

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1222 – June 3, 2012
Framework Review

We come to the end of the Framework and today we want to review. We started four years ago with a short series called the Faith-Rest drill. The strategy was to break down the mechanics of how we walk by faith and then deliver the content to increase our ability to walk by faith. There is only one way to please God, by faith, so that has been the goal.

We said there's a technique to walking by faith and it has three or four steps, depending on how you look at it. But what it's trying to do is get into the human mind and trace what happens when we're walking along in life and we run into a problem. The difficulty of tracing what happens in our mind is that life happens so fast and so its boom, boom, boom, all in a microsecond and we're responding in some way - maybe we picked it up from our parents, maybe we picked it up from our secular education, maybe we picked it up from our friends. What we are trying to do is train ourselves to the point where we automatically respond by the faith rest drill. That's why I used the military and athletics as analogies. Because in the military and athletics you train to the point of boredom and yet, after all that training, when the heat is on, you go on auto pilot and respond the way you've been trained.

We broke the Faith-Rest drill down into four steps. It's actually not my approach, a pastor in Houston developed the drill in three steps and a teacher in Maryland divided one step into two and made it four steps. It's the four step approach I'm following. So let's review. *First step*, when a stressful situation arises you want to recall a Scriptural text, a fragment, a promise, a story, anything to quiet your soul down so you can focus on the Lord. The problem is if you don't have any Scripture to grab hold of, you're going to grab hold of something non-Scriptural, a gimmick at best, something that seems to soothe your soul at the moment but something that is ultimately going to

cave in. So you've got to have Bible teaching, lots of content, you can never get too much Bible, that's what you need. And the more you have the deeper the reservoirs from which you can draw when you have a problem in life. So the first step is, when a stressful situation arises you want to recall Scripture, faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.

Second step is that you want to connect the Scripture you've recalled with your situation because if you don't you can't walk by faith. So how do you bring your situation together with the text? I suggest this takes two steps. This is where the teacher in Maryland broke with the historical way the faith-rest drill has been taught and divided step two into two steps, there's a negative side to the step and a positive side to the step. The reason is because volition is involved, there's a choice here, you can go negative or you can go positive. So if you really want to walk by faith through the problem the first thing you have to do is demolish the other side, whatever the world says is the way to solve the problem you have to ditch that, it's a gimmick. To do that, however, you have to know that it's a gimmick; you have to be convinced that it really is nothing but a lot of hot air and baloney. And the positive side is we have to be clear and absolutely certain of the Scriptures. We have to be convinced that the word of God has the only answer. So step two is rejecting the human view point gimmick and step three is accepting the Scriptural solution, that is, trusting, believing what the word of God says.

At step four, you simply keep at it until you are continually trusting the Lord through the problem. The result is rest, tranquility, the peace that transcends all comprehension even in the midst of chaos. I didn't say the problem goes away, I just said you are able to handle the problem contentedly. You're able to trust that God is in control. So we did the Faith-Rest drill first and this impressed upon us the necessity to train and increase the amount of Bible content in our soul.

It was the Framework that was designed to meet these demands so you'd automatically go into the Faith-Rest drill when you have a problem in life. So what it aims to do is first to increase the content of belief to deepen your reservoirs of faith, deepen the amount of material you can draw from to recall when you face a stressful situation. Secondly, it has an apologetic dimension, negatively to demolish what the world says. Thirdly, to positively trust what God says. And fourth, you stay at it until you get rest because you have to

see that the entire Scripture is interlocked, that it's a series of truths all interconnected into a web work of truth. This is what fortifies your faith, making it easier to believe and that's what you want to be able to do, it's what all the great saints of Scripture did. So you're just following the pattern they laid down ahead of time.

I want to spend most of our time on this interlocking thing because the world is pressing in on us. They've got an answer on the surface for everything. But it's a gimmick, really they have no answer, their answer is vanity. So what the framework is geared to do is train you to see the deeper issues lurking underneath and to go for them. And I'm not the one that developed this Framework approach to Scripture. It came from a pastor in the 1970's who was having to minister to the Vietnam and post-Vietnam crowd. Think of all the hippies he had in his congregation, and if the hippies are known for anything, it's challenging the establishment, rebelling against authority, but question, and in doing so who were they making out to be the authority? Themselves. So it's not like the hippies got rid of authority, it's that they relocated authority. You always want to listen to people's arguments because for every negative claim there's a positive claim embedded and you can turn it on its head. So just take their argument and reverse it. See how they handle that. What this pastor realized was he was living long after the theological wreck of the 1920's and 30's and he was trying to teach the bible in a theological wasteland and here are all these hippies looking for truth, really looking for some kind of absolutes because their lives were a wreck. And as this pastor was going verse by verse through books of the Bible he realized he was spinning his wheels in a way because whatever he said the people separated from reality, it was just religious, they weren't seeing how the Bible connects to reality because they came to the Bible with the presupposition that it all had to do with your private religious experience, a post WWII neo-orthodox approach to Scripture. The Bible is faith, science is truth, history is evolution and whatever is true for you may not be true for me. So if he was ever going to get through to these people he had to demolish these ideas. The strategy he implemented to do that was the Framework because what the Framework does is intensively go in the opposite direction. It emphasizes the historicity of the biblical events and attaches doctrines to each event, grounding them where? In your religious experience? No, in history. Oh, so this is not an issue of whether this is true for you but not for me, it's true for everybody and it's not science over here and history over

there and faith in here. No, you can't look at these piecemeal, they're all interlocked, there's no way around it because it is historical and everybody is accountable for this knowledge.

It gets back to what a professor of apologetics said years ago. He was trying to argue doctrine piecemeal against the liberals at Princeton, (the great Princeton, which at one time was the greatest theological seminary in America, and arguably the world, produced some of the greatest teacher the Church has ever had, but by the early 1900's the faculty was swarming with men who didn't believe the Scriptures, they rejected the orthodox doctrine of inspiration and inerrancy), so he started shooting back evidences, so many authors over so many years couldn't put a book together with such harmony and we have x number of manuscripts, etc., etc..., but all the evidence in the world wasn't convincing the liberals. They were able to end run this methodology of argument time and time again. So what he realized was something was wrong in the methodology and he started studying the Scriptures to see how the great saints of Scripture defended the truths of Scripture. What he found was you cannot defend doctrine piece by piece but you have to defend all the doctrine as a unit. He used the analogy of fighting a battle and in a battle you've got the big guns stationed deep in the area you control, they fire over the lines out front, you've got the small arms men, and they're on the front lines just behind the explosions of these big guns, then you've got tanks and other artillery behind them; the point is they all have to fight together in a coordinated attack. You can't just tell the small arms guys to go get'em without the support of the big guns or tanks, they'll get slaughtered. And that's what this professor realized when we are trying to speak truth to the world - we can't isolate the argument down to one doctrine, we have to bring all the doctrines together in a powerful coordinated attack that will overwhelm our enemy, get us off the defensive and put them on the defensive.

For example, let's just practice with some criticisms of the Scripture. One that is very popular in the swarm of atheist books hitting the New York Times Best Seller list is the argument that the God of the Bible is immoral because He commands the Israelites to go into the Promised Land and conquer, no holds barred, destroy the men, the women, the children, the animals, everything. And you believe in this God, Christian? That's what your God said to do. Now most Christians start to retreat at this point like a

puppy dog with his tail between his legs and start apologizing for the Bible. We're not going to apologize for anything. One of the things we might bring in right away is their ability to make a moral judgment. On what basis are they able to make a moral judgment about anything, in a non-Christian worldview? Sure you can do it in a Christian worldview, we have a God who is the absolute standard for right and wrong. But you reject Him so where are your standards for right and wrong coming from? Well, society. So society says what's right and wrong? What if 51% of society said it was right to murder Jews? Would that make it right? Well, it's just wrong. I agree it's wrong, but on what basis? That's just the way I feel. Finally that's where unbelief ends up, that's just the way I feel about it. And I'm sorry but that's purely subjective. So one approach is to challenge them to give an absolute basis for right and wrong in their worldview, without borrowing from your worldview. And they can't do it. It's never been done and it can never be done. They may not like it but hey, finally, that's just their opinion.

How do we construct a positive defense of the Conquest when they're attacking this? What kind of doctrines might we bring in in order to defend the Scriptures? You might bring in the question of whose land is it they were conquering anyway? It was their land, that's why it's called the Promised Land. So what historic event are we bringing in here? The Call of Abraham. God promised that land to the Israelites. The Canaanites didn't own that land. They were squatting on somebody else's land. That land and the resources of that land belong to the Israelites. But that's not enough, you want to bring in some big guns. What's another doctrine we could bring in. You have to bring this in? The doctrine of God as Creator. He created this universe, it's His universe, it's His land that He gave to the Jews, I don't see what you Mr Unbeliever have to say about it has any relevance to the question whatsoever. So you've got a faulty view of the origin of the universe, who God is and whose say really counts. Who is God by the way? God is sovereign, He's just, He's loving, He's omniscient and so forth. Take God's omniscience for example. That means God knows everything. Did He know those Canaanites were wicked people who would never respond to Him in a million years? That's what omniscience means. So is he doing wrong by scheduling their destruction? No, they already destroyed themselves, they would never believe in a million years. What doctrine am I bringing in here? The doctrine of man at the Fall, since the Fall man is a rebel against His Creator. So there's no reason God can't order the destruction of babies, last

time I checked those babies were sinful. Well, I can't see how a loving God can order the annihilation of entire people groups. Fine, I can't see how a holy God can't. See what I'm doing? In order to undercut their position, what you have to do is organize all these doctrines together; to understand the Conquest you have to have a proper view of God, you have to have a proper view of man, you have to have a proper view of Israel. And by bringing all this into the discussion you are building a much bigger picture, you're not convincing them yet but what you're doing is building a worldview, a frame to interpret these things, like Paul did in Acts 17 so that they see that the disagreement isn't just over some babies; the disagreement is over the whole nature of the universe. The disagreement is over the nature of God, the nature of man, over evil and suffering. There are a lot of disagreements here and usually what happens if you have a halfway intelligent person on the other end of the conversation, by the time you start doing this they begin to back up and realize, wait a minute, there is a profound difference here, this isn't just about one isolated issue, it's about a whole series of issues. And that's good; they may have never seen how integrated the issues are before and how deep the divide really is. You haven't won them to Christ but maybe for the first time in their lives they realize, hey, the issues are bigger than my little criticism. So what you want to do is keep the whole picture in mind because that's how one portion of the Bible protects another portion of the Bible against the full frontal assault of unbelief. That's one example of how you use the Framework in an integrated defense.

Let's take a look at the list of events and doctrines we linked to those events to see how this integrated approach works with various issues. The goal here is to be able to use the Framework in every day life, to problem solve. On the left side of the diagram those are the key events of history. On the right side are the doctrines, the truths that are revealed in and through those events. This is everything we've been through.

Destiny of the Church

Growth of the Church

Emergence of the Church

Earthly Origin of the Church

Heavenly Origin of the Church

Eschatology/Pre-trib Rapture

Sanctification specific to the Body of Christ

Work of the Son

Person and Work of the Holy Spirit

Judgment/Salvation

Resurrection of the King

Glorification

Death of the King

Life of the King

Birth of the King

Substitutionary Blood Atonement

Kenosis, Impeccability, Infallibility

Hypostatic Union

Partial Restoration

Exile

Fall of the Kingdom

Decline of the Kingdom

Golden Era of Solomon

Rise and Reign of David

Conquest and Settlement

Mt. Sinai

Exodus

Call of Abraham

Canonicity, Prayer

Sanctification/Separation

Sanctification/Chastening

Sanctification/Chastening

Sanctification/Culture

Sanctification/Confession

Sanctification/War

Revelation, Inspiration, Canonicity

Judgment/Salvation w/sub-blood atonement

Election, Justification, Faith

(Noahic) Covenant

Flood

Fall

Creation

God, man, nature

Judgment/Salvation

Evil, Suffering

God, man, nature

The reason you want to look at this diagram with the left and the right columns together is it prevents you from thinking that you can deny the historicity of the left side and still hold on to the doctrine on the right side.

Take for example the Exodus and look over to the right and see the concepts and truths of Judgment/Salvation with Substitutionary Blood Atonement.

The Exodus reveals that the only way of salvation is by substitutionary blood atonement, and somebody comes along and says well, if religious people are sincere about their beliefs God will accept them. Question? Did the Egyptians have beliefs? Did they hold them with sincerity? Pharaoh held on to his until the very end. He was so sincere he wouldn't change his beliefs to stop his entire country from going down the tubes economically, agriculturally, militarily; he was a man very stubborn in his beliefs. So I don't think sincerity of belief matters one iota to God. What matters is what you believe, is it right or is it wrong, and when I say that I mean on the level of mathematics. Does $1+1=2$? Last time I checked. Can $1+1=3$? No, $1+1=2$ is the truth. And that's what I mean when I say the bible is true; I mean it in the same sense that I mean $1+1=2$. This is not religious truth, this is truth in the hard, objective sense, that's what we're holding to. And salvation is only one

way, substitutionary blood atonement, that's the Exodus. If someone says, well, we can jettison the historicity of the Exodus, there's no historical evidence, it was just a myth written by Hebrew sages to justify the belief that they were a free people. Can we accept that? Can we hold on to the truth of the atonement if we reject it? Look what happens when you come down to some event like the Death of the King. What's the doctrine on the right side? Substitutionary Blood Atonement. Same thing as the Exodus. Now are we going to say it really doesn't matter if Jesus died on the cross? If I deny the historicity of the Exodus why can't I deny the historicity of the cross? So do you see how this is all linked? What you do to one you do to the other. This should make you sensitive, then, as to why people start to undercut the historicity of Scripture.

Like we have Christians going around today saying it really doesn't matter what happened in Genesis 1-11, it's just nice religious poetry. Well just a minute, let's look at the first two events, Creation and Fall. If those did not take place like the Scripture said, what doctrines, what major doctrinal areas are immediately affected? The whole nature of God, the whole nature of man, the nature of the universe and the whole issue of the problem of evil and suffering, which everybody says is a big obstacle for Christians. Well, I can't believe God, God wouldn't allow babies to die. They always want to use the evil issue. Well, yeah, you've got an evil problem if you don't have the fall. But if you have a fall then the responsibility falls on man. God isn't killing babies, we kill babies because we sinned against God. God created a perfect universe, when it left His hands it was very good. But if you want to reject Gen 1-11 then you do have an evil problem. Remember this diagram? If I reject Gen 1-3 then I'm immediately locked into this bottom diagram. And here I've got eternal evil. I've got no period I can look back to in history when there was no evil, it's just everlasting evil extending in both directions. Think about that one. Is that what you really believe? That evil will just go on and on and on forever. How is it that Christians have a problem with evil? We've got a separation down here so evil gets isolated. Well how does that occur? By a judgment. God intervenes and judges it. well, I don't like the idea of a God that judges. Well wait a minute here, you're upset about the evil and your blaming God for it, now you're upset that He's going to judge it. You can't have it both ways. So you've got to hold to the historicity of Gen 1-11. And it's just simply stupidity, absolute stupidity to say it doesn't matter what Genesis 1-11 says, I just believe in Jesus. What Jesus are you talking about? A little

carpenter boy? Well maybe I don't believe Matthew 28 and the Great Commission, so I'm going to toss that one out. So here we are, we're back to selecting what we want to believe. Wouldn't we have a lot more integrity just ditching the whole thing?

All these truths hang together; you've got to see that point. And then you want to see that those truths not only hang together but those truths integrate with history, with real history. That's why Christian beliefs affect every area of knowledge. You cannot become a Christian and believe the word of God as the word of God and not let it affect every area of life, including science, law, and math. Take math and let's say math is religiously neutral. Well, if math is religiously neutral that would mean that math is math whether or not God exists, and that's the official position of the Department of Education in this country, math is math whether or not God exists, therefore we don't let God in the door. He's not necessary to math. If that's the case then math could not possibly be the result of God's creative act because if it were then math is math only because of what God says it is. So to say math is religiously neutral is to deny creation. And to deny creation is to deny the God of Creation. So now we're denying God's existence. Is that being religiously neutral? Not at all. You can't be religiously neutral about math, you can't be religiously neutral in language. You can't be religiously neutral about any area of human investigation. The Scriptures insist that all creation is revealing the glory of God, that we are always and everywhere confronted with our God. He's before us, behind us, in every area of the universe that we can explore. He is there and His glory is there and all men see Him clearly. For us to deny that and to say there are religiously neutral zones where it really doesn't matter whether God exists or not for this area of study is sheer nonsense. We can't accept that. But that has infected the Christian community for a long, long time, and it has damaged our effectiveness in evangelism. It's nonsense.

Let's look at another criticism and that's faith; faith is brought in through what event on the left? The Call of Abraham. He's a marvelous picture of faith. What the non-Christian does, when you come around talking about faith, when you say I believe this or I believe that, you have to understand what they are hearing when you say that. What they are hearing is that you are a weak person, that you have to believe because there's no evidence, that faith is an irrational leap into the beyond. That's why they always think

people of the Christian faith need to be put in psychiatric wards; we're all hot air and religious talk.

Now, is that the Scriptural idea of belief? There's no evidence for it? That's why we have to believe it, and if there were evidence then it's no longer belief. Satan has really pulled one here on the Church. If that's what someone is presenting to you where would you go? There are several places, but where would you go to show them that that's not a Biblical definition of faith? Think about it, faith is the absence of evidence. Think that through and what passages might undermine that idea very quickly. Turn to Acts 1. This is Doctor Luke, he wrote two volumes, Luke and Acts. In Acts 1 notice what he says in verse 1, "The first account I composed, Theophilus, about all that Jesus began to do and teach, 2until the day when He was taken up to heaven, after He had by the Holy Spirit given order to the apostles whom He had chosen." Now, if it didn't matter that these things happened empirically, in history, then why did Luke take the time to research and write them all down? If you just believe it or don't believe it and the evidence doesn't matter? Verse 3, "To these He also presented Himself alive after His suffering, by many convincing proofs," now why are convincing proofs necessary if we just believe devoid of any evidence? On that definition you can dismiss the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as having any empirical relevance because it's not necessary for faith. See where you get in trouble? That's why you want to know the Scripture well enough so when you encounter these ideas, even if you can't open your mouth at that point because it may not be able to articulate it, at least in your mind you haven't sucked up a false idea and let it into your soul to cause havoc. You stop it right at the entry and you say, hmm, that doesn't sound right. Good, now you can take the time to figure out what's wrong and that will clear up your thinking. And speaking of this, does this definition of faith fit with Abraham? Abraham is the picture of faith. How did Abraham demonstrate His faith? He moved from Ur all the way to the Promised Land. Now do people just up and move away from their businesses, their family, their friends, their religion, their entire lives to a place they've never been all on a hunch that well, I think I heard a voice in my head telling me to go? Hardly, you have to have what in order to move away from all that. Strong evidence. Do you think God gave strong evidence to Abraham? Do you think he made it clear who He was and what He was doing in His life? Absolutely. Why did John write his first epistle? These things are written that you might believe! We could go through

example after example showing that faith is not the absence of evidence, faith is trusting God's revealed analysis of the evidence.

Here's another one related to the same issue. Remember the chart depicting the limits of human knowledge? This is a great one for our position. What it's trying to show is that if all human knowledge is trapped in that box (because down at the x axis of this graph is time, and the y axis is space, all empirical knowledge is contained in that fuzzy area, in the center. And it obviously means that it's limited, and therefore man, whatever he says is right, whatever he says is wrong, whatever he says is true, whatever he says is false, it's all coming out of this very limited data base. And it's all contingent. How do you know that tomorrow a new fact may come to light that that will change everything we believe? If you really believe this is where all knowledge comes from then that's what you'd have to wind up with. All knowledge is contingent on the next piece of data and the next piece of data could invalidate everything you believe. So you have to hold your breath until the next piece of data comes to make sure that what you believe today won't change tomorrow. When you arrive at tomorrow you've got the same problem, I can't really know that I know because tomorrow they might discover something else. It's like all these diet fads, one week it's all carbs, the next week it's all protein, one week it's msg, next week it's glycogen. There's always some new thing like this and it just goes on and on, billions of dollars are spent so we can live according to the new profound conclusions.

That's an example of the limits of empirical knowledge. So if you get some smart aleck sometime that you feel like is really demeaning the word of God you can prick the balloon with this little diagram, draw it on the back of a napkin and say do you have more knowledge than that or not. You've got to admit to limited knowledge. So on what basis, then, can you know anything for sure? On what basis may a piece of data discovered tomorrow not totally wreck everything you thought you knew? Force them to answer the question. Don't just sit there and let them keep taking aim at you and firing bullets. You don't always need to be taking the shots. Shoot back. Aim at their foundation and blast it. Make them bleed for their faith. Remember that or they'll keep you busy all the time while they're sitting back laughing.

Let's take up another issue, the argument against the Bible. What event do we have on the left here that impacts the Scriptures? Mt Sinai. What are the

doctrines? Revelation, inspiration and canonicity. What happened at Mt Sinai? God spoke to 2 million people. What people say, I can't believe that, the Bible, that's an ancient book. And they laugh at you; you really believe God's word is in that book? God can't communicate with man, if God were even there there's a barrier between God and man. And He can't cross that barrier, it's Him over there and us over here, language is just a human construct, language is inadequate, language has got problems. This is always the attack. Language really isn't a good vehicle for carrying truth, oh really? Then why are you using language to attack it? If you really think art is so great at communicating truth why are you using language to attack language? So two can play at this game.


Yeah buddy, you've got to have language that has meaning, you just haven't got a worldview that can account for language, you don't have a proper doctrine of God, you don't have a proper doctrine of man, man made in the image of God and so yeah, in your worldview God can't speak to humans and all we're left with in human language is two apes grunting. But Mt Sinai, the doctrine of revelation, that entire event is built on Creation, a God who speaks the entire creation ex nihilo. A God who made man in His own image to receive language. See how all these issues are tied together. At Mt Sinai all God is doing is talking to the people He made in His image. We're not going to stand here and argue about whether 2 million people all hallucinated simultaneously the same hallucination at the foot of that mountain. We're going to go back and interpret Mt Sinai in terms of the earlier truths about God, about man and about language. It's a bigger picture.

Let's take another idea that circulates around. Well, I don't believe there's only one way of salvation, what about the Hottentot in Africa? How can you believe that, I think that's pretty bigoted and narrow minded, I think everybody can just choose their own way to God. Of course the quick answer to that is I believe in freedom and choice, yes I do, everybody can choose to go to hell in their own way, I agree with you. Of course they don't like it when you say it that way. But one method you can use is to agree with the people but agree in such a way that you undermine their agreement. It's fun to watch because I love to watch their expression when people hear you do that. People are always saying can you accept homosexuals. Yeah, I can accept liars, fornicators and adulterers I might as well accept homosexuals, what's the problem there? I have no problem. They look at you in unbelief. Did I say

I accepted them? Sure I did, along with everybody else. The way you do that is you formally agree with them but the content of your agreement is totally against their position.

But how do we construct a positive answer from the Scriptures with regard to this criticism that Jesus is the only way? Hey, go back to the Flood, how many people got off the Ark? 8. Did all people groups on earth come out of those 8 people? Yes they did. So did all people groups have the truth at one time? Yes they did. All 8 people on the ark had the truth. So what's your problem? You got off the ark. Your people had the truth. And if we go back in your folklore I bet we can still find relics of the truth. So what do you mean you never heard? The problem isn't that you never heard. The problem is that you didn't want to hear, you suppressed the truth in unrighteousness. There are two ways to have a hearing problem, your ears are damaged or you're covering your ears. The problem the Scriptures say is not that our ears are damaged and the truth is just so inaccessible, it's that people are depraved and they are covering their ears, screaming loudly to squash the truth. So don't give me the line what about those who never heard and why do you think you have the only way. So yeah, God is exclusive, he already tried the I'm going to work with everybody else approach, it didn't work so well so I called out Abraham, now the truth is coming through Him. Gotta problem with that? I chose Abraham. And if you don't like it that's too bad, that's the way God is. So exclusivity is related to election but it's also related to something else. It's related to the second word on the right side, justification. How is a sinner able to walk into the presence of a holy God, because often people will say oh, I just cannot believe in a God that would send people to hell. The answer to that is I just cannot believe in a God who can send a sinner to heaven. Well why can't you? Because He's violating His righteous standard, how would you feel if somebody murdered your kid and the judge says that's okay, the crime that this person did to your kid is so trivial we're not going to even prosecute it. Excuse me, where's justice; I don't see any justice. So justification, it's the holiness of God that has to be satisfied

You can go through any criticisms of the Christian faith, any doctrine you're struggling with and if you'll put it in this Framework and think it through you'll see how it's interlocked with every other truth, this is the integrated approach of making the battle to live by faith easier. So this class was about seeing the total picture and putting it together so you can discern between



issues, cast down lies and deception and make use of the truth in your life to live by faith.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012