical) with humans (physical). This idea in general can also be witnessed in everyday life.

Does human free will thwart God's sovereignty? Certainly not. Example; The will of Abraham that was not desired by God did not go beyond God's plan. Saul's mistake also did not destroy God's plans. So is there free human will in elections? Yes The relationship between human will and not carrying out God's wishes will be discussed in the following dilemma 3 point.

The Dilemma of God's Desire: All Saved

Wants to Be The classic dilemma of "God Wants All to Be Safe or Partial" does indeed contain complex problems. The approach in this section will show the common thread between human will and God's will as well as the defects in it.

Universalists (mostly represented by Arminians) believe that God wants everyone to be saved. Whereas the particulars believe that God only wants to save some people who have been previously chosen without conditions.

[17]. In God there is a holy desire or "antecedent" before executing His plan (elections that include fall, grace, salvation, etc.). From the side of this holy desire, God wants all to be saved. But in terms of omniscience and other qualities, God sees sin and denies the way of salvation from human will so that the consequences are "partially saved". This is called the "consequent will" term. It is important to clarify that the distinction between antecedents and consequent will is made because humans cannot completely see and judge God. [18] Thinkers distinguish between the "presumptive" and "absolute" wills of God because of the inability to see the harmony of God's nature.

Looking at aspects of God's attributes (including His desires) and human existence as a whole will be the middle point of this problem. God has a loving nature so that in His will there is an "antecedent" which tends to want all humans to be saved. But human existence also raises the will of "consequence" of God so that the consequences of God's just nature produce salvation for some humans. So God's original desire (*voluntas signi*) is different from the situation (*voluntas beneplacitii*).

That is why the Bible mentions these two aspects. First; that God loves all human beings in the world [19] and introduces the God of the holy will, so that Christ sacrifices with universal reach. [20] Second; God presents a consequence of the existence of humans who choose to sin. This consequence is punishment which results in some survivors. Why aren't all survivors or all punished? In God's eternal-single plan, like some people who choose to sin against God, some also choose to accept God. Logically, before a holy God wants humans his creation to produce good things without denying His just nature. When His good will runs contrary to human will, certain logical consequences emerge. Regarding this, Leibniz connects the metaphysical nature of God with the physical existence of humans. [21]

From the aspect of possibility, if God's desire is not done or does not happen, then God's desire that happens must be the best. When God allows humans to fall into sin, there is a desire that God does not carry out. However, God's equally good will will be accomplished by the principle of "whole individuals". [22] Some thinkers use different terms but with the same rationale. [23] Case examples in the

Bible show that there is a difference between the desires of God before, and the desires of humans after being created. But the question of whether human free will destroys God's will is not the focus of this theory.

If God wants all people to be saved, then why is this not the case? First; This is where the importance of the theory of "whole individuals". God's desire must be in harmony with the overall nature of God. God's desire cannot go ahead of just nature or other qualities. When God's desire is not realized, it does not mean He is not Almighty. What happened was; Allah's Almighty attribute is related to other qualities. Consequently, Allah Almighty must do His will as a whole. [24]

Second; The desire for all to be saved is a "will hypothesis" or "a possibility that is hypothetical", not "subsilitatis will" or "absolute possibility". [25] Will's hypothesis can give space to say that the phrase "God wants everyone to be saved" can mean that God wants, with his previous will, a world that is different from what it is today. [26] [27] In other terms, a world where everyone achieves eternal happiness. But human desires that differ from the hypothesis of Will give birth to

"subsilitatis" or specific survivors. [28] If the energy or "conatus" of God wanting the salvation of all people does not occur, it does not mean that God's will is destroyed. In fact, safety still exists. It can be said that there is nothing in vain from the "partial salvation" that exists now.

The dilemma that is still difficult to answer is, "If God wants everyone to be saved, why didn't God design Adam not to fall into sin"? Of course it would be possible for everyone to be saved by making Adam's fall not happen. But given the existence of God that is intact with His attributes, this possibility is not the most perfect choice for God. With His plausible reason, the fall is allowed to occur.

If so, does the human will thwart God's will? As mentioned earlier, that the desires of God that do not occur are those that are hypothetical. [29] If the desires of God's hypothesis about Abraham, Moses, Saul, David, and others did not happen, it does not mean that God's plans were thwarted by human will.

The Dilemma of the Presence of Faith in Predestination: Between Terms and Media

The concept of predestination has a relationship with faith. The struggle over whether faith is the cause of salvation becomes irrelevant if you see God's plan as a whole. The issue that might need to be discussed is whether God decided in advance to save some people and therefore decided to give them faith, or whether God's election was based on prior faith knowledge.

A perfect God has only a single, eternal plan. The whole God also issues decisions with perfect consideration in eternity. Therefore, there should be no such order. Faith does not stand alone, salvation does not stand alone, grace does not stand alone, the urgency of preaching the gospel does not stand alone, neither does predestination. These things are whole in God's eternal plan. The existence of faith has to do with the conversation about "the right reason why someone is placed in the right place". Faith shows that humans and the universe took part in the election. God is concerned with the qualities of His creation as a result of His whole being and His harmonious attributes. Leibniz called it the term, "God who works holistically". [30] That

is, faith contains the role of God and humans. God works salvation of course a package with faith, because humans cannot accept that salvation without the media. The problem is, if someone has faith, is that included in the category of "trying" or "involved in the provision of salvation"? Not. Complete salvation is the work of God, humans only take part in two things; accept and reject.

If God's plan is eternal, then election and salvation should not be preceded by human good or bad deeds. In this case, Leibniz is between the Evangelical and Calvinist lines. [31] The middle way proposed here is that an eternal God must also make eternal plans. [32] His dreams, salvation and faith [33] are already in God's eternal plan. However, things to consider are; God's eternal plan, even though it was done in the past but contains knowledge about human life in the future. This does not mean that God chooses based solely on knowledge. God's election cannot be separated from God's overall plan. God's plan cannot be separated from the reasons behind it.

Although God provides salvation that does not depend on human faith, or God glorifies humans before faith, the reasons for choosing God will be understood if the concept of three angles

of time (past, present, future) is considered in God's single plan. Thus, these reasons certainly contain the principles of fairness, holiness, love, and other attributes of God. Agustin called it "a reason that can not be known by humans". [34] So in God's singular plan, there are 3 dimensions of time and circumstance. When referring to this, God's election contains "the election of the person He knows". [35] The election of God must certainly have consideration given His nature which is "whole person". The most reasonable consideration is a consideration that involves the 3 dimensions of the elements mentioned.

Does election occur before faith? [36] This question is similar to "was salvation provided before faith"? [37] If referring to aspects of God's eternal plan, there should be no such order. But from the impermanent existence of humans, it may be necessary to make a sequence of executions; pre-election of faith. Election is called first because God is the main subject. Faith comes in second because faith is inseparable from the impermanent existence of humans. But in terms of God's plan, the two are not sequential. This is a consequence of God's plan which is single or simultaneous in "one point".

The Dilemma of the Concept of Election with Award

Election cannot be separated from grace. His theological dilemma is largely centered on "God's grace to some people who cannot be denied". If so, does God choose to give His gifts to only a part? The integrity of God is questioned when seeing God's positive assessment of the entire universe in the creation story. [38]

There is a theological dispute between Evangelicals and Calvinist Protestants (commonly referred to as "Reformers" on this matter. Echavarria calls this dispute serious, [39] or not just a matter of calculating the amount saved. On the one hand, the Evangelicals (and some Lutherans) hold the doctrine of election according to their "faith" and assert that there is no need to withdraw the hidden reasons of divine wisdom to explain the election that has been determined. On the other hand, Calvinists hold the doctrine of "absolute" election, that faith itself will be a consequence of God's "haphazard" selection. [40]

Grace means any causal action by God, in the broadest sense, grace is a principle of all good actions. [41] According to Leibniz, grace is given to

all humans in a way miraculous ways, even encompassing in everyday life. [42] Furthermore, Leibniz agreed that in the will of Allah, there is a gift. However, gifts given to humans do not always end perfectly because of human free will. [43]

A gift with the same quality from God is given to all humans but with different proportional effects. Why is that? Because every rational creature receives grace with their respective capacities. Even at a certain point, good gifts can have bad effects or sin. In every being there is the ability to use gifts so that all people actually receive gifts.

If so, none escapes God's grace or no individual is left out. The gift that God gives to humans is also a gift that is enough to see the light of God. In other words, all humans are given "help" to do good. Leibniz believes that if in the end a person sins and ends in punishment, it is not because there is no grace but because of his own mistakes. [44] The principle that God gives sufficient grace to all of His creations is in harmony with existence - the whole nature of God and in harmony with different human being's use of God's grace.

This type of thinking is different from the outline of the dominians who

consider the grace of God to be only single in essence and impact. Dominant ideas emphasize the perfection of grace even in process. [45] But the whole concept of God shows that internally, God does indeed give gifts. But externally, grace itself does not always have a perfect effect. [46] This is because humans have a soul or feeling when considering things. In other terms, humans have "a dic cur hic" or certain pleasures in choosing.

The idea "God wants everyone to be saved" is an expression of divine will to give everyone enough gifts and allow them to be saved if they want to. [47] As mentioned earlier, God's holy desires are sometimes not carried out even though all His plans must be carried out.

There are two important points from this topic. First; So if in fact some people are ultimately saved, it does not mean that God's grace is only monopolized by some people. Second; looking at examples of gifts that are not used by humans everyday, it is more appropriate to use the term "humans use gifts in different ways".

Conclusion

conversation about predestination has indeed given birth to a not a simple theological dilemma. This happens

because previous studies only focused on theological concepts in the biblical text. Therefore, predestination should be discussed thoroughly. God's election includes Faith, Grace, Salvation, Sin, free human will, which are inseparable. The eternal God only carries out a single and eternal plan and determination. But in this metaphysical plan, there are three dimensions (past, present, and future) and involve human life is physical. Consequently, election (faith, grace, salvation, sin, free will) also contains three aspects. In short, this concept contains "singular and plural" or "eternal and progressive". In addition, the emphasis of this approach lies in understanding "whole God" and "whole creation".

The theological dilemmas that may still need to be elaborated are about "God's unconditional love" and its relationship to "human beings who are free to accept or reject". The dilemma that is still difficult to answer is, "If God wants everyone to be saved, why didn't God design Adam not to fall into sin"? Of course it would be possible for everyone to be saved by making Adam's fall not happen. But given the existence of God that is intact with His attributes, this possibility is not the most perfect choice for God. With His plausible

reason, the fall is allowed to occur.

But the conclusion of this discussion has at least suggested a more complete approach and proves that the conversation about predestination should not only be seen from the aspect of God's sovereignty simply because God is bound by His holy attributes.

REFERENCES

- [1] GW Leibniz, *Dissertation on Predestination and Grace*. Translated by Michael J. Murray (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), 67
- [2] Augustin Echavarria, *Metafísica leibniziana de la permisión del mal* (Pamplona: Eunsa, 2011), 314.
- [3] GW Leibniz, *Dissertation on Predestination and Grace*. Translated by Michael J. Murray (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), 67
- [4] Institutes III.xvi. 8. Here Calvin says that the eternal will and provision of God is the cause of all things
- [5] Institutes III.xv.1, 8. Calvin does not agree that responsibility for the fall of

sin is thrown at God. The fall is Adam's responsibility because his fall is his own will.

[6] Indeed, Calvin distinguishes between predestination and reprobation with the aim of explaining that election emphasizes God's sovereignty (ultimate cause) and reprobation emphasizes the reason for punishing humans (proximate cause). Man's free actions or will are not counted in election, but counted in punishment.

[7] For example in the case of Pharaoh. Is it God who hardened Pharaoh's heart or Pharaoh himself who hardened his heart? If the Pharaoh hardens his own heart, then the concept of "the eternal provision of God" becomes questionable. If reversed, it still creates a theological dilemma. Or in the case of Judas (Judas Lord sets to perish but chose to be an Apostle. Is the chance to become the Apostle is the hope that Judas turns Judas's force or God does not change?)

[8] Sublapsarian the link between elections and sin are complex. The selection of the sublapsarian version should not have begun with the fall of Adam. Because the same thing or the

same question can also be asked about Adam's sin. Did God give Adam the ability not to sin? If so, why did the fall of Adam occur?

[9] Institutes III. xxi.2

[10] Based on Calvin's interpretation of Ephesians 1

[11] If it can be described, then these events such as points or circles that are not separate from one another or may not be sorted from the eternal side of God.

[12] If it is consistent with the aspects of God's provision, free will should be eliminated both in the discussion of predestination and reprobation. If you want to be extreme, even Adam should have been created without free will

[13] The free will of human beings believed by the author is limited free will or free will that is "not all-free". Or in other terms, "free will with limited choices". This type of freedom is a logical consequence of human status as a creature.

[14] For example, by designing humans with the ability to only do God's will. In

more vulgar terms, God can design humans with automatic "on-off" buttons that only force humans to do sacred things.

[15] Regarding human sinfulness, some Calvinists agree that Allah deliberately made Adam's condition sinful. Some others, for example Norman Geisler, Ravi Zakharias, AW. Tozer, M. Erikson, believed that God established humans with the ability to love or reject God. Evangelicals are in line with this last opinion.

[16] God who determines or makes (forces) the existence of sin will only be considered worthy of the omnipotence, but not in terms of His holiness.

[17] John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxa II*, Chapter 29 (PL XCIV, 968-9). John Damascene uses the terms "proegoúmenon thélema" to explain the will of the antecedents and "hepómenon thélema" to explain the consequent will. John Chrysostom mentions the terms "first will" and "second will".

[18] Leibniz's approach is the midline between Calvinists and Arminians. God wants everyone to be saved but is bound by His other qualities. See Michael J.

Murray, "*Leibniz's Proposal for theological Reconciliation among the Protestants*," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 76/4 (2002), 623–646.

[19] For example John 3:16 and the large series in 1 John chapters 2-4. In the story of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, in His prayer there is a desire that wants everyone to be forgiven

[20] GW Leibniz, *Dissertation on Predestination and Grace*, 32. Here Murray also outlines the debate about the specific purpose of the death of Christ which was designed from the beginning for the elect.

[21] Agustín Echavarría, *Metafísica leibniziana de la permisión del mal*, 360-382. In this Agustín article, Leibniz said that the divine will cannot contain flaws even though His creation is capable of doing flaws

[22] One example of this is God's desire for Abraham and the fall of Abraham. There was a desire of God that was not accomplished without destroying God's plan and robbing Abraham of his role as a whole individual

[23] John Hostler, *omne possibile exigit existere*, 281-285. An article explaining that the possibilities in God's desire are "good" and "just". Then there is David Blumenfeld's review entitled, "*Leibniz's Theory of the Striving Possibles*", 163–177. The explanation focuses on the theory of "God who desires and strives". Then there is the writing of Christopher J. Shields, "*Leibniz's Doctrine of the Striving Possibles*," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 42/3 (1986), 343–357. Here Shields explains that the existence of the world or universe was indeed begun by God with holy desires.

[24] One example of a case that can be considered is God's call to Moses. God's desire may not have been carried out by Moses. But this did not destroy God's sovereignty over Moses. On the other hand, God's desire that Moses not enter the land of Canaan was the best possibility.

[25] The will of antecedents of man stands absolutely so that it may not be parallel with Will's hypothesis. Cases are "Will hypothesis" can occur in everyday life. For example; when someone just sits in a food stall all day without carrying out clear activities, it can be called a human "antecedent will"

that is not in harmony with God's wishes.

[26] Agustin Echavarria, *Dilemma on Predestination*, 184-188

[27] Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones Disputatae de Veritate*, q23, a2, (in the electronic edition, by Joseph Kenny O. P) translated by Robert W. Smith, SJ (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954). Regarding antecedents and consequences, Thomas Aquinas states that God's will cannot be defeated by humans. But God's desire also does not destroy human will.

[28] According to Leibniz, Allah wants all to be saved does not mean that Allah moves or forces humans to only choose to do good.

[29] The hypothetical desire of God should indeed be discussed to represent the holy nature of God.

[30] GW Leibniz, *The Shorter Leibniz texts. A Collection of New Translations*, Lloyd Strickland Translation (London: Continuum, 2006), 99

[31] Agustin Echavarria, *Dilemma on Predestination* (Spanish: Universidad

Navara, 2015), 172-175. According to Leibniz, the "main reason" for the election does not lie in the faith that was known beforehand, but in God's hidden reasons. This reason is not arbitrary because God is bound by His holy attributes.

[32] Agustin Echavarria, *Dilemma on Predestination*, 172-178. Leibniz called it the term "pre-fide preevisa" (election before the existence of faith) but without prejudice to aspects of God's knowledge of things to come.

[33] Faith, grace, salvation, and election are inseparable. A new believer at this time is not to justify that there is a change in God's plan but to show that humans are not involved in God's plan.

[34] Agustin Echavarria, *Dilemma on Predestination*, 177

[35] This term was made to distinguish between God's single-eternal plan and the impermanent human condition. New human faith is seen halfway, but faith itself has been recognized by God in eternity

[36] Agustin argues that in general, Calvinists and Evangelicals both believe that elections are made before

faith. The consequence is that faith is also a gift from God. Election is the main basis of faith itself.

[37] GW Leibniz, *Lettres et fragments inédits sur les problèmes philosophiques, Théologiques, politiques de la reconciliation des doctrines protestantes* (1669-1704), Paul Schrecker's Translation (Paris: Félix Alcan, 1934), 70-85. Leibniz likens the Evangelicals to Calvinists in terms of "election before faith".

[38] For example in Genesis chapter 1; God sees "everything" as good

[39] Agustin Echavarria, *Dilemma on Predestination* (Spain: Universidad Navara, 2015), 175-178

[40] Evangelicals usually follow the Augsburg Confession, there is no need to find out the hidden reasons when someone believes or consider the emergence of one's faith as the cause of election because the Bible does not clearly explain it. The clearest thing the Bible shows is "faith in Jesus Christ".

[41] Regarding the definition of grace, this statement is no different from the understanding of Arminius. That all

good things that God gives to humans
deserve to be called "grace"

[42] GW Leibniz, *Dissertation on Predestination and Grace*, 32.
Translated by Michael J. Murray

[43] A simple example; even in general grace, each human is different in using and treating God's gift. Each appreciates God's grace in accordance with willingness so that human existence in general is also different

[44] GW Leibniz, *Dissertation on Predestination and Grace*, 50.
Translated by Michael J. Murray

[45] The problem; if the gift is utilized perfectly by humans, why do some people have the opposite, or far from the impact of that perfect gift. This idea is not in harmony with human existence.

[46] This idea is in tune with traditional doctrines articulated by Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. That the impact or efficiency of God's grace has two aspects; internal and external aspects.

[47] Agustin Echavarria, *Dilemma on Predestination*, 189-192