

# TRUTH TIME RADIO

AWAKE, AWARE, ALIVE, & ACTIVE!

## EMAIL Q&A AND BLOGS

< All Posts

### The History Teacher Barks Back

April 8, 2022 | Blogs

On March 20, 2022, TTR published a blogpost titled, "[What Happens When You Put A "History Teacher" Above God's Word?](#)" On April 7, 2022, we responded to TTR's blogpost with the release our [YouTube video](#) and corresponding [PDF document](#) titled "Response to TTR's Blog-What Happens When You Put A "History Teacher" Above God's Word?" A day later, on April 8, 2022, TTR replied with the publication of this blogpost "[The History Teacher Barks Back](#)."



Actually, it's more of a whimper. It shows the weakness of a person's proclaimed position when their only rebuttal includes misrepresentations (straw-men) and conjecture. -To take a side-argument from an entire article/interaction and speak on it for nearly an hour sort-of wrecks of the desperation of proving one's own self as "right" and "authoritative."

A little while back, we released (in blog form) an interaction with a somewhat suspicious anonymous person under one of our Youtube Videos. This troll, who never revealed their true identity, kept insisting on sharing items in link form in the comments from a certain "history & social justice grace teacher." As such it is that we do not agree with much of what this teacher stands for, it has not been our wish to promote him. It was only **after** being accused of "not being able to answer" this teacher's proclamations that we revealed the very reason why we have chosen to have **no part** in the promotion of his teachings. -Which is not only our prerogative, but our responsibility. We are not here to prop up teachings that we would never endorse.

Since we don't waste time going around publicly whining and crying "where's the grace" when someone opposes us or personally attacks us, nor do we victimize ourselves to gain sympathy, many do not realize the level of premeditation, deceptiveness, maliciousness, and vile accusations that we have endured over the years just for sticking to the truth of the scriptures. (From supposed 'grace people')

Yet we don't just set out to expose the false, inaccurate, biased, or lazy teachings of others for no reason and without provocation. You can bet that if you were targeted by us for exposition, you did something to earn it. -And it's very likely we have very gracefully held back on any response to you for many years. Such is the case with this history teacher. What some may conveniently fail to notice is that he wasn't even addressed in any of our teachings or blogs until this suspicious person came along and kept on insisting that we recognize and revere his teachings. We've left him alone for **many years**, although he has consistently campaigned against what we teach.

So, this teacher, the very one who is responsible for initiating the war against the ministry of reconciliation among the 'grace circles' in the first place - has chosen to respond to our blog, well, sort-of:

We woke up today to someone giving us a "heads up" on his most recent teaching. One in which he repeatedly uses our ministry name,

## Categories

All Posts

Blogs

Listener Q&A

## Sign up for blog updates!

Join my email list to receive updates and information.

Email address

SIGN UP

## Recent Posts

Noah Webster:  
The Calvinist Kin...

Apr 22, 2022

Don't Fall Prey to  
The Gospel Buffet

Apr 15, 2022

There We Go  
Again, Upsetting...

Apr 14, 2022



website images, and youtube channel - putting it all on full display within his own video. -Which I'm sure the biased 'grace police' will overlook, even though it's against their own 'rules of conduct.' (Hypocrisy, anyone?)

And let me emphasize **their own rules**, because it is not our rules or even God's rules for that matter. We are perfectly fine with those who choose to speak out publicly against what we teach. All we ask is that they do not misrepresent what we teach and to make sure and spell our name right. The history teacher only succeeded at one of those, but I digress.

He did mention that he disagreed with what we teach about forgiveness. Funny, that's what the entire blog in question was about and the very thing he has campaigned against for years, yet he chose not to argue any of that. Quite telling.

In this attempted dissection of our blog post, he chose to only focus on one small portion, which was actually nothing more than a side-note to the overall content of the blog. Although, he did find time to victimize himself by stating that we made 'ad hominem attacks' before stating that he wasn't "going to get into all that." Apparently he couldn't help himself not at least bring it up - since after all, this whole 'rebuttal' really had everything to do with his attempt to maintain his own image, and little to do with what the scriptures actually say and mean.

In his hour long defense of HIS WORK in researching a single topic (and not in defense of the actual scriptures or terms within the context they were written), his repetitiveness was underwhelming at best. -Especially when you take into consideration that the vast majority of what he said did not oppose our statement that he zeroed in on within our blog post. So let's get into it.

This is the portion from our blog which he took so much time and effort to pick apart:

**"TTR: No one's creating "new" definitions. Just letting the King James say what it says. You should try it. It's unfortunate that you have an issue with that and feel the need to "consult" other sources as your final authority. But I'll entertain your irrelevant claims for a second: "new birth" (which is the definition of regeneration being strongly pushed lately) and RE-birth are not even the same thing.**

**NEW (never before)  
RE (again)**

**If the best I could do was claim that "new" and "again" were both the same thing, I'd probably just shut up. -And I definitely would not preach entire sermons on it. -But that's just me.**

**Also, if I want an extrabiblical source for helping to define words from 17th century text, I usually find it more appropriate to look at the available sources from that same time period. Do etymological research, consult the contextual usage of that word in other relevant sources, etc. - Instead of putting all my trust in something from 200 years after that time period, which contains obviously proven incorrect definitions of other words. But again, that's just me."**

Now, I'm not sure if this guy has completely missed the point made from this small section of the blog post, or if he's misrepresenting this whole section on purpose. (Again, this was not even what the entire blog was about - there were much more important facts that he chose to ignore. This was only in response to one random "out of context" statement from a suspicious anonymous listener within the entire discussion.)

**However, this teacher tried to imply that we were against using man-made dictionaries as study tools. Notice, in the quote above, we stated very clearly that we are opposed to the practice of consulting other sources as the FINAL AUTHORITY. How do you get the claim that we are saying not to use man-made dictionaries from that statement? -You'll have to figure that one out for yourself - especially when we obviously go on to say what we "might" do instead of relying the Webster's 1828 to define terms from 200 years prior. Misrepresentation #1.**

He then goes on and on and on (and on) about how regeneration means "new birth" - which is precisely what we said was being

**Response to Misrepresentation #1**-This statement from TTR is blatant misdirection. TTR is banking on the fact that the readers of this blogpost will not have watched our [video](#) or read the corresponding [document](#). In both we quoted from TTR's video from March 16, 2022, titled "[Wretched Radio vs. Truth Time Radio: To Be, or Not To Be Born Again](#)" in which the speaker can be heard stating the following:

"(18:42) No need to word search, you can lay down the man-made dictionaries. And you don't have to Greek it. The Bible in English is just fine. This Bible, God's word is its own dictionary. We simply compare scripture with scripture and sit back and watch the dots connect. . ."

This quotation coupled with the portion of the original blogpost (highlighted in green) was the impetus for our critique. Taken at face value TTR's combined comments suggest that they are against the use of "man-made dictionaries" when conducting Bible study. Furthermore, they frowned upon using Noah Webster's dictionary from 1828 because it is 200 years removed from the King James Bible (1611). Meanwhile, TTR has completely ignored the very etymological research from the 16th and 17th-century that they called for as to the meaning and usage of the word "regeneration" at the time the King James Bible was translated. This research/evidence was presented in our [YouTube video](#) and [PDF document](#) from April 7, 2022.

Since this blogpost was published on April 8, TTR has authored a follow-up blog titled "[Noah Webster: The Calvinist King James Corrector](#)" (4/22).

Response to Misrepresentation #2—This is classic gaslighting on the part of TTR. Yes, they noted in their [blogpost from 3/20](#) that the definition of "regeneration" being "pushed" was "new birth." Now, in the current blogpost, TTR is seeking to misdirect their readers from the main point by withholding relevant information and asserting that all we did was restate what TTR already said. Above (in Green), TTR connects the prefix "RE" with the word "again" in contradistinction to "new." TTR is endeavoring to isolate the prefix "RE" from the rest of the word "regeneration" and build an argument accordingly. Put another way, rather than defining the entire word "regeneration" by 17th century standards, TTR is advancing a prefix argument to steer their readers to the understanding they are seeking to advance i.e., "RE" equals "again" not "new." This is proved beyond doubt below when TTR presents the *Online Etymological Dictionary* entry for the word "again." In other words, TTR is stacking the deck and hoping their readers don't realize it. Moreover, we presented far more than "a single selected definition" that regeneration/regenerate means "born again." In fact, we cited the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) which stated the following in the etymology section in the entry for "regeneration": "the process or fact of being spiritually **reborn**." Likewise, the first definition cataloged by the OED reads, "the process or fact of being spiritually **reborn**." Did you catch it? According to TTR's own prefix argument "REborn" must mean "born again." Why? Because "RE" equals "again," according to TTR. This is why TTR has hidden information from its readership. It contradicts the argument they are advancing. In addition to the OED and *Table Alphabetical* from 1604 (see the images in the left margin and below) we presented multiple entries from the *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (LEME) as to the meaning/usage of regeneration/regenerate in the 16th and 17th-century. Once again, TTR is failing to convey all the relevant facts to its readership while making out like we can't read or follow basic arguments. This is gaslighting at its finest. Interested parties are encouraged to search the LEME for themselves at the link above and/or check out the images appended to our [PDF document](#) from April 7. Consistent application of TTR's prefix argument reveals the following: REgeneration = born AGAIN. Thus the withholding of relevant facts on the part of TTR.

1604 *Table Alphabetical* entry

1604

regenerate, borne againe  
regeneration, a new birth,

It doesn't matter if you define "regeneration" as "new birth." The fact of the matter is that "new birth" and "born again" are not the same thing. Citing a single selected definition of "regenerate" to mean "born again" from 1604 does not change that fact. -Especially when the actual Bible word used is "regeneratIOn" (not regenerate) from the same dictionary, with the definition of "new birth." As a matter of fact, the word "regenerate" is not even in the King James Bible. So why are we using a word NOT in the Bible to define a word that IS in the Bible? Odd.

When we said in the blog "NEW (never before) RE (again)" it was in the context of the exact sentence prior, which was talking about New BIRTH vs RE BIRTH. The "RE" was not in reference to the word "REgeneration." But this teacher chose to argue as if our "RE" was in reference to the word "regeneration." It seems pretty clear in the context of that statement in our blog that we were talking about NEW birth vs RE birth (ie. born again), but apparently not so clear to the history teacher.

That's a strange way to fashion a supposed rebuttal, and unless he has reading comprehension skills, this is *misrepresentation #2*.

Furthermore, he continues to conflate the words "new" and "again" (in passing, like slight-of-hand tactics) as if they mean the same thing. (And it absolutely isn't the first time he has used this method of conflating terms to prove his own pet doctrine. He does the same thing with forgiveness combined with justification, salvation, and righteousness.)

Anyone with common sense knows that the claim of "new" and "again" having the same meanings could not be further from the truth, because we can define words in the context of every day language. But just because this guy is so bent on choosing his favorite historical textual definitions (without regard to the limitations on various definitions according to context and commonly understood scriptural truths) let's go back in time to evaluate the meanings and origins of the words "new" and "again."

From the etymology online website:

### "new (adj.)

Middle English *neue*, from Old English *neowe*, *niowe*, earlier *niwe* "made or established for the first time, fresh, recently made or grown; novel, unheard-of, different from the old; untried, inexperienced, unused," from Proto-Germanic \**neuja-* (source also of Old Saxon *niuwī*, Old Frisian *nie*, Middle Dutch *nieuwe*, Dutch *nieuw*, Old High German *niuwil*, German *neu*, Danish and Swedish *ny*, Gothic *niujis* "new").

This is from PIE \**newo-* "new" (source also of Sanskrit *navah*, Persian *nau*, Hittite *newash*, Greek *neos*, Lithuanian *naujas*, Old Church Slavonic *novu*, Russian *novyi*, Latin *novus*, Old Irish *nue*, Welsh *newydd* "new").

\*Note: Further down in the entry is this interesting statement:

"Meaning "not habituated, unfamiliar, unaccustomed," 1590s. Of the moon from late Old English. The adverb, "newly, for the first time," is Old English *niwe*, from the adjective."

\*\*Another note: Just so there isn't any confusion, regarding the example from the 1590's above, the "new" in the term "New Moon" was never meant to indicate that the moon was newly created. It is in reference to the (new) beginning, or starting point, of each lunar cycle. Which should be obvious, as when it is said to be the "New Moon," the actual moon is not even visible in the sky. New = beginning (as in GENESIS) in this instance.

### "again (adv.)

Response to Misrepresentation #2—This is classic gaslighting on the part of TTR. Yes, they noted in their [blogpost from 3/20](#) that the definition of "regeneration" being "pushed" was "new birth." Now, in the current blogpost, TTR is seeking to misdirect their readers from the main point by withholding relevant information and asserting that all we did was restate what TTR already said. Above (in Green), TTR connects the prefix "RE" with the word "again" in contradistinction to "new." TTR is endeavoring to isolate the prefix "RE" from the rest of the word "regeneration" and build an argument accordingly. Put another way, rather than defining the entire word "regeneration" by 17th century standards, TTR is advancing a prefix argument to steer their readers to the understanding they are seeking to advance i.e., "RE" equals "again" not "new." This is proved beyond doubt below when TTR presents the *Online Etymological Dictionary* entry for the word "again." In other words, TTR is stacking the deck and hoping their readers don't realize it. Moreover, we presented far more than "a single selected definition" that regeneration/regenerate means "born again." In fact, we cited the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) which stated the following in the etymology section in the entry for "regeneration": "the process or fact of being spiritually **reborn**." Likewise, the first definition cataloged by the OED reads, "the process or fact of being spiritually **reborn**." Did you catch it? According to TTR's own prefix argument "REborn" must mean "born again." Why? Because "RE" equals "again," according to TTR. This is why TTR has hidden information from its readership. It contradicts the argument they are advancing. In addition to the OED and *Table Alphabetical* from 1604 (see the images in the left margin and below) we presented multiple entries from the *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (LEME) as to the meaning/usage of regeneration/regenerate in the 16th and 17th-century. Once again, TTR is failing to convey all the relevant facts to its readership while making out like we can't read or follow basic arguments. This is gaslighting at its finest. Interested parties are encouraged to search the LEME for themselves at the link above and/or check out the images appended to our [PDF document](#) from April 7. Consistent application of TTR's prefix argument reveals the following: REgeneration = born AGAIN. Thus the withholding of relevant facts on the part of TTR.

On the left, TTR cites the *Online Etymological Dictionary* entry for "new" as proof of their argument that "NEW (never before)" is something wholly different from "RE (again)". Careful readers will notice that one of the definitions of "new" in the very source cited by TTR means "different from the old" i.e., "new" does not exclusively mean "FOR THE FIRST TIME," as they have asserted (see highlighted below).

Moreover, the very same dictionary utilized by TTR defines "regenerationION" (see blue highlighting above) as "a being born AGAIN," a point that was explicitly covered in our video from April 7 and completely ignored by TTR. Put another way, "regeneration" means the "radical spiritual CHANGE in an individual accomplished by the action of God" i.e., a change from the "old" to the "new." Therefore, the very dictionary utilized by TTR in their attempted rebuttal does not support their point. The image below from the *Online Etymological Dictionary* was displayed and discussed in our video on 4/7 and is appended to our annotated copy of TTR's blogpost from 3/20. Yet TTR has completely left the most relevant definition from the source they are citing out of the discussion. Misdirection at its finest. Once again, TTR is banking on the fact that the readers of this blogpost have not watched our video or read our annotated document. Put another way, they are not forthcoming with all of the relevant information.

REgeneration = "a being born AGAIN"

Despite their claims to the contrary, TTR is privately defining words. If one applies TTR's prefix argument consistently using the very dictionary they cited, their argument is proved false.

### regeneration (n.)

mid-14c., *regeneracioun*, "act of regenerating or producing anew," originally spiritual, also of the Resurrection, from Old French *regeneracion* (Modern French *régénération*) and directly from Late Latin *regenerationem* (nominative *regeneratio*) "a being born again," noun of action from past participle stem of Latin *regenerare* "make over; generate again," from *re-* "again" (see **re-**) + *generare* "bring forth, beget, produce," from *genus* "race, kind" (from PIE root \***gene-** "give birth, beget," with derivatives referring to procreation and familial and tribal groups).

Originally theological. "radical spiritual change in an individual accomplished by the action of God;" of animal tissue, "power or process of growing again," early 15c.; of forests, 1888.

late Old English *agan*, from earlier *onagan* (prep.) "toward; opposite, against, contrary to; in exchange for," as an adverb "in the opposite direction, back, to or toward a former place or position," from *on* "on" (see on (prep.) and compare *a-* (1)) + *-gegn* "against, toward," from Germanic root \**gagina* (source also of Old Norse *gegn* "straight, direct;" Danish *igen* "against;" Old Frisian *jen*, Old High German *gegin*, German *gegen* "against, toward," *entgegen* "against, in opposition to")

In Old English, *eft* (see *eftsoons*) was the main word for "again," but this often was strengthened by *onagan*, which became the principal word by 13c. Norse influence is responsible for the hard *-g-*. Differentiated from *against* (q.v.) 16c. in southern writers, *again* becoming an adverb only, and *against* taking over as preposition and conjunction, but *again* clung to all senses in northern and Scottish dialect (where *against* was not adopted). Of action, "in return," early 13c.; of action or fact, "once more," late 14c.

\*Notice the last definition- "once more," late 14c. This shows the evolution of the word "again" and how it came to mean "once more" by the late 14c.

Compare:

#### NEW- for the first time

#### AGAIN- once more

Now, this begs the question - **how do the words "new" and "again" mean the same thing?** When have they EVER meant the same thing? Perhaps the history teacher should REthink (think again) on this dilemma. His desire to apply the term "born again" to the Body of Christ certainly isn't a NEW thought (never thought of before) - as religious Christianity has been saying the term "born again" means "new birth" **since around the 1920's**, near the end of the late modern era of Christianity.

Before that, being "born again" was the theme of the Great Awakening beginning in the 1700's - the "revival" in America led by preachers of **Reformed Theology**. (See Johnathan Edward's Doctrine of Original Sin.) In other words, being "born again" was the **Calvinist Conversion Experience** promoted during the Great Awakening. The term wasn't even widely used in mainstream Christianity until the 1970's. So, being a "born again" christian isn't a new thought, but it's not very old, either. Oddly enough, thousands of years must have passed before Christians historically began referring to themselves as being "born again."

Why one would make such efforts to conflate meanings and derivatives, KNOWING (as a history teacher **should**) where the usage of the terminology originates, thereby removing the obvious distinction that is one of the obvious Pauline tenets clearly laid out when "rightly dividing the word of truth," is beyond me. Perhaps this history teacher doesn't like being separate from the **Calvinistic Reformed Theologians?** Perhaps he needed to locate some "common ground" with mainstream Christianity? Maybe he has the idea that he needs to "stand out" from the others in what he calls the "greater grace space" and make a name for himself? Maybe he's just doubling down on "not knowing any better." -Who knows, and who cares, really? It's incorrect, misleading, compromising the truth, and dangerous to his followers.

**And, just for the record, TTR doesn't "make up" definitions for terms. (Misrepresentation #3.)** Yes, we do conduct our own research outside of scripture. We just do not promote it as "our work which cannot be questioned," nor do we go "all out" to defend it. Besides, if our own research does not line up with the contextual usage of the scriptures, it goes in the trash. Because, ultimately it isn't OUR WORD or OUR own understanding of terminology that matters, it is GOD's WORD that IS the final authority. **-Not that of the extrabiblical research of a "history teacher," and certainly not that of a "born again" Calvinist who published a partially plagiarized dictionary in 1828. (More on that subject to come in the near future.)**

**Paul never uses the term "born again" to describe what happens to those of us saved during the dispensation of Grace.** That fact cannot be argued. Well, at least it can't be argued against in an honest and non-misleading manner. If regeneration means "NEW birth" then it cannot, without breaking the law of non-contradiction, mean "born

See our comments above about TTR's deck stacking in terms of the defining of words.

See our comments above regarding the details on how TTR has selectively engineered the definitions they are using to advance their theological argument. This is accomplished by playing games with the prefix "RE" and ignoring the very 17th-century etymological research they called for in their blogpost from March 20. Once again, the very dictionary cited by TTR in this blogpost undermines their argument. See our comments above regarding TTR's selective use of the *Online Etymological Dictionary*.

**TTR foreshadows the release of a follow-up blogpost to this one on the topic of Noah Webster in the "near future." The promised blogpost on Webster titled "Noah Webster: The Calvinist King James Bible Corrector" was originally released on Friday, April 22, 2022. The history of TTR's blogpost on Webster is curious to say the least. We will refrain from commenting further at this time.**

It is true that Paul never uses the term "born again," however, he used the word "regeneration" a word that means "the process or fact of being spiritually REborn," according to the OED. Likewise, the Online Etymological Dictionary, the very source cited by TTR in this blogpost, defines "regeneration" as "a being born again," a fact conveniently left out of this blogpost (see images above). Consistent application of TTR's prefix argument to all of the relevant data reveals the following:

Premise 1) RE=AGAIN-Once More (See TTR's prefix argument above.)

Premise 2) REgeneration = "spiritually REborn" (See the OED's definition above.)

Premise 3) REborn = Born AGAIN (By consistent application of TTR prefix argument.)

Conclusion) REgeneration = Born AGAIN (The exact definition of "regeneration" that is presented in the Online Etymological Dictionary the very source cited by TTR in this article.)



AGAIN." That's just common sense - no need to dig up ye olde dictionary entries to prove it.

NEW and AGAIN do not mean the same thing. It's astounding that one would even have to make such a statement, but this is the time in which we live - wherein the 'history teacher's' campaign to blur the lines between Pauline Truth and denominational dogma continues on.

Oh, and one more thing worth mentioning (*misrepresentation #4 - we'll 'show some grace' by ignoring the rest in this supposed rebuttal, as well as all of the others piled on through the years, for now.*):

*Just because someone trusts the King James Bible as their final authority on God's Word does not mean they hold a "superstitious view" of it.* Perhaps the all-knowing history teacher should look up the word "superstition" and its relation to religious beliefs. Then he might come to the conclusion that getting away from the superstitious religious dogma is the very reason why we (and SO many others who understand Pauline Doctrine) are so opposed to his new passion for embracing of the term "born again" as a shiny new label for those of us who adhere to Pauline Doctrine.

But then again, perhaps he likes religious dogma, since he took time to point out the fact that we question his salvation. And we do. While religion has made it SO taboo to question anyone's salvation (especially those of particular status within the alleged 'grace movement'), our Apostle Paul says this:

2 Corinthians 13:5 Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?

"Examine yourselves." Last time I checked, exams have questions in need of answers.

According to religious gracers, and the rest of Christianity in general, Paul really shouldn't have questioned anyone's salvation, should've he? How offensive of him! (By the way, questioning doesn't mean doubting. It means questioning.)

It's becoming more and more obvious that many who proclaim to follow Paul don't seem to understand half of what he said or why he said it.

TTR doesn't "assume" anyone into Heaven OR Hell. But we do listen to the words people say. We pay attention to the implications of what teachers promote, and the amount of time they spend doing so (which indicates motives.)

This history teacher has gone so far out of his way to prove himself "right" in opposing the finished work of Christ on the cross, I don't know how anyone who's paying attention wouldn't at least question exactly what he believes regarding the gospel. He teaches that belief is what gets sins forgiven - and not that what Christ accomplished on the cross earned forgiveness without anyone else's participation needed.

Suggesting that your belief is what earns you something that God granted (a done deal) for Christ's sake (not yours) around 2000 years ago is a blasphemous claim and a dangerous teaching which has produced rancid fruit among some 'gracers' at best, and will potentially cause some to stumble into Hell at worst.

But somehow, we at TTR are the "dangerous" ones?

Why?

Because we give ALL (not part of) the credit to Christ for forgiveness?

Because we take God at His Word?

Because we believe that the King James Bible IS God's Word?

Because we do not place men (past or present) on pedestals?

Because we don't seek the approval of men, but only of God?

We can only assume that the comment about "others piled on through the years" is a reference to our historic opposition to TTR's teaching regarding forgiveness/reconciliation in II Cor. 5:19. Over the years, since learning of the position in 2013, we have taught against the notion that there are forgiven people in hell as maintained by TTR. Initially, when we were first made aware of the position via Facebook, we were not aware of TTR's advocacy of the view. Parties interested in our position on the greater doctrinal dispute regarding forgiveness/reconciliation are encouraged to check out the following resources.

[Do People Go to Hell With Their Sins Forgiven \(PDF Notes\)](#);6/30/13

[Understanding the Ministry of Reconciliation](#)-2/4/18

[Understanding the Ministry of Reconciliation, Part 2](#)-2/11/18

[Understanding the Ministry of Reconciliation, Part 3](#)-2/18/18

TTR's position maintains that forgiven and reconciled people will miss the rapture because they have not believed Paul's gospel and are therefore not justified. For others, belief in the forgiven and reconciled lost is an unbiblical theological nonstarter.

It should also be pointed out that nowhere in this blogpost does TTR address/respond to our actual scriptural exegesis of the topic of born again/regeneration. Yet again, TTR is found relying on the fact that their readership is not aware of our scriptural exposition of the relevant texts. Parties interested in understanding what we actually said on the matter are encouraged to check out the following resources.

[Born Again or Regenerated: Is There a Difference](#)-3/6/22

[Born Again or Regenerated: Is There a Difference, \(Part 2\)](#)-3/13/22

[Response to TTR's Blogpost-What Happens When You Put A "History Teacher" Above God's Word](#)-4/7/22

[Response to TTR's Blogpost-What Happens When You Put a "History Teacher" Above God's Word \(PDF Document\)](#)-4/7/22

Because we insist that our listeners study for themselves without the need to rely on our (or anyone else's) teachings?

Because we don't forsake **sound doctrine** in favor of supposed "fellowship?"

Because we refuse to compromise on clear distinctions between Pauline teachings and doctrine meant for Israel?

-Those kinds of things would only be "dangerous" to certain types of people with certain motives.

You can decide for yourselves who those people are and what their agenda is. We don't need to tell you.

Share this post:  



Copyright © 2011-2021 Truth Time Radio - All Rights Reserved. You are welcome to share our content with others ONLY if proper attribution to Truth Time Radio and links to this website are included. Otherwise, unless protected under "fair use" doctrine, no content of this website may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of Truth Time Radio. Truth Time Radio does not authorize any sales of our intellectual property by other entities.

Intellectual property is protected by U.S. federal law via copyright, patent, or trademark. Any copyright and/or trademark infringements may be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

[HOME](#) [LISTENER Q&A - BLOGS](#) [BEST NEWS EVER](#) [PODCASTS](#) [STATEMENT OF FAITH](#) [TRUTHWEAR](#)  
[TRUTHCONNECT](#) [PRIVACY POLICY](#)

---

#### RELEVANT TIMELINE:

3/6/22-[Born Again or Regenerated: Is There A Difference?](#)(Taught @ GLBC)

3/13/22-[Born Again or Regenerated: Is There a Difference?\(Part 2\)](#) (Taught @ GLBC)

3/16/22-[Wretched Radio vs Truth Time Radio: To Be, or Not To Be Born Again](#)" (TTR released video on YouTube.)

3/20/22-[What Happens When You Put A "History Teacher" Above God's Word?](#)" (Blogpost published by TTR)

3/20/22-TTR published "BS" comment on YouTube in response to Emerald24 with a link to the Blogpost.

4/7/22-Response to TTR's Blogpost-What Happens When You Put A "History Teacher" Above God's Word? (Video released on the GLBC [YouTube](#) channel & [PDF document](#) published to website.)

4/8/22-[The History Teacher Barks Back](#)" (Blogpost published on the TTR website.)

4/22/22-[Noah Webster: The Calvinist King James Bible Corrector](#)" (Blogpost published on the TTR website)

