**If Isaiah 53:6c Is True Then Universalism Is True?**

I’ve seen the following argument made in several quarters in the last ten years or so – if everybody’s sins were laid upon Jesus, then everybody is going to be saved (universalism). What are people thinking? What do they mean IF everybody’s sins were laid upon Jesus?; isn’t that what Isaiah 53:6c says – “the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all”?

Actually Universalism’s argument is “Jesus died for all, therefore all will be saved.” The “substitution” concept is not usually mentioned in their argument. So if the Substitution concept makes Universalism true, then the fact Jesus died for all would also make Universalism true. If not, why not?

Notice Jesus “purged” (past tense) everybody’s sins on the cross (Hebrews 1:3). If everybody’s sins were purged at the cross, how could anybody be held accountable for those purged sins? Wouldn’t that mean everybody is going to be saved (universalism)? If you can understand why that argument is unsound, then why would you make the exact same argument against Jesus dying in our place (John 11:48-52)?

So it appears many are making an argument they don’t really even believe. But I am not accusing anybody of dishonesty. No, I don’t think brethren realize they are doing such. But this does show how desperate some are to come up with something, anything to get around the plain meaning of the substitution Bible proof texts.

I think this is another point in favor of doing religious debates. I am convinced that any gospel preacher who has ever debated against the Limited Atonement theory would never make this argument. Because he would realize he was making the same false argument as the Calvinists make for their theory.

By the way, my same argument can be made from I Timothy 2:6 – if Jesus “gave himself a ransom for all,” does that mean all are going to be saved? Why not if all were ransomed? “Universal Provision, Individual Appropriation” (Kevin Kay) is the answer to both false concepts – Universalism, and our brethren’s parallel argument against Jesus’ vicarious atonement.