

ALEXANDER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen, let me first deal with my opponents answers to my questions. The first question was; Are repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ conditions that must be met by responsible sinners in order for them to be saved and have hope of glory, He said I'm going to answer them by the Articles of Faith and Baptist Waybook. Now, he evaded my question. He couldn't tell us whether the scriptures teach that repentance toward God and faith in Jesus are necessary in order for one to obtain, for a responsible sinner to obtain, to be saved and have hope in glory. He did say that repentance and faith are fruits of regeneration. Now he has taken the position as I understand it, that regeneration, the impartation of eternal life comes before repentance and faith. Now, I'm going to leave that for right now, but we're going to deal with it again before this debate is over and I want you to remember that he has publicly taken the position that one must be regenerated before he can repent and trust Jesus Christ.

The second question was: Since you evidently teach that those individuals whom God elected to salvation were not elected because of any act or quality or attitude of response, foreseen or foreknown in him. What quality or attribute was there in God himself that attached itself to those individuals alone as the causative motive for God's election of those particular individuals. Now that question means this: Since my opponent teaches that God did not elect men to salvation because of anything he foresaw or foreknew in them. Then what was there in God what attribute was there in God that caused him, that attached himself to these individuals and caused him to elect them. I've heard Calvinist say many times, I've read their statements that the cause of God's election of certain individuals was in him, it wasn't the individuals, it was in God himself. Well I want to know what attribute in God is the cause of him electing those individuals. Well he pointed to Ephesians 1:5, "According to the good pleasure of his will." Now this is about what I expected. "The good pleasure of his will." Well now God says and he swears by his own life, Brother Crawford, In Ezekiel 33:11, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked but that the wicked turn from his way and live," and the turning is before the living. Now you mark that down. God does not take pleasure in a wicked man dying in his sins. God takes pleasure in the wicked man repenting and living and that's proof that God elected the penitent believer. I'll take, that's the good pleasure of his will. But you'll never find God taking pleasure in reprobating unbelievers to hell. You'll never find his pleasure in men dying in their sins. His pleasure is in men repenting and living; and on that grounds he elected men to salvation.

All right. The third question. Would God have been equally wise, just and benevolent in the election of salvation of sinners in order, if the order had been reversed so that he would pardon and save the obstinate impenitent unbelievers and would reprobate the submissive penitent believers to everlasting punishment in hell? Now I didn't really know what to expect as an answer on this. But I'll tell you, I didn't expect what he said. He said, "How do you know he didn't invert the order. How do you know he didn't invert the order? I know, because Jesus said, "My sheep hear my voice and I know them and they follow me and I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish." His sheep are believers in Christ. Jesus said, and I know that he didn't invert that order because Jesus said to Nicodemus in the third chapter of John, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the Son of Man be lifted up that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life." That's how I know it.

Question No. 4. Are those who are elected to salvation but have not yet been regenerated, under condemnation. If so when will the condemnation be removed. He said, of course they are under condemnation. He didn't tell me when the condemnation will be removed. But I'm glad he acknowledged that they're under condemnation. Now I'm going to have use for this later and I'm going to let it ride right now; but I'll tell you, I will carry it this far; If God in eternity before the time ages began unconditionally elected certain number of people to salvation and gave them to Christ then, according to my brother's own statement; I have his words later on in this speech when he pointed to the first chapter of Ephesians and he said, "we were in Christ before the foundation of the world," then he has people in Christ condemned. Because he has those who were elected before the foundation of the world," then he has people in Christ condemned. Because he has those who were elected to salvation and have not yet been regenerated under condemnation and then he turns around and says that we, referring to all of the elect, were in Christ from before the foundation of the

world. Calvinists always meet themselves in their inconsistencies. There's not a man in this world who holds to any false system of doctrine that doesn't cross himself up and my brother holds to a false system of doctrine. And they crossed themselves up. On the one hand, he has unregenerated elect people condemned. On the other hand, he has them in Christ. Even before the foundation of the world in Christ, and yet condemned. Now, that shows the absurdity of this system of Calvinism.

All right. Question No.5. I asked about; was it possible for certain mentioned in the Bible as the rich man who came to Jesus and the people of Sodom and Tyre and Sidon and the people of Jerusalem over whom Jesus lamented and the people who Paul charged with putting the gospel from themselves and judging themselves unworthy of everlasting life. I asked if it were possible for them to have repented and believed on Christ and to have received eternal life. He said, you're trying to make me God. Now you know better than that Brother Crawford, I simply want to know, could those people have repented and believed on Jesus Christ, would they have received eternal life. I point you to the words of Jesus in the, concerning the people of Sodom and Tyre and Sidon in the 11th Chapter of Matthew, he upbraided the cities where most his mighty works were done because they repented not. And he said to them, "Woe unto thee, Chorazin." Let me take the time to read this, the 11th Chapter of Matthew. I want to read it. I don't want to misquote it. The 11th Chapter of Matthew, beginning with verse 20. "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not." Now I want you to know Jesus never upbraided people for not doing that which was impossible for them to do. Never did do it. "Woe unto thee, Chorazin, woe unto thee, Bethsaida, for if the might works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgement, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, that it shall be for tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgement, then for you." Now Jesus said concerning Tyre and Sidon, if the miracles had been worked there that would have worked in Chorazin and Bethsaida they would have repented. I say it again, if they would have repented, as Jesus said, then they could have repented and if they could have repented, they could have been saved. Because every sinner who repents toward God is saved. Now I defy my brother to take the position that a sinner can repent toward God and still dies and go to hell. All right. I'm going to pass from that right now. He referred to Romans 9:30, 32. My argument that I had made I believe be was the last argument that I made, the reason that Israel did not obtain righteousness was because they sought it not by faith. My opponent said, "Where did the Israelites get their faith." Well he answered his own question when he quoted to I Corinthians 3:5, when Paul said, "Who is Paul and who is Apollos but the ministers by whom you believed even as God giveth to every man." All right. I believe I don't think my opponent will take issue with, that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. These Israelites who did not obtain righteousness because they sought it not by faith, could have received faith by hearing the word of God. Giving heed to it. I want to point you to a passage of scripture in John's gospel account. In the 12th chapter of John if my memory's right, Jesus was speaking to some of those Jews whom God blinded and whose hearts God hardened. Now I'll show you that in just a moment. But in the 12 chapter of John beginning with verse 35, then Jesus said unto them, he's speaking to these Jews, "Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light lest darkness come upon you for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he go." Now watch verse 36. "While ye have light, believe in that light that ye may be children of light." I want to tell you that Jesus was admonishing these people to believe in him. He is the light of the world and if that believing in him was in order to their becoming children of light, or children of God, if you please: "These things spake Jesus and departed and did hide himself from them. But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him." Now these are people who did not believe, and I want to show you why. That the saying of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, "Lord who hath believed our report. And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed; therefore they could not believe. The time came when they could not believe, because that Isaiah said again, "He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts that they should not see with their eyes nor understand with their hearts and be converted and I should heal them. These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spake of him," but Jesus said to them, "While ye have light, believe in the light that you may be the children of light." Jesus never would have said

that if it had been impossible for those people to believe in him and be saved. I'm not afraid to take the position that those people that I referred to in this question could have repented of their sins and trusted Christ and have been given eternal life. My opponent wanted to evade it. He said, "you're trying to make me God." I'm not. I'm just trying to get you to answer a question Brother Crawford. Could they have been saved? I think he knew where that I was going to get him, and he didn't dare answer it. I think he knew that if he answered it, he knew he was going to ruin his argument.

Now, let's proceed a little further. He feels sorry for me because I do not understand the deeper thing of election and so on. Well I appreciate my brother's cordial feeling toward me, feeling sorry for me because I don't understand enough and know that God elected or chose men to salvation on the condition of their repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ and all through this discussion, I'm going to point my opponent, I'm going to challenge him to produce an impenitent unbeliever whom God has chosen in his unbelief to salvation. And if he can't do it, then his proposition falls. Every person who does get saved, gets saved when he repents and trusts Christ. God chose the penitent believer. God will have mercy on him who repents toward God and believes on Jesus Christ. God will not have mercy on the impenitent unbeliever. He tried to point to the 1st chapter of Jeremiah as an example of God having mercy on an impenitent unbeliever before Jeremiah was ever born. Well let's just see what that says. Jeremiah chapter 1, verse 5. If my memory's right, it doesn't say anything about mercy. God said, "Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee." I believe that. "And before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." He did that on the grounds of his foreknowledge by there isn't a thing here about God's mercy. God sanctified him and ordained him to be a prophet on the grounds of his foreknowledge. I believe that. But you've got to find a responsible sinner, a sinner capable of responding to the influence of God, whom God has had mercy on and saved before he repents and trusts Jesus Christ. You haven't found that.

All right. He said those whom God hath given him; John 17:2. I want to go to the 17th chapter of John. John 17:2, "As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou has given him." Hast given is in the past tense. It's in the perfect tense, if I remember right. That's fine. I like that. Then Jesus Christ gives eternal life to those whom God has given him. He gives eternal life to the believer and God has given the believer to him. Not any unbelievers. Show me an unbeliever that God has given him. Show me an impenitent unbeliever that God's given him. There isn't a verse in all the Bible that points to an impenitent unbeliever that God has given to Christ. Certainly, he gives eternal life to all whom God has given him. Whom has God given him? The believer in Christ. No unbelievers. Now in verse 11, Christ prayed like this: "And now I am no more in the world but these are in the world and I come to thee Holy father keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me." Hast given is in the same tense it is in verse 2. On the one hand my opponent says that unregenerated elect person is under condemnation. And on the other hand, this Jesus said he prayed for the father to keep those whom he has given to me. If God had gave them to him before eternity, then he's keeping them in condemnation. If they're under condemnation they don't belong to him. Now my friend made the statement a while ago; well, we'll get to it after a while, but he made the statement and I want to deal with it. That before the foundation of the world God chose us in Christ. He pointed to the first chapter of Ephesians. And he made the statement that we were in Christ from before the foundation of the world. Am I quoting you right? Therefore, we are not of the world. Now he's talking about all the elect. Not of the world. Even those who are unregenerated. Those elect people who are unregenerated not of the world. Well, let's see whether they are of the world. Second chapter of Ephesians, Paul was writing to the same people whom God had according to the good pleasure of his will chosen in Christ. And in the second chapter he says to these same elect people: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses in sin wherein in times past." Now that's since eternity, you understand, "in time past, ye walked according to the course of this world. According to the prince of the power of the air." Who is that? That's Satan. "The spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience among whom also we all had our conversations, or manner of life in times past, in the lust of our flesh fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind and were by nature the children of wrath even as others." And yet my friend says that they were not of the world. Paul says they were. Now I believe that Paul knew what he was talking about. Now he says that every time in the Old Testament that God calls one of his

people, he comes. Well I want to know who God was talking to in the 1st chapter of Proverbs when he said, "Because I have called you refused, I've stretched out my hand no man regarded you, you would have none of my counsel." I want to know was God talking to his people in the book of Romans chapter 10, when God said, but to Israel he saith all day long have I stretched my hand unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." Was God calling to his people? But they did not come. Because Paul said earlier in this chapter verse 18, "But they have not heart. Yes, verily." Now pardon me, verse 16. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel for Isaiah saith Lord who hath believed our report so then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God. But I say, have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went unto all the earth and their words unto the ends of the world." And God said to Israel, "all day long I have stretched forth my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people." (Five minutes.) All right.

I want to proceed with some other arguments if you will. I was talking about the necessity of faith to salvation. I want to continue with that. Personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain salvation. All who are destitute of personal faith in Christ are lost. And all lost sinners are children of the devil. John 3:18, John 3:36, John 8:24, John 8:44. John 8:44 is where Jesus told some Jews, "You are of your father the devil." 2. Personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain remission of sins. Luke 8:48, 50 and Acts 10:43. In Acts 10:43, Peter tells where all the prophets preached to him, gave all the prophets witness that though his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. 3. Personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to be justified. Acts 13:38, 39, Romans 5:1, Galatians 2:16. 4. Personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain sonship with God. Now I want to emphasize this. Galatians 3:26. "You are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." and I John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." No unbeliever is born of God my friend. Now this is further shown; this act of personal faith in Christ is necessary to obtain sonship in God, is further shown in that only those who receive Christ by faith are given the right of adoption into the family of God. John 1:12, 13, "He came to his own and his own received him not, but as many as received him, received him by faith, to them gave he the power, the legal right." Now you get the legal right, not to be born, but to be adopted. To them gave he the legal right to be, or, to become the sons of God which were already his sons by right? As many as received him. Not one unbeliever has it. All right. Now personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain eternal spirit life. I point you to John 3:14-16. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life." John 6:47, 53, 54. In John 6:53, Jesus said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have no life in you." I defy my opponent to show how that any sinner eats the flesh of the Son of man and drinks his blood before he repents and trusts Christ. And unless he eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the son of man he has not spirit life in him. Now that ruins his position that regeneration comes before repentance and faith. Faith in Christ is absolutely necessary in order to obtain eternal spirit life. And that verse proves it. He's got to show an unbeliever who has eternal life or else admit that faith in Christ is necessary to obtain the eternal life, eternal spirit life. I don't think, believe he can do that.

All right. I point to my next argument is Titus 1:1, "Paul a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ according to the faith of God's elect and the acknowledging of the truth which is after Godliness." This scripture tells us that God's elect have faith. What my opponent has to do is show some unbelievers, some people who are without any faith in God who are elected of God to salvation. My brother you can't do it. The faith of God's elect. All right. (Your time is up.)

CRAWFORD'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen, my honorable opponent, I stand before you with a heart filled with gratitude and thanks for the opportunity to come and again affirm the proposition that has been read in your hearing. Permit me to re-read the proposition: "The Scriptures teach that some men are unconditionally elected to salvation and eternal glory." As I said, I did not write these propositions, my opponent did that. I signed them in order to keep down endless fussing and quibbling over propositions. I would have worded it probably a little differently, but that's neither here nor there. I affirm what he has written out and he put me in the affirmative in four of these propositions. That's quite all right with me. Permit me also to give a definition of the terms of this proposition:

1. By Scriptures, I mean the sixty-six books commonly known as The Bible as they were originally written in Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek.
2. By teach, I mean the scriptures set forth by precept and convey in words to instruct; to cause to know; to impart the knowledge of.
3. By unconditional election; I mean what the ancient Waldensean Baptist meant in their confession of faith of 1120 A.D. and printed and sold by the Baptist Sunday School Committee of the American Baptist Association of Texarkana, Arkansas; article eleven states. "That God saves from the corruption and condemnation those whom he hath chosen from the foundation of the world, not for any disposition, faith or holiness that he foresaw in them, but of his mere mercy in Jesus Christ his Son; passing by all the rest according to the irreprehensible reason of his free will and justice." (Churches of the Valley of the Piedmont, by Samuel Morland, p. 64)

To this time, my friend has not brought to your attention one thing about that confession of faith. I hope he does, and he probably will. I was in the midst of Argument No. 8 when my time ran out, I passed over Argument No. 7 and I will get to Argument No. 7 in this debate. Because it goes over all the great Baptist preachers and scholars who have put forth their sentiments on election. And I'm going to save that. My 8th argument was what I was speaking to when my time ran out. And that is:

ARGUMENT #8

The doctrine of election was taught by the early Church Fathers, and it is a characteristic of martyrs who died for Christ.

FIRST PROPOSITION: Christ promised perpetuity and continuity to his church.

1. Matthew 16:18, "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Eph. 3:21, "Unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.")

SECOND PROPOSITION: In order for the church to continue through succeeding ages, the doctrines of that church must also continue because without the doctrines of Christ, the church would cease to be the identifiable church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

2. In 2 John 9, "Whosoever transgresseth, abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ he hath both the Father and the Son."

THIRD PROPOSITION: Since it is a clear and unmistakable fact that his churches would teach what their Lord and Master taught, or they would not continue to be his churches for any great length of time.

3. Christ taught unconditional election.
 - a. John 15:16, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: and whatsoever ye ask of the Father in my name, he may do."

This was not an election to offices as apostles but to bring forth fruit. Otherwise you would have to be an apostle to bring forth fruit, and I mentioned that, but my friend observed that Passover when he came to that argument. Let it be said here and now that John 15:16 says, "Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you and ordained you that ye should go and bring forth fruit and that your fruit should remain."

- b. John 13:18, "I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me."

FOURTH PROPOSITION: The pastors of the true churches of our Lord Jesus Christ have preached the doctrines of election down through the ages. The doctrines of predestination and election have been the identifying characteristics of the persecuted flock of the Great Shepherd.

- 4. I bring up first of all, Clement of Rome (A.D. 30-114) taught election and predestination.
 - a. He was a companion of the Apostle Paul, and his name is mentioned in the New Testament. In Phil. 4:3, "...with Clement also, and with other my fellowlabourers, whose names are in the book of life."
 - b. Clement wrote a letter to the church at Corinth in A.D. 69, While the Temple was still standing at Jerusalem, and the Apostle John was still alive, and before the Gospel of John, the epistles of John, and the book of Revelation were written.
 - c. In fact, he, Clement was called an apostle by many of the early writers.
 - d. Next, Clement said in his letter to the church at Corinth, the first epistle to the church of Corinth, he said, "He who made us and fashioned us, having prepared His bountiful gifts for us before we were born, introduced us into His world." That's taken from The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, P. 49) I want you to compare brother, Eph. 1:3-4, Paul said, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ according to the good pleasure of his will."
 - e. Next, Clement used the term "elect" to describe those whom God had chosen to be saved. Here's what he said, chapter two, "Day and night ye were anxious for the whole brotherhood, that the number of God's elect might be saved with mercy and a good conscience." Now, compare II Timothy 2:20, says, "Therefore I endured all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." Christ said in John 10:16, "And other sheep have I which are not of this fold: them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Romans 11:25, "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness is part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." And that is what the Lord Jesus Christ was talking about when he said 'other sheep have I which are not of this fold. Them must I seek they shall hear my voice and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.' Clement preached the sovereign will of God. It is the eternal will of God which controls our lives. Here's what he said in chapter 26: "When he wills, and as he wills, he does all things; none of those things which are decreed by him, shall pass away," or be unaccomplished. That's in the same Ante-Nicene Fathers, the Book, chapter 26. Notice what he said: "All that he wills, what he wills, he wills, and he does all things none of those things which are decreed by him shall pass away or be unaccomplished."
 - aa. Eph1:11, "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his will."

bb. And then Isaiah 14:24, "The Lord of host hath sworn, saying surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; as I have purposed, so shall it stand...For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? And his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?"

SUMMARY

1. Clement who was a companion of Paul preached and taught the doctrines of sovereign grace, as did Christ and the Apostles before him.
2. These doctrines of predestination and election were taught in the church down through the ages. Therefore, without teaching the doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ the church's perpetuity hangs in doubt.
3. Therefore, without teaching and preaching of these doctrines any modern church of our day and time cannot be identified with the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ or the churches of succession.

In fact, I'm making this type of a statement right here and now. Dr. Alexander is my friend and we're going to be better friends when this debate is over than we are tonight. He can't find a Baptist church 200 years ago that believed what he's been preaching here. Now I'll tell you what I'll do. Dr. Alexander. If you find one, I'm not talking about General Baptist, I'm talking about Missionary Baptist. You find a Missionary Baptist church that affirms what you're teaching here I'll admit that I'm wrong to all these people. You bring it up here. You, my dear brother are preaching and teaching General Baptist doctrines in a Missionary Baptist church. And I will prove that in the next three days. I will prove that in the next three days.

5. Ignatius in the next testimony I'm showing the continuity and perpetuity of Baptist here. Ignatius A.D. 30-107.
 - A. Ignatius and Polycarp were young assistants to the Apostle John. Tradition says the former was a little child which Christ set in the midst of the Apostles in Matthew 18:2, when he taught them the lesson on humility. In fact, he went by the name Theophorus, which is the Greek term, born in the arms of God.
 - B. Ignatius wrote several letters in which he magnified the doctrines of unconditional election.

Here's the Ante-Nicene Fathers, published by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Vol. I, p. 49. Ignatius said in his letter to the Ephesians church, "Ignatius, who is called Theophorus, to the church which is in Ephesus in Asia, deservedly most happy, being blessed in the greatness and fullness of God the Father, and predestinated before the beginning of time, that it should always for an enduring and unchangeable glory, being united and elected through the true passion of the will of the Father, and Jesus Christ, our Lord: Abundant happiness through Jesus Christ, and his undefiled grace." Now that's Ignatius, the way he wrote to another missionary Baptist church.

 - a. Eph. 1:4-5, 11, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." That is the way Paul wrote, they were the same.
 - b. II Tim. 1:9, "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works but according to his own purpose in grace, which has given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."
 - c. Rom. 8:29-30, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."
 - C. Ignatius preached the doctrine of reprobation also.

Now Brother Alexander our baptism came through these churches. We had better be careful of declaring non-fellowship for some people that we claim we have a succession back to Christ.

Ignatius said this in The Epistle to the Magnesians, Chap. V. My dear friend brought up this afternoon and he made a big passionate plea on god not predestinating or not reprobating people to hell. I don't know of any Baptist that ever preached that. Any true Baptist. Let me say this. You'll find as you go back through the ages that our old brethren laid their lives on the stake for Baptist doctrine. Now you listen to what he said. Chapter V. Here's what he said about reprobation, Dr. Alexander. "For I remark, that there are two different characters found among men, the one true coin, the other spurious. The truly devout man is the right kind of coin, stamped by God himself. The ungodly man, again, is a false coin, unlawful, spurious, counterfeit, wrought not by God, but by the devil. I do not mean;" now in case you go off on a two-seeder tangent here, he added those so you wouldn't do that. "I do not mean to say there are two different human natures, but there is one humanity sometimes belonging to God, and sometimes belonging to the devil." You make what you want out of that."

- a. II Tim. 3:7-8, Paul preached the same thing. Paul said, "They're ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." That's what Paul said.
- b. I Peter. 2:3-9, "A stone (this is Christ), of stumbling and a rock of offense, even to them that stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto they were appointed, but ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth praises of him that called you out of darkness into his marvelous light."

Now Brother Alexander you have an argument with this scripture, take it up with Peter. He said they were stumbling at the word whereunto they were appointed.

Now the summary on Ignatius (A.D. 30-107)

1. Ignatius taught the doctrine of unconditional election and said God hath predestinated his people "before the beginning of time" which agrees with Paul in Eph. 1:4. "According as He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world."
2. Ignatius taught the doctrine of reprobation: that men are divided into two different kinds; the counterfeit or the spurious stamped by God and stamped by the devil. Now I don't know whom God has stamped and you don't either. I don't know whom the devil has stamped. But that doesn't mean that I deny it. Because I read in Matthew the 13th chapter that there is a field in which there is true wheat and there are tares and the Lord Jesus Christ said the enemy did this. All right. We'll find out.

6. Polycarp (A.D. 65-155)

a. Polycarp was the young assistant to the great apostle John who wrote five books of the New Testament: The Gospel of John; First, Second and Third John; and the Book of Revelation. Irenaeus gives this portrait of Polycarp: He said "I could describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and taught; his going out and coming in; the whole tenor of his life; his personal appearance; how he would speak of the conversions he had held with John and with others who had seen the Lord. Now Irenaeus was Polycarp's disciple and says "Polycarp was instructed by the Apostle, and was brought into contact with those who had actually seen Christ." (Here's what he said in Euseb. His Eccl. III 14)

b. Polycarp preached how his martyrdom was predestinated and foreordained of God. In the Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, p.42, "They did not nail him then, but simply bound him. And he,

having his hands behind him, and being led like a distinguished ram (taken) out of the great flock for sacrifice and prepared to be an acceptable burnt-offering unto God, looked up to heaven, and said, "O Lord God Almighty, Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the knowledge of Thee, the God of angels and powers, and of every creature, and of the whole race of the righteous who live before thee, and I give thanks that thou hast counted me worthy of this day and hour, that I should have a part in the number of thy Martyrs, in the cup of Christ, in the resurrection of eternal life, both soul and body, through the incorruptible (imparted) gift of the Holy Spirit. Among whom I may be accepted this day before Thee as a fat and acceptable sacrifice, according as thou, being the ever-truthful God foreordained, and hast revealed beforehand unto me and hast fulfilled." Now here is Polycarp and as the; (Ten minutes) Let me finish this argument, Polycarp is dying at the stake getting ready to die and he says that God had foreordained how he should die.

a. Eph. 1:11 says, "God foreordained all things according to the counsel of his own will."

b. Matt. 10:29, 30, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered."

c. Dan. 4:17, "The matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the Holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men...And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou."

I want to go through a few syllogisms:

Syllogism #1

1. Whosoever teaches the doctrine of Christ hath the Father and the Son. (II John. 9)
2. But one doctrine of Christ was unconditional election, (John 15:16; Matt. 20:16, John 13:18)
3. Therefore whoever teaches unconditional election teaches the doctrine of Christ.

Syllogism #2

1. Whosoever does not teach the doctrines of Christ transgresseth, (II John 9)
2. But one of the doctrines of Christ was unconditional election. John 15:16
3. Therefore whosoever does not teach unconditional election transgresseth the doctrine of Christ.

Syllogism #3

1. The Church of our Lord Jesus Christ was promised continuity and perpetuity of doctrines through all ages.
2. But the doctrine of election was preached and practiced by the churches which have endured through the ages.

3. Therefore in order to claim kinship or a connection with those churches a church must preach the doctrine of election.

Syllogism #4

1. Whosoever does not teach the doctrine which the martyrs of ancient Baptist churches taught cannot be identified with them.
2. But the ancient martyrs taught the doctrines of predestination and unconditional election.
3. Therefore whosoever does not teach and preach predestination and election cannot be identified with the martyrs who died for the cause of Jesus Christ.

Syllogism #5

1. The Bride of our Lord Jesus Christ is a martyred church which suffered death during the dark ages rather than to deny the doctrines of Christ.
2. But the martyred church preached absolute predestination and unconditional election.
3. Therefore those who do not teach or preach election and predestination cannot be identified with the martyrs of the Bride of Jesus Christ.

That's Argument No. 8 Now, How much time do I have? (Seven minutes) Thank you sir.

ARGUMENT #9

The tenses of the verbs used in the New Testament to describe when the election of God's People took place are always in the past time.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The election of God's people took place in eternity, before the conception of the world.

1. The Aorist tense in the indicative mood is used to describe the fact that election took place before the world was created.
 - a. Eph. 1:4, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation or the conception of the world." That word foundation is translated conception in Heb. 11:12 when Sarah conceived seed.
 - b. II Tim. 1:9, "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."
2. The verbs in these passages as well in countless other places, when speaking of election in salvation are in the aorist tense and the indicative mood which clearly and unmistakably puts the election in the past time.

SECOND PROPOSITION: All Greek grammars teach that the Aorist tense when in the indicative mood describe the act as past tense.

Now my friend brought this up this afternoon, I hope you were listening. Here's a quote from Dana and Mantey p.191, a Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

1. The Aorist tense...it's time relations being found only in the indicative, where it is used as a past...Not when the sinner believes, but in the past.
2. The "Tenses of the indicative...action simply means taking place in the past." A Greek Grammar by Wm. Goodwin, p. 268
3. "It is true that in the expression past time in the indicative, and with all other moods, the aorist is the tense used as a matter of course." A Grammar of the Greek New Testament In the Light of Historical Research by A.T. Robertson, p. 831
4. Here's what he said, "The aorist indicative represents the action simply as brought to pass or done at a past time." A Greek Grammar For Schools and College by Hadley and Allan, p. 267.

THRID PROPOSITION: Every passage used in the term election, when referring to salvation, places the time of the election in the past and therefore before and without any condition in the part of those elected.

1. John 15:16, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you" is in the indicative aorist. And therefore, it is without conditions. My dear friend doesn't want to deal with that. But we're going to deal with it in four days.
2. John 13:18, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen..."
3. Eph. 1:4, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world..."

SUMMARY, Argument No.9. Here is a syllogism for you Brother Alexander.

Syllogism #1

1. The Aorist tense in the indicative mood is used to describe past time.
2. But when election is used in connection with salvation the aorist tense and the indicative mood is used.
3. Therefore election to salvation was in past time.

Syllogism #2

1. Election to salvation in Eph. 1:24 is in the aorist tense and the indicative mood.
2. But the aorist tense and the indicative mood is used to describe past time.
3. Therefore election to salvation in Eph. 1:4 took place in the past time.

Now that's an argument from grammar and I hope my friend will deal with it.

ARGUMENT #10

I want to deal with some arguments here, argument 10.

Unconditional election is a fact which glorifies God and brings countless blessings to mankind without which there is no reason for the creation of the world, and poor mankind is left without reason for his existence.

FIRST PROPOSITION: All the works of God are perfect; therefore, they have a reason or purpose.

1. Ps. 149:17, "The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works."

2. Matt. 20:15,16, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen."

SECOND PROPOSITION: God has chosen David to be King, and God had rejected his brothers from the office long before the Prophet Samuel went to anoint the young shepherd boy; by this, God was glorified and much good was accomplished which would not have been the case without God's election grace which is also true in the matter of salvation.

1. I Sam. 16:1, God said, "And the Lord said unto Samuel, how long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? Fill thine horn with oil and go. I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite: for I have provided me a king from among his sons."

2. Rom. 9:29, "Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodom and Gomorrah."

3. John 15:16, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you."

4. Rom. 9:13-26, "And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he hath before prepared unto glory, even us, whom he hath called."

THIRD PROPOSITION: Without the fact of God's unconditional election, there would be no reason for the creation of the world and mankind has no reason for his creation or existence.

Now Brother Alexander, please listen and I'll listen to you. Without God's sovereign election, unconditional election, there is no reason for creation. (Time) Is my time up? All right, I'll take this up later.

ALEXANDER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen, I come to deny once again the proposition my opponent has read in your hearing. That proposition reads; the Scriptures teach that some men are unconditionally elected to salvation and eternal glory. I want to repeat, I do not deny that some men are elected to salvation. And I want to affirm that my opponent has spent quite a bit of time in this speech making arguments on the tense of the Greek verb to prove that election took place in time past. That is in eternity. I have no objection to that. I believe election took place in eternity. But that's far from proving that God unconditionally elected men to salvation. Now you haven't proved a thing about unconditional election. Now I accept the fact that God in eternity elected some men to salvation. But I deny that he elected men unconditionally. Now my opponent has gone into the historical matter. I don't want to deal too much with the history because it would be time consuming in the first place and in the second place the proposition does not read that history teaches that some are unconditionally elected to salvation. The proposition reads the scriptures teach. But I want to tell you and I'm going to read a quotation or two here to prove what I'm about to say. My friend refers to these doctrines of Calvinism as the doctrines of grace. They sometimes call them the doctrines of sovereign grace. Now I'll tell you they would be more accurately described as the doctrines of arbitrariness. If these doctrines are the doctrines of grace then I assert to you that before the days of Augustine of Hippo, the churches of Jesus Christ were without the doctrines of grace. Because my friend cannot read, cannot find a man before the days of Augustine, who taught the doctrine of unconditional election, limited atonement or irresistible grace, nor the doctrine that God decreed all things that happened; we're going to be discussing Friday. He can't do it. He read quite a few things about Clement and Polycarp and all these others. He didn't read one statement that Clement taught unconditional election. Some of those men believed in election, but not unconditional election. I want to read, I have here a quotation taken from Benedicts History of the Baptist. And I copied this out of a debate book that I have. Thee Throckmorton-Porter Debate on the question; "Who are the Primitive Baptist." This debate was held in Fulton Kentucky, July 12-15, 1887. And I copied this quotation from pages 270, 271, 272. In quoting from Benedicts History here is the quotation; "This class of Baptist although much the smallest, now claimed priority of their more orthodox brethren in the organization of their churches and in the diffusion of Baptist sentiments in the country. And it is pretty clear that two centuries ago and for a long time afterwards they had the largest number of men of education and influence. As an introduction to Mr. Taylors account of this people in their sentiments, I'll make some selections from his preliminary remarks which contain well condensed sketches of the History of the Baptist from the commencement of the Christian era to the reformation. After arriving at the close of the reign of Queen Elizabeth in the beginning of the 17th century he observes; 'How many of these were the men who during the long night of popery from age to age thus opposed infant baptism were general Baptist is not easy to determine.' Now listen to this. "The disputes about personal election and reprobation concerning which principally the general Baptist differ from their other Baptist brethren appears not to have been known during many of the first centuries. Augustine was perhaps the first who in the heat of this controversy with Pelagius introduced the idea of some absolute decree of the Almighty which foreordained all events and determined the everlasting conditions of men. The school men puzzled themselves about these decrees but could by no means agree. Luther who was an Augustine monk followed the opinion of the founder of his order in which he was opposed by many great men. And last, Calvin undertook to new model the doctrines and made several additions to the tenants of his predecessors. But these disputes appeared before the reformation to have been confined in a great measure to the schools and seldom engaged the attention of the people. Indeed by making salvation depend on baptism, which might or might not be administered according to the decision of the man, the Catholics set aside all the ideas of a particular predestinating decree and the noble advocates for truth to whom we have alluded by," now here are some Baptist and listen to what these Baptist taught, "the noble advocates for truth to whom we have alluded by adhering the scripture declaration that whosoever believeth shall be saved certainly had no necessity to adverting to it. Had, therefore, these good men asserted ever so clearly the universal extent of our Saviours atonement it would neither have excited the attention of their contemporaries nor aroused the

indignation of their adversaries like the opposition to infant baptism.” Now this quotation tells us that Augustine was the first man who preached and taught, introduced the idea of some absolute decree of the Almighty which foreordained all events and determined the everlasting conditions of men. This is what Benedicts History said about it, Brother Crawford. And this quotation lets us know that the disputes over personal election was not even known among God’s churches before the reformation. Let me tell you that these doctrines of unconditional election, limited atonement and irresistible grace were never heard of in the churches of Jesus Christ before Augustine of Hippo. Never were. And I challenge my opponent to read one man that taught them. He can’t do it.

Now, concerning John Calvin, I quoted this. I took this quotation from Shippers Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. I, pages 365, 366, 369, 370. “His fundamental ideas, he based his system upon the apostle’s creed and followed its lines. Ethics and theology were handled in the closest connection. Calvin’s reformation in theology was pre-eminently practical affair. Even the doctrine of predestination was developed not as a speculation but as a matter of practical concern by extraordinary emphasis upon it the Genevans were taught to consider it almost the cornerstone of Christian faith.” This is what Calvinism amounts to. Now listen to this. “In opposition to the lax views of sin and grace which the Roman church inculcated, he revised the Augustinian doctrine in order by it to conquer Rome.” What’s the truth about this? Augustine was the man who first preached and taught these doctrines of unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace and so on. And later, much later, John Calvin took those and as Benedicts History says, “new-modeled” them and added some things to them and developed what is now known as the Five Point Calvinism. They bare, those doctrines bear his name. I’ll tell you; I have a copy of the book titled the History of the Evangelical Churches of the Valley of Piedmont. My brother has referred to the Waldenseans. The early Waldenseans did not have these doctrines in their confession of faith. They did not have them there. I want to read something that some Waldenseans had in their teaching in the year 1508 and again in 1535. You can find this in the book concerning the Evangelical Churches of the Valley of Piedmont. Listen to this. “Lastly they teach in this place that men are to understand that so long as they live in this world there is a time given them by God which is a time of grace to the end they may seek him and by his goodness, mercy and gentleness and so through his promise may find and by that means attain blessedness and salvation. To the end also that every man while this time of grace doth last may repent of his past life be reconciled to God and pacify and secure his own conscience through faith in Christ. And by his ministry in the church here upon firmly believing that his sins re pardoned and that God has reconciled for the sake of Christ in whose grace being established walking and persevering in good works he ought assuredly to expect that his soul being loosed from the prison of the body he shall pass not into any punishment but be carried like the poor Lazarus into eternal happiness and there remain with the Lord forever.” That was written by the Waldenseans in 1508 and 1535. That doesn’t sound like they believed in unconditional election and limited atonement and so on. Now, my brother, I want to take up some things he said this afternoon.

I remember he said that I quoted several passages of scripture and he said that doesn’t mean a thing. Well, I suppose Brother Crawford that it means more to quote from J.R. Graves’ book than it does to quote from the scripture. If the scriptures don’t mean anything in these propositions, then what does settle the issue? I’ll tell you our propositions reads the scriptures teach. Now he’s complained twice about how I worded that proposition. Well I see nothing wrong with the wording of it. At least he signed it to affirm it. And the proposition reads the scriptures teach that some men are unconditionally elected to salvation and eternal glory. Now he can read all the scriptures he wants, or all the quotations he wants to about men being elected to salvation and I’ve told you I believe men were elected to salvation. I believe that election took place in eternity; but I deny that God elected them unconditionally.

Now, I quoted that Hebrews 5:9, “God is the author of eternal salvation to all those that obey him,” and well, I don’t remember whether my brother said anything about that scripture or not. I’m not going to say whether he did or not. I’ll just wait and let him answer it again if he didn’t. But I remind you that Hebrews 5:9 tell us, that Christ, “being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him,” And I pointed out that the word obey comes from the same word, the same Greek word hear comes from

and it can rightly be translated Christ became the author of eternal salvation to all them who submissively hear him. And I challenged my brother to find one person in all of Adams race whom god has elected to salvation who does not submissively hear Christ. He's not the author of eternal salvation to unbelievers. All right.

I pointed to Paul's admonition to pray for all men. And he says you can't pray for all men. Says you cannot do this. Well, I deny that, I believe you can. You don't have to know every person in the world to pray for him. You don't even have to know every saved person in the world to pray for him. You don't even have to know every saved person in the world to pray for God's people. But you can pray for God's people everywhere. And you can pray for lost sinners everywhere. I'll tell you the truth of the matter is with my brother, that he cannot stand before a congregation and tell that congregation, he can't stand before this congregation and tell everyone of you that God loves you, that Christ died for you, that you can be saved if you'll repent of your sins and trust Christ you will be saved. He can't tell you that and be consistent with his teachings. Now I think I'm right. If I misrepresent him I'll accept it graciously if he'll correct me. But I suspect that Brother Lawrence Crawford has stood in this pulpit and preached to people and has stood here and appealed to people to turn to Jesus Christ and be saved. And then turn around and teach that God has unconditionally elected a certain number of people before the foundation of the world and gave them to Christ then? Brother, that's inconsistent. And his is one of the inconsistencies of Calvinism.

Now my friend teaches; Let me look at my notes here just a moment. He said when Jesus told his disciple, I have not chosen, you have not chosen me, But I have chosen you and ordained you that he should go and bring forth fruit. That he hadn't chosen them to be apostles. Wasn't to an office. If so, you have to be an apostle in order to bear fruit. Well not, if he hadn't chosen them to the office of apostleship to what were they ordained? Now Jesus said, "I have chosen you and ordained you that you should go forth and bring forth fruit. Now, if you have to be an apostle to bring forth fruit you have to be ordained to bring forth fruit. Let him tell us what they were ordained to if it wasn't to the office of apostleship.

Now, my friend this afternoon showed one of the gross inconsistencies of his teaching. He said the elect that God unconditionally elected a certain number of people before the foundation of the world. He gave them to Christ then in eternity. That they are not of this world and yet I asked him if the elect who have not yet been regenerated were under condemnation. And he said of course. He has the elect in Christ all the way from eternity, yet they are condemned at the same time they're in Christ. And he has them not of this world. They're in Christ not o this world yet they're condemned. Now I want my brother to tell us these people in this congregation want to know Brother Crawford, that elect person who has been in Christ from eternity past, given to Christ back there in eternity when God unconditionally elected him. If that elect person dies before he's regenerated, will he go to heaven or hell? Now if he goes to heaven, he goes to heaven without eternal life because he goes, he dies before he gets regenerated. If he goes to heaven, he goes to heaven condemned because my brother has already admitted that the elect are condemned until they are regenerated. While they're in Christ they are condemned. Now this is just one of these absurdities of that doctrine that Augustine started back there in the early part of the 5th century. And John Calvin new-modeled it, and added a few things to it that Augustine hadn't thought of and that God's churches never did preach, until it had been brought in unto them from that Catholic priest. Now I want to tell you and I say this statement without backing up my brother, that these doctrines of Calvinism, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace and the doctrine that God decreed all things that happened did not originate in New Testament churches, they originated in the church of Rome by a Catholic priest and were brought into God's churches through John Calvin who himself was never a Baptist. Now there was a period of about 300 years, 250-300 years when the doctrines of Calvinism were predominant doctrines among the Baptist. But I'll tell you 300 years lacks a whole lot of being all the history of God's churches since Christ established his church. And if my brother wants to build his system of theology on what was the predominant system of teaching among Baptist for that period of 300 years, let him do it but I'm going to stay with the word of God. All right.

In answer to my question this afternoon of whether or not repentance and faith were necessary for a responsible sinner to obtain salvation and hope of glory: You remember I asked him that, and he said I'm going to answer that by reading the Baptist Waybook. Strange thing that he wants to stay away from the scriptures. But I'll tell you, he read in the Baptist Waybook that repentance and faith are fruits of regeneration. Now brother, if you are taking the position that I think you are, that regeneration must take place before repentance and faith, I want you to tell these people when is a sinner regenerated? When is he regenerated and what causes God to come at a certain time and regenerate a sinner? What determines when that sinner is going to be regenerated? I want to know when he's regenerated in relation to repentance and faith. And while he went to the Baptist Waybook to answer my question; whether repentance and faith are necessary for a responsible sinner to obtain salvation, I want to go to the Bible. My Lord said in Luke 13:3, chapter 13, verse 3,5, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." (You have five minutes left.) All right. Thank you. Now, I believe that teaches, I believe that teaches that repentance is absolutely necessary for one to obtain eternal salvation. I asked him this afternoon since you teach God did not elect sinners to salvation on the grounds of anything that he foresaw or foreknew in them, what was it in God that caused him to elect them. And he said, "God's good pleasure." Now I pointed him to Ezekiel 33:11 that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked but that the wicked turn from their way and live. Now I want to tell you something else about the good pleasure of God. And I didn't get this from the Baptist Waybook, I didn't get this from a Confession of Faith, I'm reading this from God's word. I Corinthians 1:21, "After then the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God;" This is something good about the good pleasure of God. "It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching to save him that believed." Now I asked my opponent this, if it pleases God now in time to save them that believe, did it please God in eternity to purposely save them that believe. Did it please God in eternity to elect them that believe? He's yet to show one unbeliever who's elected to salvation. Until he can do that, he has not one leg to stand on in his proposition. His proposition requires that men be saved, are elected totally apart from any repentance or faith or any other quality in them. He hasn't shown that. All he's done is shown that election took place in time past. I don't deny that. I believe that. He said that some of those ancient men believed in election. So do I. But they did not believe in unconditional election until Augustine. I defy him to read it. They did not believe in it until Augustine. This doctrine did not come from God's word. This doctrine did not come from, did not originate in New Testament churches. It originated in the church of Rome. It was brought into God's churches from the outside. No, these are not the doctrines of grace, they are the doctrines of arbitrariness.

Now, my brother this afternoon charged me with coming very close to rationalism. Brother Crawford, if believing that Jesus, that God loved all sinners, if believing that Christ died for all sinners is rationalism, you tell the world that J.R. Alexander is a rationalist. Because, I thoroughly believe that God loved all men. I verily believe that Jesus Christ died for all men and that I'll prove tomorrow. All right.

He referred in his third speech, he began his third speech with unconditional election. He said, he defined the term unconditional election. He said, "I mean what the ancient Waldenseans meant in their Articles of Faith written in 1120. Is that when unconditional election began? No. Find somebody before Augustine that believed that. Find some New Testament churches. Those people in 1120 did not believe in unconditional election, they believed that God offers salvation to every sinner so long as that sinner lives. That he may repent of his sins and turn to Jesus Christ and be saved and be assured that he's going to heaven, not to hell. (Your time is up.)

CRAWFORD'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Ladies and gentlemen, gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, I come before you to answer my good friend's speech and I intend to do so and then I'm going to read some history. Since we are in history, we're going to be in it. Fine, these next few days. He said he believes that election took place in eternity. Now dear brethren, I want you to listen to the because the gentleman had admitted that election took place in eternity. Now, if God elected a people in eternity and since none of us were there in eternity, then I want to know what conditions made God choose a person since none of us were there. Now he keeps talking about a responsible sinner, a responsible sinner, a responsible sinner. I'd like to know Dr. Alexander, who made him responsible? Now here's what he said. And I'm saying this because we have four days of this. This is not all of it. The responsible sinner is a sinner he will tell you that knows the truth. Then he becomes responsible and then he'll go to hell unless he repents. But if he is, if he doesn't know the truth, this man will tell you, if he doesn't know the truth he's not responsible, therefore, brethren the way to do this is to call in all our missionaries, burn all our Bibles, keep all these heathen people in darkness and they'll never be responsible sinners and they'll all go to heaven according to that man. Now let's come to this argument, Dr. Alexander.

Now he quotes Benedict and I agree with Benedict and I have Throckmorton and Porter and I'll bring it here in the morning. We're going to have this for four days. I'm so glad he brought it up. I don't know why my good friend got on regeneration, tomorrow is on atonement and then we have an entire day on the regeneration Thursday, and that will be such a good thing. He said this though, about that responsible sinner before I leave that, He said, "Crawford read from the Baptist Waybook," Well I hope that all of our brethren read from the Baptist Waybook. I didn't know that was a crime, to teach from old Dr. Bogard's Baptist Waybook until now. Crawford read from the Waybook; Crawford read it. Yes, Crawford preaches from the Waybook in this congregation and for twenty-seven years brethren I have stood in here and preached for sinners to turn to Jesus Christ; but listen Brother Alexander, no sinner will ever turn to Jesus Christ until the Holy turns him. You get that because we're going to have that hot and heavy. I just feel that coming on in my bones. John 3:8 says and he said this, tell me how repentance and faith comes to a sinner and how this sinner is regenerated and then it produces repentance and faith. Well Christ preached it to Nicodemus. In John 3:8, he said, "the wind bloweth where it listeth. Thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell from whence it cometh. So is everyone that is born of the spirit." Now Brother Alexander the Lord said, if you know how the wind, get this, if you know how the wind blows and where it blows, and who controls the wind you can control the regenerating power of God. Now my friend can control it, because as many as he gets down front repenting or whatever you want to call it, that's how many he can control. But the Lord said, "so is everyone that is born of the spirit." And then he asked me. He said, I'll tell you the good pleasure of God. And I introduced the argument in Ezekiel 33:11, this afternoon and I read it from Dr. Graves. How that God does not have pleasure in the death of any man. But he said, I'll tell you what God's pleasure is, it's in I Corinthians 1:21, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed. Brother Alexander why don't you go ahead and read the rest of that verse. It says, and I will just read it. He said, "for after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." I say amen, but let's read Paul, verse 22, "for the Jews required a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness." Now let's listen to what this foolishness is. "But unto them which are the called," and He denies that. He denies that God actually calls people to salvation. Now we preach all of this to everybody the Jews and the Greeks, "but unto them which are the called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." And I say amen. "Oh" my! I'm going to use that. Now we're going to have a beautiful time.

He said, find one unbeliever that God had mercy on. Find one unbeliever that God elected. All of us were unbelievers when we were elected. Of course the Greek New Testament, God should have written that in Hungarian or Chinese or something. It wasn't the hand of God that planned everything according to my

friend. Listen, Brother Alexander, God moved to have the Greek New Testament written so that the indicative mood would be used. You have not dealt with it. And the Indicative mood is the mood and the aorist verb is the tense of the verb that shows that election was in the past. And the indicative mood shows it was unconditional. Now I'll tell you what I'll do. We can end the debate and spend the rest of the days hunting, fishing or everything else, if he'll find one, now I want to make this clear. I teach Greek every day and I'll do this to any student that is here, you find one place in the New Testament where election is in any other mood than in the indicative mood then I'll quit this debate, admit that I'm wrong and that election is conditional. You find it. He will not find it. It's not there. Election to salvation is always in the indicative mood meaning that it is without conditions. Either that, or we need to burn our Bibles and get a loin cloth and go naked because it doesn't make any difference. No, and while I'm talking about it, he said, "Crawford said, these scriptures did not mean a thing." I didn't say the scriptures don't mean anything. I said you standing up hear just rattling of chapter and verse and this and this and this, that doesn't mean anything. Make an argument and I'll answer your argument, but until then, just rattling off scripture, that's the old Jehovah Witness trick. Let's stop and make an argument. He said find one person that was elected to salvation before he believed. Well for one Jeremiah 1:5 says, "Before thou was formed in the womb I knew thee." All right. And then he said, "Before thou camest forth," now listen to this, "Before thou camest forth out of the womb." Was he a believer or non-believer in that embryo state? Before thou comest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee and ordained thee a prophet unto the nation." My goodness, in the whole Bible. My friend says that Crawford stands here in this pulpit and preaches, and sinners turn to the Lord Jesus Christ and then he says some of them can't be saved. I've never said that in my life. Let me tell you something, when I get to where I quote him. I don't know what he preaches at home and I'm not going to stand up here and demean my brother by saying what he preaches. Let me say this brethren, Ezekiel in the 37th chapter was told to preach to some dry bones and he preached. But it wasn't Ezekiel's preaching that brought them alive. Now we're going to have that when we get over to the work of the Holy Spirit.

And he said that Crawford didn't make any answer to Hebrews 5:9. I did, I did. It says, "as a son he learned obedience." Well I used to whip Campbellites all over the country with that scripture. Hebrews 5:9 said, "Yet as a son learned he obedience by the things that he suffered that he might become the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." Of course, and that obey comes from the "akouo". That's right, we're going to have some Greek here, and he said, now the sinner can hear. I deny it. He can't hear it without the Holy Spirit opening his deaf ears. Christ said in John 8:43, he said, "Why is it that ye can't understand my speech, it's because you cannot hear my word," and those people were standing there before him. I never saw anything like this in my life. And besides brethren he's talking about the good pleasure of God. Let me talk about it.

Christ said in Matthew 11:25 he said, "I thank thee Holy Father because thou hast hid these things from the eyes of the wise and prudent and has revealed them unto babes." That's "I thank thee Holy Father," that's the good pleasure of God, Brother Alexander, and we may have some more of these things but I see that my dear friend, not because we give each other these arguments, don't you think that we don't love one another, we do. Why these are Baptist brethren and we can discuss things in a Baptist way. I was in the, he said you can't find anyone back before Bishop Augustine of Hippo that believed these doctrines. That's what I was doing brethren, I read of Clement who was a companion of Paul in Philippians 4:3. My friend wasn't listening to it. Clement said, here's what he said. Find out if this is conditional or unconditional. In the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians he said, "He who made us and fashioned us, having prepared his bountiful gifts for us before we were born, introduced us into the world." Were you back there before the foundation of the world forcing God to give you good sense and hands and feet and all these blessings? Why of course not. I read from Clement and I read from Ignatius and I read from, and I will tomorrow in the universal atonement or the universal general atonement of my friend, I will show you and I will read a letter from one Baptist church to another Baptist church in the year 169 in which they advocate limited atonement. He said I won't find it, we'll wait and see, now I promised you I'd do that, didn't I? You remind me if I don't.

First of all, I want to go to John Calvin. My dear friend read from the encyclopedia on Calvin. But this is my argument, 9th argument.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENT #9

All true Baptist churches are Calvinistic and not Arminian because these terms are used to describe the theological position of churches and ministers and not their founders; as a matter of fact, Baptist were Calvinistic hundreds of years before the man John Calvin was born. And he said a Catholic priest. Calvin never was a priest, Brother Alexander, he was a lawyer. Get the man straight. I'm more a Calvinist than Calvin was. Don't call him a priest, he was a lawyer. As a matter of fact, Baptist were Calvinists hundreds of years before John Calvin was born; and it can be proved by history, a man from ancient Waldensean Baptist whose name was William Farell, look it up in an encyclopedia if you want to, taught Calvin the doctrines of election, predestination and divine calling; so when the term Calvinistic is used to describe a true Baptist church, it is to separate it from the disgraceful term "Arminian" which represents salvation by the efforts of man; with this in mind, we make this statement as the introduction to argument nine: All true Baptist churches are Calvinistic and not Arminian.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The term "Calvinism" is more than a synonym of predestination; it is a life-and-world-view of the absolute sovereignty of God: It is the theology of the prophets and the teaching of Christ and the Apostles.

1. The dictionary or encyclopedia do not adequately define words which have Biblical or spiritual significance; for instance, the word:
 - a. Baptize, go to the Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, pg. 116, it says, "to baptize, to dip a person into or sprinkle with water as a symbol of admission into a Christian or a specific Christian church or washing away sin; administer baptism to. To purify; cleanse; initiate. To give a first name to (a person) as part of the baptismal ceremony; to christen. That is their definition of baptism.
 - b. A Baptist, a member of a Protestant denomination holding that baptism should be given only to adult believers and by immersion rather than sprinkling.
 - c. Now there are several things wrong with those definitions:
 - Baptism is not by sprinkling in the scriptures but by immersion (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:13)
 - Baptism does not wash away sin, it is a figure of the resurrection. (I Peter 3:21)
 - A Baptist is not a Protestant, we never were a part of Rome and never did come out protesting.
 - d. Now, conclusion: Therefore, the dictionary or encyclopedia cannot be taken as a source of definitions of religious terms.
2. History and facts can give true definitions, and we must go to history for the true definition of Calvinism. What is Calvinism?
 - a. Here is What Calvinism Has Done for America, by Monsma, p.2. Here's what he said, this man, by the way, was president of a university. He said, "Calvinism was not fathered by John Calvin. The system of ideas indicated by this word was in existence long before that illustrious man, whose name it bears...Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were staunch "Calvinists"...Proceeding from the patriarchal tents, the "Calvinistic" movement took its course, through the national channels of Israel; found its divine representative in the Rabbi of Nazareth; was advocated and popularized by the great student from Gamaliel's school, the apostle Paul; was upheld by Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus,...Peter Waldo, John Wyclif and John Huss."
3. My definition of Calvinism:
 - a. Calvinism is that principle of life which governs a man and causes him to admit the absolute sovereignty of God in all his beliefs, manners and actions, and conduct, it is this absolute sovereignty of God which controls the individual in his religion, and it governs every aspect of the home, business, trade and dealings with his fellowman.
 - b. "The principle of divine sovereignty, when applied to politics, must be necessity a militate for the Biblical view that there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. (Romans 13:1)

governments are instituted by God through the instrumentality of the people. No Kaiser, no president has power inherent in himself." That's from *What Calvinism Has Done For America*, p.5.

But hold on just a moment here, W. A. Jarrel the great scholar who signed that doctrinal statement of the American Baptist Association with my grandfather, G. W. Crawford, (see the Baptist Waybook, p.80.) Now here we go brethren with the Waybook. All of you are supposed to hiss in spite of what Dr. Smith said. Hiss because I'm quoting from the Baptist Waybook. W. A. Jarrel's name appears next to my grandfathers on page 80. Here's what W. A. Jarrel said:

1. "The Waldenses, of whom were the slaughtered saints, whose bones lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold; the victims of the reign of "Bloody Mary, John Rodgers and Hooper, Farrel, Ridley...were all Calvinists." That's taken from Baptist Church Perpetuity or History, by W.A. Jarrel, p.166
2. Now get this... "these anabaptist believed in election: Christ the Lamb of God, has been from the beginning of the world a mediator between God and men, and will remain a mediator to the end. Of what men? Of you and me alone? Not so, but of all men whom God has given to him for a possession." That's from Jarrel's History, Perpetuity of the Baptist, p. 188.
3. Here's another one, he says, "The General Association of 'Particular' or 'Calvinistic' Baptist of England and Wales, the one which adopted the confessions of 1689 said, "they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel." That's p.410. Called the Calvinistic Association.

(Ten minutes. Thank you.) Let me read one more, P. 139 of W.A. Jarrel, he said:

4. The Paterines of the Waldenseas in Italy and Jarrel says, "They were Baptist on the doctrine of election and appealed to the texts of the ninth chapter of the Epistle of Romans, employed by other also in proof of the doctrine of unconditional predestination." That's W.A. Jarrel who signed the doctrinal statement of the ABA. Where has the Association gone? Where has it gone?

Now let me read, we're talking about the second proposition right now.

SECOND PROPOSITION: Baptist were "Calvinistic" hundreds of years before Calvin, and it was one of the Waldensean Anabaptist who taught John Calvin the doctrines of Grace.

1. The Waldenseans taught the doctrines of election and predestination hundreds of years before Calvin was born. They said in a confession of faith dated 1120 A.D.: (Now here brethren, he's not willing to come to the lick log, here's a confession of faith of our Baptist back in 1120. And he said this doctrine came out of the Catholic church and these people died rather than denounce it. Well now, if it came out of the Catholic Church then why was the Catholic Church burning themselves at the stake? I'll tell you that's anomaly isn't it") "That God saves from that corruption and condemnation those whom he hath chosen from the foundation of the world not for any disposition, faith or holiness that he foresaw in them, but of his mere mercy in Jesus Christ, his Son; passing by all the rest, according to his irreprehensible reason of his free will and justice." *The Churches of the Valley of Piedmont*, p.65.
2. Now, William Farrel, this man taught Calvin. Let me give you something brethren. William Farrel, (1489-1565) was a Waldensean student in the University of Paris and student of the great J. Lefevre after receiving his degree, Master of Arts, Farrel lectured in colleges connected with the university with his preaching on total depravity, election, distinguishing grace, etc.; which made such an uproar he was forced to flee but not before many notables were saved by God's grace, among them was Margaret, the sister of the King of France; however, one must go to history to get the full story of how Farrel went to Geneva six years before Calvin and this was after he had

preached throughout France. David Wilkinson gives a long-detailed account of how Farrel gave a copy of the original scriptures in Greek unto Robert Olivetan which was used by the Waldenseans to preserve the Bible during the dark ages. (See the Authorized Bible, and authorized version of the Bible Vindicated, By David Wilkinson, p.37) Lights and Shadows of the Reformation, p 102-136. The Reformation, by Lindsay, p.52, 56.

THIRD PROPOSITION: All Baptist churches in America were Calvinistic and these are the churches from which we got our Baptism, our ordination, our organization, and our Lord's Supper.

1. Every true church in America came from the Calvinistic churches.
 - a. The History of Middle Tennessee Baptist by J.H. Grimes p. 2-3. Here's what he said, "From these two sources came the early Baptist of South Carolina; who founded the Charleston Association in 1751. This Association was constituted upon the old London Confession of Faith (1643, five years before the Westminster confession of Faith by the Presbyterians) which is very strong Calvinistic document. It might be remarked just here that this is the original or the Philadelphia Confession of Faith and was adopted as a statement of doctrine by the early churches and Associations of America with the exception of one small association which soon became extinct."

How much time do I have? (Six minutes.) Thank you. I want to give you some syllogisms on this argument.

SUMMARY

Syllogism #1

1. The historians speak of Calvinism. When they do, they mean a system of theology which existed long before John Calvin was born and that system was salvation by grace.
2. But the Baptist were the only true witnesses of Christ and the only true churches of truth from Christ down through the ages.
3. Therefore, all true churches, were Calvinistic long before Calvin.

Syllogism #2

1. It is a fact of history and undeniable to those who know it and who know the facts that William Farrel, was a Waldensean and preached for the Waldensean Baptist.
2. But Farrel taught John Calvin the doctrines of election, predestination and distinguishing grace of God
3. Therefore, Calvin got his doctrines of election, predestination and calling from the Baptist.

Syllogism #3

1. It is an undeniable fact of history how all true churches in America came from the Calvinistic Baptist of England and Wales.
2. But Missionary Baptist got their baptism, their Lord's Supper, their ordination and church succession from the Calvinistic Baptist churches.
3. Therefore, to repudiate the Calvinistic doctrines of the Baptist churches of the past is to repudiate their baptism and their church succession and leaves you without baptism, Lord's supper or church organization. You just unchurch yourself my dear brother when you ridicule these brethren. Now let me go on to some other arguments.

I'd like to make an argument right now on the sphere of the doctrine of election. Because this is my last speech on this subject and no doubt it will be brought out from time to time in the debate, but this is the last session on this subject of election. This is an argument:

ARGUMENT #22

The confessions of faith of the Baptist churches which brought the faith of Christ to America and through which our Missionary Baptist got their baptism and succession all believed the doctrine that God elected a people before the foundation of the world: Or else we'll burn our Bible. The Greek New Testament doesn't mean a thing and let's all get ignorant and worse. And get ignoranter and ignoranter, as Dr. Thomas Tucker says at the university of Nevada. All right. Therefore, the modern churches who deny the doctrines of their forefathers should not claim a succession through them because they are not the same faith and order.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The Particular Baptist believed in election:

London Confession of 1689 of the Particular Baptists, "By decrees of God for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, to the praise of his glorious grace; others being left to their sin to their just condemnation.

SECOND PROPOSITION: These Particular Baptists were Missionary Baptist according to Dr. Roy Reed, Past President of the American Baptist Association.

Here's what Dr. Reed said in the 1976 minutes, P. 19: "Dr. John Clarke was a Particular Baptist from England; the Particular Baptist were Missionary Baptist."

SUMMARY

1. The preachers and leader in The American Baptist Association claim a succession of their churches through the Particular Baptist of England, and The Waldensean Baptist.
2. But many of the preachers of the American Baptist Association ridicule the faith and doctrines which these ancient Baptist held and call them heretics.
3. Therefore, they do not have a succession of churches back to Christ because they confess a different faith and doctrines; therefore, they are a different people.

Now that is an argument, I hope my dear friend will deal with because we're going to hear this the next few days. Now the next argument. How much time do I have? (One minute) I'd just like to say this in closing. That in my argument this afternoon in Eph. 1:4, "According as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," that gives a reason why he created the world. It is a world that was created for his elect people to live in. Otherwise my friend denies that God has a purpose in creating this world. And what his kind of preaching produced is the doctrine of evolution in the churches. The churches where they hear this "God loves everybody" and "God is trying to save everybody" produces nothing but social moralism. And he said, if that, if that is the doctrine of rank modernism, then I will be a modernist. No, my dear friend you don't want to be a modernist. But when we deny that Jesus Christ died for his people that he had a people and that he has churches down through the ages which preached his doctrine instead of trying to love everybody, we are upholding the truth of Jesus Christ. (Time) Thank you.

ALEXANDER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Ladies and gentlemen, I come to the last speech concerning this proposition and I want to review what my opponent has said and review some things that I said. I'll not introduce any new arguments in this speech because my opponent will not have an opportunity to reply to them. But I want to go over some things that both of us have said.

First of all, my opponent has said in his arguments and my questions to him he has this teaching. That in eternity God unconditionally elected a certain number of men to salvation and eternal glory. And that God gave that certain number of men to Christ right then. They belonged to Christ right then. And if I understood my opponent right as he made an argument concerning Jeremiah, whom God before Jeremiah was born knew him and sanctified him and ordained him to be a prophet and so on. If I understood him right, he implied that all of the elect have been sanctified from eternity. I won't charge him with this if it's wrong, but I understood that, if I'm misrepresenting him, I want him to let me know. But he has them, he has all the elect in Christ from eternity past, belonging to Christ from eternity past. Unconditionally elected to salvation from eternity past yet those elect people are lost and condemned until they are regenerated. Now I asked my opponent in my first speech this evening, that if an elect person is in Christ before he was regenerated, he's been in Christ since eternity if an elect person dies before he's regenerated, where would he go? He did not answer that. He didn't attempt to answer it. He has him in Christ, he has him belonging to Christ, he has him sanctified but at the same time, condemned. Now I assert to you that that is a gross inconsistency but that shows how inconsistent the doctrines of Calvinism are.

Now I said a while ago that the doctrines of Calvinism did not originate in the New Testament churches, they originated in the Roman Catholic church by a Roman Catholic priest. I think he understood me to say the John Calvin was a Roman Catholic Priest. No, Augustine was the Roman Catholic Priest and there's where these doctrines originated. I asked my opponent to point to one man or to read one man before Augustine that taught unconditional election. I read the statement from Benedicts History that Augustine was the first man who taught this doctrine of unconditional election or a divine decree that unconditionally settled the eternal destiny of men and so on. He claimed that Clement taught unconditional election and he read some things that Clement taught. Clement believed in election but not unconditional election.

Now my opponent has spent quite a bit of time on the tenses of verbs and the indicative mood. Well I think I know what the indicative mood does, and it doesn't affect our proposition one bit in the world. I asserted to you in my first speech this evening that I believe that election took place in eternity, not in time. It took place in time past. But he has not proven that God unconditionally elected anybody to salvation. All he has done is shown by what scriptures he's used that God did elect some people to salvation. And I believe that. Now he said in his fourth speech, he said if God elected men in eternity what were the conditions upon which he elected men since none of us were there? Well I'll tell you the conditions. That's what I have been telling you all through these speeches today. The conditions were his foreknowledge of our repentance and faith. In I Peter 1:2, Peter wrote to those who were elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Now if men were elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father and this is not new material, my opponent has used this verse two or three times in his speeches and I have referred to it a time or two;

If God elected men according to his foreknowledge what did he foreknow about them? if he elected men according to his foreknowledge, he had to foreknow something about them. My opponent teaches that he did not elect men on the grounds of anything he foreknew about them. If that's true, then he didn't

elect anybody according to his foreknowledge. If he elected anybody according to his foreknowledge, he foreknew something about them. Now I assert to you as I have been asserting all through these speeches that God foreknew in eternity past who would under the convicting influence of the Holy Spirit and the preaching of the Gospel, repent of their sins and trust Jesus Christ. Those he elected to salvation. That is the Bible doctrine of election. But that's far from being an unconditional election. That kind of election is in harmony with every passage of scripture that deals with the subject of the salvation of sinners. It does not deny salvation to any sinner. God freely and truly offered salvation to all men and this I'm going to prove before our debate is over as we deal with some other propositions. He could not honestly and sincerely do that if my opponent's proposition were true.

Now, my opponent has gone to, my opponent has gone to history again and again to prove his proposition. And I have repeatedly said, and my opponent has read this proposition two or three times. The proposition reads, "the scriptures teach that some men are unconditionally elected to salvation and eternal glory." I don't care how many Baptist in time past have believed in unconditional election. The fact that Baptist's in time past have believed that does not prove this proposition and my friend knows that. Now I have called on him for scripture that prove it and he has not yet presented a scripture that proves his proposition. He's gone to history because that's all he has to rely upon is what some of those Baptist back there. I told you a while ago that there was a period of 250-300 years when in the 17th and 18th century and part of the, about the last half of the 16th century when Calvinism, the doctrines of Calvinism was the predominate doctrine among Baptist. Church historians let us know this. I do not deny that. But I don't have to deny that. That fact does not prove my opponents' proposition. He can carry them all the way back to 1120, but he leaves God's churches for the first 1100 years according to his own arguments without what he calls the doctrines of grace. Because those early Waldenseans did not have the doctrines of unconditional election in their Articles of Faith. Did not have it. I read to you a statement a while ago that they believed that as long as men live in this world God gives them a time, every man a time, and time of grace in which he can repent of his past life or his sins and turn to Jesus Christ and trust his soul to him and be assured that his sins pardon. That's what the early Waldenseans believed. He can go to all the history he wants from these Baptist but that doesn't prove his proposition. He has failed to present any scripture. Not one verse of scripture has he presented that teaches, that God unconditionally elected men to salvation. One of the feeble efforts he's made is to assert to you that inasmuch as election took place in time past it had to be unconditional. Why did it have to be unconditional because it was in time past? When God's word tells us that God elected men according to his foreknowledge. Could not God elect men according to what he foreknew about men in eternity? Yes, he could. He did do it., He foreknew every person who would under the influence of the Holy Spirit and the preaching of the gospel, repent of his sins. My friend has already admitted in one of his speeches this evening that a man gets faith because the word of God is preached to him. He pointed to I Cor. 3:54, where Paul said, "Whom is Paul and who is Apollos but ministers by whom ye believed even as the Lord gave to every man." I agreed with that. I certainly do. But what he's got to find is a sinner who God has elected to saved apart from his faith in Christ. I pointed you to, to the good pleasure of God. He said in answer to my question, "what is it in God that caused him to elect these particular individuals to salvation." He said, "God's good pleasure." Frankly I expected him to say love and if he had I was going to show that God loved some men who never did get saved. I was going to show that. But he didn't say love, he said God's good pleasure. But he never has shown us that God had any pleasure in saving an unbeliever. Never did show that Brother Crawford. I showed you by the scriptures that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked. But his pleasure is that the wicked, here's the clash, not some wicked, but the wicked, any wicked man, anywhere in this world. God's pleasure is that the wicked turn from his way and live and that turning from his way is in order to living. That's eternal life too. I've pointed you to God's good pleasure in I Cor. 1:21. He didn't deny this, but he didn't answer it. "After that in the wisdom of God it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching; or, after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God." Here's what pleased God, "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." If it pleased God in time to save them that believed, I'll tell you it pleased him in eternity to elect that believer to salvation. He didn't answer this. He simply

went to the verse that says where we preach the Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified unto the Jews a stumbling block and the Greek foolishness but to them which are the called. I'm glad he mentioned that. Now I'm not going to deal with that tonight, we're going to get on this call in a day or so. We're going to get on it and he's going to get enough of this called business and he doesn't know it, but he's getting his head right in a trap. We're going to see. All right. It pleased God for the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed. Where is the scripture brother that it pleased God to save any unbeliever? Never has he produced one. Now if God unconditionally elected them to salvation, elected them to salvation totally apart from any condition of faith or anything else, somewhere in the Bible God would hold up an example of a man whom he has saved without any faith in God. But he hasn't shown it. It just isn't in God's word.

Now, he didn't deal with my argument that I made this afternoon that personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain salvation. I want to repeat this argument. And I'll tell you he never will answer this. I said to you this afternoon, this is not new material. I said to you this afternoon that personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain salvation and this is shown by the fact that all who are destitute of personal faith in Christ are lost. And all lost sinners are the children of the devil. John 3:18, "He that believeth not is condemned already because he hath not believed in the name of the only God and son of God." John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, he that believeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 8:24, John 8:44. John 8:44, Jesus told some Jews you are of your father the devil. Every lost sinner, every unbeliever, every person who is destitute of personal faith in Christ is lost. He's a child of the devil. Next, personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain remission of sins. Now if he's elect sinner is in Christ from eternity past, he's in Christ without remission of sins. Or, faith in Christ is necessary to obtain remission of sins. In the 7th chapter of Luke, Jesus said to that sinful woman who came to him, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." And he said to her in verse 50, "thy faith has saved thee, go in peace." In Acts 10:43, Simon Peter said to Cornelius and his family concerning Christ, "To him give all the prophets witness." This is every prophet God ever called. "To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Now that does not fit with unconditional election to salvation. Personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to be justified. Acts 13:38, 39; Romans 5:1; Acts 13:38 39, "Through this man is preached unto you the remission of sins or forgiveness of sins and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses." Romans 5:12, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." And Galatians 2:16, Paul said, "We have believed on Jesus Christ that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the law." And fourth, personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain sonship with God. He never did deal with this. I want him to show by the scriptures that any man on this earth is a son of God before he believes in Jesus Christ. Galatians 3:26, Paul said, "You are the children of God." How? By faith in Jesus Christ. My friend didn't deal with this. And this scripture just does not fit with this doctrine of unconditional election. No man is a son of God, a child of God until he has faith in Jesus Christ. And I pointed you to the fact that I John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God, but the unbeliever is not born of God." And I told you this afternoon as I pointed to John 1:12, 13, "He came to his own and his own received him not, but as many as received him," and I don't think my opponent will deny that receiving Christ means faith. I don't think he'll deny that. "To as many as received him, to them gave he power." And my opponent knows that that word power means the authority or the right or privilege to become the sons of God. And I don't believe this refers to giving them the right to be born of the spirit of God. They are born of the spirit of God when they believe in him. And when they are born of the spirit of God at the point of faith in Jesus Christ, Christ gives them the legal right to become the adopted sons of God in the resurrection. That's the legal right. But this right to adopted sonship is given only to those who receive him by faith. Now this ruins my friend's doctrine of unconditional election. He can't find the scriptures that shows that any man is a son of God by birth or has the legal right to be a son of God by adoption until he has faith in Jesus Christ. He hasn't attempted to do it. And he will not do it. Next, personal faith in Christ is necessary for the responsible sinner to obtain eternal spirit life. John 3:14-16

Jesus told Nicodemus, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up that whosoever believeth in him, here's the purpose of God in salvation; "That whosoever believeth in him shall not perish but have eternal life." But he was lifted up that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have eternal life." Personal faith in Christ is necessary to obtaining that eternal life. I'm going to pinpoint this to you my brother in John 6, when Jesus taught that doctrine that caused many people to turn away from him and follow him no more. The doctrine that he was the bread of life. He said in verse 47, John 6:47, "Verily, Verily I say unto you he that believeth on me hath everlasting life." My friend won't deny that, but he can't find a scripture where any unbeliever has everlasting life. Now John Chapter 6 the same chapter verses 53, 54; "then said Jesus unto them, Verily, Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day."

Now, my friend wanted to connect me with rationalism. He made, he got it tangled up in his last speech and wanted to make it modernism, but that was a slip of the tongue, I think. (Five minutes left) All right. Now listen to me. Calvinists have many times told people that a dead sinner can't act. He can't act toward God. Well right here's a scripture that ruins that. Jesus said to these Jews, "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Now if Jesus knew what he was talking about, the man who did not eat his flesh and drink his blood was without eternal spirit life. But in the next verse he said, "he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." Now if the one who does not eat and does not drink it has no life and he that eats it and drinks it has eternal life when did he get it? He got it when he eats the flesh of the Son of man and drinks his blood and I don't think my friend will deny that a man eats the flesh of the Son of God and drinks his blood by faith. Now Jesus used this beautiful symbol of saving faith and I'll tell you eating and drinking are acts. You can argue all you want to against the dead man acting but here is proof that a spiritually dead man must act and can act and must act in order to obtain eternal life. Personal faith in Christ is absolutely necessary for a sinner to obtain that eternal life. Jesus said so right here in John 6:53, 54. My friend has not dealt with this. Now I'd be willing to rest my whole case on this, this argument the necessity of personal faith in Christ in order for a responsible sinner to obtain salvation. He hasn't dealt with it. He didn't touch it because he can't do it. He knows that every principal I've shown in this argument is true. Now I didn't get this out of a Baptist history, I got these out of God's word. And he hasn't dealt with it. Now if personal faith in Christ is necessary for a sinner to obtain salvation and hope of glory then God elected the person to salvation on the condition of his faith in Jesus Christ. If it pleased God in time to save them that believe then unless God has changed his mind, it pleased God in eternity to save them that believed. And if it was pleasing to God in eternity to save them that believed, then he elected in eternity them that believed to salvation. That's the kind of election that Bible teaches but that's a far cry from my opponents Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election which he has not supported from the word of God. He's gone to history. Just what I expected him to do. Because that's all he has to lean on. There is no scripture that teaches unconditional election. I could give him from now on, until this debate is over with, from now until Jesus comes, and he won't find any scripture that teaches it. He hasn't attempted to. He's pointed to these men that he claimed taught it but even Clement that he claimed did not teach unconditional election. He taught election, but no unconditional election.

Now I want to refer to a statement that he made toward the close of his speech. He says as he made his argument on the history of Baptist and Baptist churches in this country coming from Calvinistic Baptist. And I'll tell you I'm aware of the fact that in the early part of the Baptist in this country there was quite a number of years when Calvinistic Baptist and Missionary Baptist were all in the same churches and the same association. That's a matter of history. I don't deny that. I don't need to. But he said to repudiate the Calvinistic doctrines is to repudiate our baptism and the Lord supper and church organization. Now I want you Missionary Baptists to know that this man has... (Your time is up) All right.