

ALEXANDER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen, I come before you once again to affirm the proposition that has been read in your hearing: The Scriptures teach that the sacrificial substitutionary death of Jesus Christ was on the behalf of all men. This afternoon in our afternoon session on this proposition, my opponent apologized for me for making an argument on the infants. You don't have to apologize for me Brother Crawford. I made an argument he may deem it as getting on a low plane as he called it in debating, but I made an argument that presents that consequences of his doctrine. He has clearly stated, he stated in answer to a question that I asked in the first session this afternoon about infants dying; Do non-elect infants die in infancy, and if they do, where do they go? And he answered that God has provided for infants and those who die in infancy die because they are elect. And I made an argument that if you want to find out whether an infant is elected or not, try killing him. If you cannot kill him, you know he is not elected to salvation. If you can succeed in killing him, he's heaven bound. That's an argument, that's the consequence of his doctrine and I wanted to refer to it because he apologized for me. You don't have to apologize for me. I don't apologize for it. I present the argument and I want him to meet it.

Now, my friend has neglected, has completely ignored my argument on Jn. 1:29. I want you to deal with this tonight Brother Crawford in time for me to respond to your answer. Jn. 1:29, "Jesus beheld," or "John the Baptist beheld Jesus and said, 'behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.'" And I pointed out that that sin is one singular sin, that involved the whole world, but no one other than the world. Whatever the term world means. If he makes it mean the elect only, then he has to find one single sin that involved all of the elect, then he has to find one single sin that involved all the elect, but nobody other than the elect. And that's what I want him to try and do. And if he, if he recognized that the term world involves, or means the entire human race, then Jn. 1:29 teaches indisputably that Christ died for the entire human race. Now I don't care which direction you go on it, but I want you to answer it Brother Crawford. You haven't dealt with that yet.

Now my opponent charged me with saying two things that I didn't say, and I want to respond to that right now. He charged me with saying that a sinner makes the atonement when he repents and believes. Brother Crawford you know I did not say that. I did say that a sinner receives the atonement, the propitiation, the benefits of the death of Christ when he repents and believes. Now I asked my opponent to tell us if a sinner does not receive the benefits of the atonement when he repents and believes, tell us when he does receive it. I maintain he receives it when he repents and believes.

Now my opponent charged me again with saying that the rich young ruler went to hell. I did not say that. I said he came to Christ wanting eternal life and he went away still lost. I did not say he went to hell. He went away still lost.

All right. I want to proceed with some arguments. But let me deal with something, two other things that he presented here. He referred twice today to Matt. 1:21, "His name shall be called Jesus for he shall save his people from their sins." I've heard this from Calvinists over and over. Yes, he shall save his people from their sins. But who are his people? Gal. 5:24, write this down Brother Crawford. Gal. 5:24, "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." They have repented, no man belongs to Christ in redemptive capacity until he repents. Gal. 5:24. Now what did the angel mean when he said, "He shall save his people from their sins." Well he meant simply this: John wrote in I Jn. 1:8, he wrote to saved people, people who had been regenerated and said, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves for the truth is not in us," and so on. And in the 7th chapter of Rom., Paul describes the sin principle that works in the old man of every child of God, but in the resurrection, Jesus Christ is going to deliver his people; those who have been regenerated from their sins. That's what Matt. 1:21, means and it does not in any sense limit the atoning benefits of the death of Christ to the elect.

All right, now I respond to one other thing that he mentioned toward the close of his speech. He said Aaron went to the holy of holies, Aaron was the high priest and on the day of atonement, he went into the holy of holies with the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel on his breastplate and on his shoulders and he challenged me to show that Aaron made an atonement for the Hittites and the Amorites and so on. Doesn't have to. Brother Crawford, did all the people of Israel get saved and go to heaven? Now you come up and answer that.

I'm about to present an argument, one of my arguments. My next argument is based on the fact and I want you to get this. Is based on the fact that some men for whom Christ died and to whom salvation is offered will perish in hell. When Jesus named his twelve apostles he sent them on a preaching tour. But he instructed them, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not but go around to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. 10:5) After some further instructions he said to those apostles, "And whosoever shall not receive you," now his is a people among the lost sheep of Israel, the only ones to whom the apostles were sent. "Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgement than for that city." That was the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And their eternal destiny depended on their response to the gospel that the apostles preached to them. Matt. 10:14,15, and see also Lk. 10:1-12, where Jesus sent the seventy disciples on a similar tour and gave them the same instructions. All right. Now the apostles were sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel preaching the gospel of the kingdom of heaven. It is apparent that some of those lost sheep would not receive the apostles nor hear, give heed to their message. And Jesus said, concerning those who would not; "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in that day of judgement than for that city." The gospel was preached to them offering them salvation but some of them would go to hell. But salvation can be offered only on the grounds of the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ. Christ died for those lost sheep of the house of Israel, yet some of them went to hell. Now Jesus died for the nation of Israel. My opponent introduced this scripture this afternoon in Jn. 11:49-52 reads; "And one of them named Caiaphas being high priest that same year said unto them, 'ye know nothing at all nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people and that the whole nation perish not.' And this spake he not of himself but being high priest that year he prophesied." He was inspired by the Holy Spirit. He prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. Now Caiaphas prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation. The nation of Israel, but some of the nation of Israel went to hell. And Caiaphas made his prophesy by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit my friend. All right.

Further, Gal. 4:4, 5, "But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth the Son made of a woman made under the law to redeem them that we might receive the adoption of sons." Christ died to redeem them that were under the law. But some of them that were under the law went to hell. Therefore, Christ died for some who went to hell. Observe the following syllogism: Christ died to redeem them that were under the law. All the nation of Israel were under the law. I don't think he'll deny that. Therefore, Christ died for all the nation of Israel. Or, Christ died to redeem them that were under the law. Only the elect were under the law. Therefore, Christ died for only the elect. Now if Christ died for all the nation of Israel and some of the nation of Israel went to hell then Christ died for some people who went to hell and if he died for some people who went to hell, then by what rule of logic or scriptural reasoning can you conclude that he did not die for all people who went to hell? And if he died for all people who went to hell then he died for all the human race because he certainly died for the elect.

My next argument is based on the universal work of the Holy Spirit in conviction. Just a minute let me find my material here. Argument, the next argument is based on the universal work of the Holy Spirit in convicting lost sinners. Gen. 6:3, "And the Lord said, my Spirit shall not always strive with man for that he also is flesh, yet his day shall be 120 years." In those Old Testament days, the book of Genesis, the Holy Spirit did strive with men convicting them of sin and of righteousness and of judgement before the flood came in the days of Noah. Prov. 1:23, "Turn you at my reproof, behold I'll pour out my Spirit unto you. I will make known my words unto you." Prov. 29:1, "He that being often reproveth hardeneth his neck, shall

suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy.” Jn. 16:7-11, I think generally outlines the work of the Holy Spirit in conviction. “Nevertheless I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you. But if I depart I will send him unto you and when he is come he will reprove the world.” Now, I maintain that means all men in general. Every responsible sinner. I’m not including infants; he doesn’t convict infants or people who are not capable of responding. But those who are capable of responding to the influence of the Holy Spirit. “He shall reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgement. Of sin because they believe not on me.” There’s the condemning sin my brother. “Of righteousness because I go to my Father and ye see me no more. Of judgement because the prince of this world is judged.” Now I want to point something out to you. At least three times in this debate my opponent has come out clearly with the position that regeneration must precede repentance and faith. He did it this afternoon at least twice. He did it in our discussion of our first proposition. Now if my opponent is right in it and that the, that the first thing the Holy Spirit does for a spiritually dead sinner is to impart eternal life to him; then when the Holy Spirit convicts a sinner of sin and of righteousness and of judgement, convicts him that he’s lost and ruined, he convicts him of a lie. Because he’s already regenerated according to my opponent’s doctrine. If regeneration precedes repentance and faith, the convicting work of the Holy Spirit that comes to one who’s already regenerated and leads him to repentance and faith, he’s convicting him of a lie when he convicts him that he’s lost and ruined and condemned. Because no regenerated sinner is condemned. Now don’t you get the idea that I’m accusing the Holy Spirit of lying. This is another consequence of my opponent’s doctrine. My opponent’s doctrines accuse the Holy Spirit of lying to a sinner when he convicts him of sin and of righteousness and of judgement to come. Because that sinner, according to my opponent is already regenerated and if he’s already regenerated, he’s not lost. And I want him to deal with this.

I come to another argument. And this one on the basis, this argument is based on the rejection of Jesus Christ. Lk. 9:2, “The Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected of the elders and chief priest and scribes and be slain and be raised the third day.” Lk. 17:24, “But first he must suffer many things and be rejected of this generation.” Now according to the doctrine of my opponent the non-elect; he doesn’t like the term non-elect but it’s a consequence of his doctrine anyway. I can’t help whether he likes the term or not. It’s a consequence of his doctrine. According to the doctrine of my opponent the non-elect cannot reject Jesus Christ because he has not been offered to them. Now you mark this down. And I invite any of you in the congregation to run a little experiment on this. No man can reject anything that hasn’t been offered to him. You see. All right. But Jesus was rejected. Lk. 9:22 and Lk 17:25. Therefore he was offered to those who rejected him. Now I have some syllogisms on this. Would you hand this copy to my opponent please? Listen to these syllogisms:

Now no man can reject Christ to whom Christ has not been offered. The non-elect do reject Christ. Therefore, Christ is offered to the non-elect. Or, only those can reject Christ to whom Christ has been offered. Christ has been offered only to the elect. This is according to my opponent’s doctrine. Therefore, only the elect can reject Christ. (Ten minutes) Furthermore, if Christ has been offered to men; now listen closely to this: If Christ is offered to men, he is offered to them as a Savior. Now I affirm to you that Christ is going to be the judge of all men, but God never has offered his Son Jesus Christ as a judge to anybody. If God offers his Son, he offers him as a Savior. Since no man can reject that which is not offered to him those who reject Christ reject him as a Savior. Let me read it again. Since no man can reject that which is not offered to him, those who do reject Christ reject him as a Savior. If Christ is offered as a Savior to those who reject him then those who reject him could have been saved else God lied to them at the altar. This is another consequence of my brother’s doctrine.

I asked him, you’ll remember, a question this afternoon: Does God sincerely offer salvation to all men both elect and non-elect? And he hasn’t answered that. He evaded it. He hasn’t answered that. He knows not to answer that. But I’m telling you that God has offered his Son to every responsible sinner. Every sinner who rejects Jesus Christ rejects him because he has been offered to him as a Savior. That’s the only way he can reject that him. Now, if Christ; let me read this again. If Christ is offered to men he is offered to them as a Savior. Since no man can reject that which is not offered to him, those who do reject Christ reject

him as a Saviour. If Christ is offered as a Saviour to those who reject him, then those who reject him could have been saved. But only those can be saved for whom Christ died. Therefore, Christ died for those who reject him. And if he died for those who reject him, he died for all the human race. All right.

My next argument is based on the fact that all men are commanded to repent. Matt. 3:1, 2, "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea and saying, 'repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'" Mk. 1:14, 15, "Now after that John was put in prison Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of heaven and saying, 'the time is fulfilled, the kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye and believe the gospel.'" Lk. 13:3, 5, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." Acts. 3:29, revised version, "Repent ye therefore and turn again that your sins may be blotted out so that there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." Acts 17:30, 31, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained. For now he hath given assurance to all men in that he had raised them from the dead." Is. 55:7, "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy on him and unto our God for he will abundantly pardon." Now my brother, repentance is unto salvation. II Cor. 7:10. And repentance is unto life, Acts 11:28, Then if God has commanded all men everywhere to repent he certainly has salvation for them. He certainly has eternal life for them. But salvation and eternal life can only be had on the grounds that Christ died for a man and the fact that God commands all men everywhere to repent is proof unimpeachable that Christ died for all men everywhere. I want my brother to deal with this.

Now my next argument is based on Acts. 3:25, 26, "Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our Father saying unto Abraham, 'And in thy seed shall all kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you in turning away every one of you of his iniquities.'" (Five minutes) Thank you. Now in this third chapter of Acts, it is said to those Jews that "God sent his Son to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." I asked my opponent did every one of those Jews turn from his iniquities and get saved? If not, then Christ was sent to bless some of them who did not get saved and he blessed, his blessing was on the grounds of his death, he died for every Jew. He died even for those Jews who would not repent of their sins and believe on Jesus Christ and be saved. And if he died for Jews who didn't get saved, he died for Gentiles who didn't get saved. Now I want my brother to deal with this argument. This scripture. Some of those Jews died in their sins. Jesus announced to them that "You will die in your sins fir if you believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." Not because he had determined it, but because they would not repent of their sins and put their faith in him. All right.

My next argument is based on the fact that God's goodness is enjoyed by all men and that his goodness leads men to repentance. Ps. 86:5, "For thou oh Lord art good and ready to forgive and plenteous in mercy unto all of them that call upon thee." Ps. 25:8, "Good and upright is the Lord, therefore will he teach sinners in the way." Ps. 33:5, "He loveth righteousness and judgement, the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord." Ps. 125:8, 9, "The Lord is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger and of great mercy. The Lord is good to all and his tender mercies are over all his works." And Rom. 2:4, "Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Now I want you to know that where ever on the face of this earth a man experiences, receives the blessings of God's goodness the design of God's goodness is to lead him to repentance and repentance is unto salvation, II Cor. 7:10. Repentance is unto life, Acts 11:18, And if God's goodness is designed to lead men to repentance and God is good to all men all over the face of the earth, he has salvation for all men. But men can be saved only on the grounds that Christ died for them. This proves my brother that Christ died for them. This proves my brother that Christ died for every man of Adam's race. Now I want to take up a thing that he has dealt with to some degree and that is the absolute substitution of Christ. He has intimated on occasion that those for whom Christ died; Since he paid their sin debt, their sins can't be charged against them. Now this is his doctrine of absolute substitution. The sins of those for whom Christ died cannot be charged against them. That's what he teaches and yet on the first day of this debate my

brother agreed that the unregenerated elect people are under condemnation. Now I want my brother... (Your time is up.)

CRAWFORDS' THIRD NEGATIVE

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen and my distinguished opponent, I come before you with a heart filled with gratitude, thankful for the opportunity to meet in this session such as this and commend my friend on offering the best that could be offered from his side of the question. Now there's no point in somebody saying that we could have gotten a better debater, because I think my friend is the best and the most able man. I think my friend is one of the ablest men, I've known him for years. We have been good friends. We're going to be good friends when this debate is over. And I really hope that all of you tomorrow will be here for the good Thanksgiving dinner and be here for the debate.

Now, we're going to, I'm going to answer my friend's syllogisms in just a moment. But I have some questions here for Dr. Alexander. Would you hand those to him please sir?

Five questions:

1. *Since you say that repentance and faith actually gets a man to heaven and not the atonement of Christ could not people have gone to heaven without the death of Christ?*

I want him to explain that because he said Jesus Christ died for all men. And yet that doesn't get anybody to heaven for sure, until he repents personally, he repents and personally exercises faith then that makes the atonement work.

2. *Since you said on p.59 of your book "The Doctrine of Tulip" that Jesus Christ justified the entire human race for Adam's sin and yet some of them die and go to hell: Would not some justified people be in hell? Or partly justified people in hell, or three quarters justified, or at some instance they have been justified in some means from their Adamic Natures?*

All Right,

3. *Since Christ's death justified the Adamic transgression but not their own personal transgression, do not the people who are saved according to this teaching justify themselves by repentance and faith?*

My friend is going to answer these questions. He will.

4. *How does a responsible sinner become such?*

I want him to tell us how a responsible sinner becomes a responsible sinner and then I'm going to do the very opposite because I don't want him to be responsible; for all irresponsible people go to heaven according to my friend. Now watch this.

5. *Since you say Christ died for all men's sins, did he die for the sin of unbelief?*

Now, if he died for all sins, then he died for the sin of unbelief. Say, about that rejection of Jesus Christ, since Christ died for all sins wouldn't he die for the sin of rejection too? We'll get to that after while.

Now my friend brought up about the infants and he said I didn't have to apologize for him. Dr. Alexander I have read your book, you made that argument in the book when you preached that same doctrine to another church someplace. But our people here didn't know you and I didn't want them to feel hard toward you. Now if that's bad then I'm guilty of trying to help a brother. If I would have wanted to get into this infant and killing babies as he did. And I apologize for that language. That is so base. I could say according to Dr. Alexander's argument, since Jesus Christ died for all people in the Adamic nature state and since he died for all infants whether they're elect or non-elect as he said, go out and kill your baby and they would surely go to heaven. Now wouldn't that be a great argument. I even apologize, and this is going into a book and I apologize to you readers who are going to read this. That is so slipshod.

Now he said Jn. 1:29, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," and he said, why Crawford you didn't deal with that. Well we only have one Savior, right? He made one sacrifice on the cross, right? Then in I Jn. 2:2 when John said, "He is the propitiation for our sins and not only for ours, but for the sins of the whole world;" and he introduced the heretic John Calvin this afternoon to prove his position. And I said John Calvin was a heretic because Baptist were preaching the doctrines called Calvinism today before John Calvin was ever born. And I resent the fact that he, with the slip of the tongue called him my daddy. That is beneath the dignity of a good debate. But in I Jn. 2:2, "He is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but for the sin of the whole world." And I clearly stated that John wrote both of these passages under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Jn. 1:29, I Jn. 2:22 and Jn. 11:51, 52. And when he said that Jesus Christ was the sacrifice for the people of God. Jn. 11:51, 52; not for just the entire world as a blanket redemption he said that "he died for the children of God." That man has never read that correctly and I forgive you for it Brother Alexander. It says, "for the children of God." It didn't say for the, all the non-elect as you've used the term non-elect. It said, "for the children of God."

Now my dear brother goes to the rich young ruler and he's trying to get this man out of hot water. I heard my dear brother correctly this afternoon. He said Christ loved him and therefore he went away and he went to hell and he was lost. Christ loved a man that went to hell. Now he comes back tonight and he says, I didn't say he went to hell. Well what's your argument then? You're trying to prove that Jesus Christ died for everybody. I said that the man, there's no record of this man being saved but it is presumptuous to say that the man went to hell. That's adding to the word of God.

Now, Gal. 5:24, He said "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh." Well I believe that. I believe that scripture. He said no one belongs to Christ until he repents of his sin. Is that right? Now listen to Christ. Jn. 10:16, now I'm not going to fool away my time. I'll listen to his speeches. He's not listening to mine. I introduced this time and time again. Jn. 10:16 Christ said, "Other sheep have I which are not of this fold. Them must I bring, they shall hear my voice and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Now A. T. Robertson says concerning those and he's the Greek scholar and he said in Jn 12:32, "If I be lifted up from the earth I will draw all men unto me." And the "all" there means the all sheep not the very individual. And this man has been silent as a tomb on all those scriptures of the great Greek scholar A.T. Robertson. What did he say? While we're on that I said, Brother Alexander this afternoon he made that plea on Lk. 19:10, "For the son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost" and I said that was the aorist infinitive and the aorist infinitive is, and it means eventually that takes place. It must be an actual thing that transpired. Dana and Mantey p. 199 says that. Now Christ actually did seek, and he did save them that are lost and if he didn't then the Bible told a lie. Because the Greek infinitive is used and that aorist infinitive in the Greek means that if actually takes place. No ifs, no ands about it. Now if it had been a present infinitive there would have been conditions. Brother Alexander what you want to do is get Dana and Mantey's Greek Grammar and turn to page 199 and read that. Here's the way it would read or read then. Lk. 19:10, "For the Son of man is come trying to seek and trying to save those who are lost." Now that would be the present infinitive. You schoolboys who are going to school and taking Greek, you know this. All right.

Matt. 1:21, "He should save his people from their sins." I said amen. He said that's the Jews, he's going to try to save the Jews or something like that. I don't want to put words in the gentlemen's mouth. But dear friends he shall save his people from their sins and he either did that or else he didn't do it. One of the two. I believe that Jesus Christ saved his people.

He went over the lost sheep of the house of Israel. He's trying; now Brother Alexander, Matt. 10:5, 14 says Christ said, "I am not sent," not offered; I'm going to get to this offered in a minute. There's a difference between preaching Christ, brother, and offering Christ. You don't have any right to offer Christ, Christ doesn't belong to you to offer. God gave his Son on the cross of Calvary and I read in Eph. 5:2 that Christ offered himself to God. And you can't find in the Bible, now here's what you can't find my brother: Is where Paul stood up before people and said, "I'm offering Christ to you." He wasn't Paul's Christ to offer. Now you get that. Now look, this lost sheep of the house of Israel, I would like to do this. He said he must have died for some of those or all those lost sheep of the house of Israel. My dear friend when he died for his

sheep, he saved his sheep. He said in Jn. 10th chapter, "I am the good shepherd I lay down my life for the sheep." Now he died for them or else he personally is accountable for everyone of them and they will be charged to his inability to save them. That's what the shepherd means, my dear friend.

And then he came to Gal. 4:4, 5 he says, "Christ is the fullness of time God sent forth his Son born under the law to redeem them that are under the law." My dear friend has a hard time of understanding in my first speech yesterday; I read it. I said there is a sense in which Jesus Christ died and removed all the legal barriers between mankind and God and he hasn't noticed that to this day. It's in argument three, proposition six. That's where it is. I made the argument, I didn't really make the argument, I read from Dr. J. R. Graves and it's printed by the American Baptist Association and I read it to the people, and I stand unflinchingly on it. Why of course Christ removed all the legal obligations.

Universal work of the Holy Spirit and he quoted Gen. 6:3 where "My Spirit shall not always strive with man. Brother Alexander that word DOON, Hebrew word DOON there, which is to use the word for strive is translated judge over in Job 24:19, Now what the Lord said, "My Spirit shall not always judge man." It wasn't that God was trying to save the Antediluvians and they wouldn't get in the ark, brethren. No, it wasn't that. It was not. It's a, there's a kind of scripture over in II Thess. 2:7 that says, "Only he who now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way." The Holy Spirit today is holding back the anti-Christ from taking over. And II Thess. 2:7 says, "Only he the Holy Spirit is holding back" and in Gen. 6:3 my dear friend, and any scholar will tell you this, just look it up. They say that the Holy Spirit was actually holding down the rebellious ungodliness of those antediluvians and his day was to be 120 years. Now if that means the Holy Spirit was striving with a sinner and you get up and you preach that. I don't know what you do Brother Alexander, but if you do it, you sinners just remember this, you have 120 years to repent in. I don't think you believe that do you? Because it says, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man yet shall his days be 120 years." Well if he's striving, to trying, God is trying to get you saved but you just won't be saved, then you have 120 years according to my dear friend or maybe he'll put a different interpretation on that.

And then he said Christ was rejected. Lk. 9:22, Lk. 17:25, I believe that. But not, let me say this, our Lord Jesus Christ is rejected today by the ministers who reject him in declaring he is not able to save his people from their sins. You don't have to go to sinners rejecting Jesus Christ, he's rejected in the churches today.

Repentance, he goes to repentance. Now Brother Alexander I know that we're brothers and after this debate is over if the Lord should come you and I are going to stand before him up there and I'd hate to say anything that would, I would have to come over and apologize to you before all the angels and the Lord. So I'm not going to do that. But he used Acts 11:18 "Repentance is unto life." And when I meet a Campbellite I use that. Repentance is unto life; eis life; because of life. A sinner repents because he has life. Now here's the way I do Guy N. Woods when I meet him in a debate or one of the Campbellites. You take a dead mule out here and give him all the commands, the Campbellites commands. Now you here, we're going to make you, don't take offense right now will you please Brother. We're going to make you a responsible sinner. Now listen mule, hear the commands: first of all you have to hear the word, now you're going to have to repent, and then make a good confession. That mule just lies there, he's dead. That's the way I meet a Campbellite. But repentance is because of life, the Holy Spirit comes and he gives a sinner life and he repents. One of the odd things about my dear brethren, when they meet a Campbellite they take the Calvinistic position. That the Holy Spirit operates separate and apart from the word. And then get up in their pulpits and preach Campbellism on Sunday morning. That's what they do. Campbellite Baptist churches all over this country. And yet when we meet a Campbellite we say the Holy Spirit operates separate and apart from the Word.

Now my friend in this book, now tomorrow we're going to be on this, he says the Holy Spirit operates through the word. And I'm going to read Alexander Campbell's confession of faith to you Brother Alexander. All right.

Acts 3, he goes into the goodness of God. Yes, I believe in the goodness of God. Ps. 86:5, Ps. 25:8, Ps. 145:8, 9 and then he quotes Rom. 2:4, which says "Knowest thou not that the goodness of God leadeth

thee to repentance.” Brother Alexander in the Greek grammars that’s called a conative present. Now let me just say this because when you get into a debate such as this you put yourself in the light of trying to be a know-it-all. But the conative present is that it should, but it doesn’t. It should work, but it doesn’t. Here the goodness of God should lead you to repentance, but it doesn’t. And therefore, it takes and must have an actual operation of the Holy Spirit to lead the sinner to repentance. All right.

I think that’s all the dear brother said. Maybe I missed something, maybe I didn’t. I don’t know. I’m going to deal with whatever the brother puts out. I think these debates are very helpful. I want to go to this syllogism though. He said, syllogism for the argument on the rejection of Christ. Now he said no man can reject Christ to whom Christ has been offered. I deny that the Bible says that we offer Christ. Now the Catholic priest offer Christ to their communicant when they turn that wafer into the actual body and blood of Jesus Christ that bought it. They drink the blood. But now they offer Christ to the communicant. No place in God’s word will you ever find where a Baptist preacher ever offered Christ to people. Jesus Christ is preached to people, and there’s a difference in preaching to lost sinners and offering them Christ. He is not yours to offer. He’s on the right hand of the throne of God and he refuses to be given to the wicked people of this world.

Now we preach his marvelous atoning work and the Holy Spirit will bring those to Jesus Christ which are in the covenant of redemption which my dear friend has never said one word about that eternal covenant of redemption that I mentioned yesterday. Now dear friend; (Ten Minutes) Thank you.

I would just like to go to somethings on the history of atonement. And I’d like to go through some things on the false theories of atonement. And my dear friend I hope that we will be friends as long as we live because life is short, and it doesn’t behoove any of us to try to run over anybody. And therefore we should all be brethren even though I disagree with Dr. Alexander. But we’re friends and we will be friends. And if we’re not, I want to be. I’m not sacrificing the teaching of Jesus Christ for it. But I want to be his friend. Now the false views of atonement. And my friend has these he is part and parcel of all of these views.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The false view of Socinianism is that Christ did not die for anybody in particular, but that man makes his atonement by repentance and faith.

1. Laelius Socinus (1525-1562) a preacher of Poland and an Arian who denied the trinity of three persons of the one essence; God, he said God did not need appeasing or propitiating but man could become reconciled to God by repentance and reformation; This can be affected by man’s own free will, but the death of Christ is only the death of a martyr because he did not really buy or redeem anybody...These are Socinian ideas. - ---- Some of the points of Socinianism is that: Christ died of a broken heart, showing his love for man, hence sentimentalism is a part of Socinianism.
2. False things about Socinianism is that: Christ did not die, he says Christ did not die for sins of His redeemed people...But, the Bible teaches us different from that beloved.
 - a. Christ Died for our sins. I Cor. 15:3
 - b. Christ redeemed or bought his people by his blood. I Pet. 1:18-19

SECOND PROPOSITION: The false view of Bushnellianism is that God is not propitiated, and Christ died, not to pay for the sins of his people, but that death was to manifest the love of God.

1. Horace Bushnell (1802-1876) held to the Sabellian idea of the Trinity. He believed in God as one person and manifested in three ways; instead of the truth of the three distinct persons but of one essence; therefore he denied the eternal sonship of Christ. Bushnell came under the influence of N.W. Taylor, Nathaniel Emmons, Charles G. Finney et al, who had modified the old Calvinism into the New England theology which denied total depravity, and taught man was born with the potential to sin, but man was not really totally depraved.
2. Bushnellianism says Christ did not satisfy divine justice but as a doctor suffers for his patient or as a wife suffers for the exiled husband, or a husband who is imprisoned.

3. The falsehoods in Bushnellianism must be exposed.
 - a. Christ actually suffered instead of his people. Matt. 10:28 “The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for (instead) of many.”
 - b. Christ offered himself to God to appease the justice of God. Eph. 5:2, “Christ hath love us and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor.”

THIRD PROPOSITION: The false views of the Grotian or Governmental theory: Christ did not satisfy God's justice but to promote God's moral government in the world. Christ died to enable men to a good clean life and obey the righteous laws of the Bible; this was the Grotain Theory of Atonement.

1. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) was a genius in international law but held the subjective opinion of Christ's death to satisfy the law of God, but not to pay for man's sins against the law, but enable man to live a clean moral life instead of a sinful and dishonoring life.
2. This view ignores three facts: a. Sin is against God and not just against God's moral law. Ps. 51:4, “Against thee and thee only have I sinned.” b. Christ actually put away the sin of his people. Heb. 9:26, “But now in the end of the age hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” c. Christ died on the behalf of his people. Jn. 10:11, “I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.” (Not everybody is a sheep) Jn. 10:26 “Ye are not my sheep because ye believe, ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep.”
3. My opponent's idea is made up of these three false views of atonement. Dr. N.W. Taylor, Dr. Charles G. Finney adopted this Grotian theory. Today it is preached by most modern Baptist along with Billy Graham and John R. Rice type of preachers. It is summed up in the idea of Christ dying to enable men to live clean moral life, but it ignores the atonement made to redeem and reconcile hopeless and helpless sinners.

(Five Minutes) Thank you.

FOURTH PROPOSITION: The false view of the Irvington Theory which is the idea that Christ overcame the temptations of the devil and the world and by his resurrection, he gives power to the people to be saved by his surrendered life.

1. Edward Irvington (1792-1834) a London preacher taught this heresy which said Christ was born in a human nature as it was in Adam after the fall; a human nature with its corrupt nature, but Christ conquered this nature through the power of the Holy Spirit; he not only kept his human nature from sinning but gradually purified it, and men are not saved by Christ's death but by his conquering life. My opponent's proposition leans toward this because nowhere in his proposition and he wrote the proposition, does he say one word about redemption, atonement, or reconciliation.
2. The falsehoods in the Irvington theory exposed:
 - a. Christ did not have a sinful nature, 2 Cor. 5:21 says, “God made him to be sin who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”
 - b. Christ was born of a virgin birth and did not inherit the sin nature which is received from an earthly father. Lk. 1:30-35; Jn. 8:56
 - c. There is no atonement in the sermons, tears, miracles of Jesus; but only by his precious blood is atonement made for his people. Matt. 26:28 “This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed (instead of) the remissions of sins of many.”

FIFTH PROPOSITION: The ethical theory of the atonement which came out of the Andover divines.

1. This false view sprang from the ideas of Dr. N.W. Taylor and Dr. Nathaniel Emmons who turned from the old Puritan views to the weak form of Calvinism which denied total depravity, election, blood atonement for those in the covenant of redemption. In 1808, a spineless minister, Samuel Abbot, and a woman preacher by the name of Madame Phoebe Phillips and her son set up a seminary which was dedicated to destroy Calvinism as it had been taught by the London and Philadelphia

Confessions of Faith of our Baptist people, and the sad thing is these heretics have gotten their views into the blood bought churches of Jesus Christ.

2. Its major points are: A. That Christ is a universal mediator. Christ is not the mediator of the elect only but of the entire world. B. Christ's work was to change the relations of God to man which secures a change in the relations of man to God. C. In atonement there is no imputation or transfer of sin of man to Christ of Christ's righteousness to man. D. Yet in Christ as a substitute of man the race approaches God representatively suffering for sin and repenting of it. E. The atonement of Christ and the repentance of man combine to set man free. (See Systematic Theology, By James Petigrew Boyce. p.300). F. The spirit regenerates no one except through that one's personal knowledge and experience of the gospel facts.
3. This theory is mixed with Grotian, Irvington, Bushnellian, and Socinian beliefs and it is preached in the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ today to the shame and disgrace of God.
(Time)

ALEXANDER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen, I come to you to present my last speech on this proposition. That, the Scriptures teach that the sacrificial substitutionary death of Jesus Christ was on behalf of all men. I cannot present any new material in this speech and I'm aware of that. If I should inadvertently present any material that I have not already presented or that my opponent hasn't presented, I ask my moderator to call my attention to it. I'm going to deal with something in just a moment that he has presented, and he'll have an opportunity to respond to this of course. And I want him to respond to it. First of all let me remind you that he went back to John, Matt. 1:21, "He shall save his people from their sins." And he said that I said, "And he shall save the Jews," or something like that. No Brother Crawford, I said Matt. 1:21 teaches that Christ shall in the resurrection deliver his people those who have repented of their sins and been regenerated from their sins. John wrote in I Jn. 1:8 to save people and said, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." Paul in the 7th chapter of romans dealt with the sin principle that works in the old man of every child of God. Now, and he closed that chapter by saying, "Oh wretched man that I am. Who shall deliver me from," as the King James version says, "the body of this death." I believe a better construction of it is from the revised version, "this the body of death." Now I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord; Christ is going to deliver saved people from their sins in the resurrection. That's what Matt. 1:21 teaches. It has nothing to do with limiting the atoning effect of Christ's death.

Jn. 1:29, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." The sin of the world my opponent has not yet, after I have asked him twice, he has not yet told us what one single sin involved all the world, but only the world. Now if he wants to limit the world there to the elect, I don't care let him limit it to the elect. That's what he wants to do with the term world in many other scriptures. But if he doesn't, I want him to tell us what one single sin involved all the elect but only the elect. He hasn't done that. Now even though I'm not going to have an opportunity tonight to respond to what he may answer, I want him to tell us in his next speech, what one single sin involved or affected all the elect but only the elect. Christ took away the sin of the world, I maintain that that was the Adamic transgression that involved the entire human race. And that teaches that Christ died for the entire human race. My opponent hasn't answered that.

Now, he says that God does not offer Christ to any man and so on. And that we have no right to offer Christ to man if we preach Christ to men. Well when you preach the gospel to men and plead with them to repent and trust Christ, what is that but offering Christ to men? I asked you a while ago, how can a man reject something that has not been offered to him? But Christ was rejected by men and is rejected by men today. And my opponent has admitted that. He didn't like the way he had to admit it, but he admitted that Christ definitely is rejected by men. Well if he's rejected by men then Christ is offered to men. Since he cannot be rejected by anyone to whom he is not offered. And I said a while ago that as God offers Christ only as a Savior to men, he doesn't offer him as a judge. He offers him as a Savior to men. Then when men reject Christ, they reject him as a Savior. But if Christ is offered to men as a Savior then God really has salvation for them. I've tried to get my opponent to tell us today all through this discussion today; does God sincerely offer salvation to all men both elect and non-elect. And he has not answered that. But I'll tell you the Bible teaches abundantly that God does offer salvation to all responsible sinners. And those who go to hell are going to hell because they rejected Jesus Christ. All right.

He repeats something that he said yesterday. I wanted him to say this again and he didn't. He repeats that there is a sense in which Christ died and removed all legal obligations between God and mankind. Well then, why are you denying this proposition Brother Crawford? If Christ did remove all legal obligations between God and all mankind but he could do it only by dying for all mankind. And that sustains my proposition and he has admitted as much. Now one other thing I want to deal with before I answer his questions that he asked me.

He talked about the dead mule. He didn't want me to be offended. Brother Crawford I'm not that easily offended, so don't worry about offending me, don't worry about hurting my feelings. He said, here's a dead mule and he walked up to him and said, "hear mule." Now I know the Calvinist teach that a spiritually

dead sinner can't hear. But let's see whether he can or not. In Is. 1:18, pardon me, Is. 1:10, God said "Hear the word of the Lord ye rulers of Sodom, give ear to the law of our God ye people of Gomorrah." Now here in this first chapter of Isaiah he was talking to people who were spiritually dead and he described them like this. "Why should ye be stricken anymore ye will revolt more and more, the whole head is sick, the whole heart faint from the sole of the foot even to the head. There is no soundness in it but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores that have not been closed neither bound up, neither mollified with ointments." But he called on those sinners to hear the word of God. Can they hear? God said they could. In Is. 42:18 God said "Hear ye deaf and look ye blind that ye may see." In Jn. 5:24, "The son of God said, Verily, Verily, I say unto you it is the hour coming and now is when the dead shall hear." This is the spiritually dead, not the physically dead in the grave. For a few verses later he said, "Marvel not at this for the hour is coming" and here he didn't say it now is, "but the hour is coming in which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice". There's the dead bodies hearing his voice. But back in verse 25, it's the dead souls of men. "The hour is coming and now is that" it was present when Jesus said this, "when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and they that hear shall live." So, a dead man can hear. A spiritually dead man can hear.

Now, I'm going to answer his questions and then I want to deal with something that he introduced concerning redemption. Since he said that I haven't said a word about redemption or anything of this kind. The questions he presented to me.

Question #1. Since you say that repentance and faith actually gets a man to heaven and not the atonement of Christ, could not people have gone to heaven without the death of Christ?

Now Brother Crawford when did I say that repentance and faith gets a man to heaven and not the atonement of Christ? When did I say that? Now to use some words that I think I've heard you say, I haven't said it drunk or sober, asleep or awake. I wouldn't say such a thing. I said that a sinner receives the atonement, the propitiation, the benefits of the death of Christ after putting their faith in Jesus Christ. That's what I said. And I have repeatedly, and this will show up in the record, I have repeatedly said in this debate that no man can be saved except on the grounds of the death of Jesus Christ. I have repeatedly said that. And then my opponent charges me with saying that repentance and faith actually gets a man to heaven and not the atonement of Christ. I've never said such a thing.

Question #2. Since you said on p. 59 of your book The Doctrine of Tulip that Jesus Christ testified, or Jesus Christ justified the entire human race from Adam's sin, and yet some of them die and go to hell; would not some justified people be in hell or partly justified or three-quarters justified?

Now listen, there will be people in hell who were justified from the Adamic transgression. Every person who is in hell was justified from the Adamic transgression. He justified the entire human race from the Adamic transgression. Jn. 1:29, "He taketh away the sin of the world." I Tim. 4:10, "God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe."

Question #3. Since Christ death justified the Adamic transgression but not their own personal transgression, do not the people who are saved, according to this teaching, justify themselves by their repentance and faith?

No, a sinner, now listen to this. I'm not going to a Baptist declaration of faith and I'm not going to what some Baptist wrote in time past, I'm going to the word of God to answer this question. A sinner is justified from personal condemnation by the blood of Christ, Rm. 5:9. Put it down. "Therefore being justified by his blood." He's justified by the grace of God, Tit. 3:7, "Being justified by his grace we should be made heirs according to his will" and so on. He's justified at the point of faith in Jesus Christ, Rom. 5:1, "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." And Ga. 2:16, "We have believed in Jesus that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the law." All right.

Question #4. How does a responsible sinner become such?

Well I've answered this before, but I'll answer it again. By maturing mentally sufficiently to be capable of responding to the influence of the Holy Spirit.

Question #5. Since you say Christ died for all men's sins, did he die for the sin of unbelief?

Yes, he did, if he hadn't no believer could ever believe on Jesus Christ and be saved. Because Brother Crawford you were an unbeliever at one time, and I was an unbeliever at one time.

Now my opponent said, he pointed this afternoon to, or referred, pardon me, to Heb. 9:12, "Neither by the blood of goats and calves but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us." Now I ask you to listen to me carefully. My brother purported in his application of this, his Calvinistic doctrine of absolute, absolute substitution: That those for whom Christ died as a substitute they were redeemed right then when Christ died. That redemption was obtained for them then when Christ died. And that their sins could not be charged against them. And yet in the first day of this debate he acknowledged that unregenerated elect people are under condemnation until they get regenerated. Now he has not told us yet how it is that unregenerated elect people are under condemnation, yet their sins can't be charged against them. In the 8th chapter of Romans, the apostle Paul said, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect." It is God that justifies, and that scripture shows us that God's elect are people who have faith. No unbelievers.

Now what about redemption. When Christ died, he obtained eternal redemption for sinful beings But when is that redemption possessed by an individual sinner? Well I want to show you by the word of God. And I'm going to the word of God. I'm not going to a Baptist Confession of Faith. I'm not going to what some Baptist wrote 75 or 100 years ago. I'm going to the inspired word of the living God Brother Crawford. Eph. 1:7, now you listen to me, before I read this scripture, I want to use five terms here and I challenge every one of you to dig into the word of God. I challenge my opponent to this. These five terms that I'm going to use when a sinner possesses one of them, he possesses all five of them. First, reconciliation, atonement, redemption, remission of sins, peace with God. Five terms, let me read them again. Let me go over them again. The first one is atonement, that word is only used one time in the New Testament. That Rm. 5:11, If I remember right. In some versions it's translated reconciliation there, but that doesn't mean anything, there's no argument there. Atonement, reconciliation, redemption by his blood, remission of sins, peace with God. I affirm to you that when an individual sinner has redemption through the blood of Christ he has remission of sins. And I'm going to prove that. When he has reconciliation with God, he has peace with God, for peace with God implies reconciliation. When he has redemption through the blood of Christ, he has reconciliation with God. In Eph. 1:7, Paul referred to Christ "in whom" that is in Christ "we have redemption through his blood the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace." Now this scripture equates redemption through his blood and forgiveness of sin, and brother no sinner has redemption through his blood until he has remission of sins and no sinner has remission or forgiveness of sins, until he repents toward God and believes on Jesus Christ. (Ten minutes) All right. Col. 1:14, the same thing, "In whom we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins." There Paul makes it clearer. He equates redemption through his blood and the forgiveness of sins, and I affirm to you again that when a sinner has redemption through his blood, he has the remission or forgiveness of sin. If the elect have had the redemption through the blood of Christ since Christ died on the cross then every elect person since then has had remission of since he died on the cross and their sins could never be charged against them even before they were regenerated. And my opponent has already admitted that unregenerated elect people are under condemnation. And whether he knows it or not, whether he'll admit it or not, I think he can see it right now. He's an intelligent man and I think he can see this in spite of his unconditional election doctrine my brother inadvertently teaches, a provisional redemption for the elect only. Now there goes your doctrine of absolute substitution my brother and you'll never rub that out of the word of God. When does a man have peace with God? "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God." When he has peace with God he's reconciled to God. Peace means that all enmity has been removed between you and God. And Paul says we get that peace when we have faith in Jesus Christ. And if they have peace with God by faith in Jesus Christ then you have reconciliation with God. When you have reconciliation with God you have redemption through his

blood. Even the forgiveness of sin. There are an abundance of scriptures that show us that the sinner receives remission or forgiveness of sins when he repents and trusts Jesus Christ. This was Luke's account of the great commission; "Jesus said, the repentance and the remission of sin should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning in Jerusalem and you are witnesses of these things." Acts 3:19, the apostle Paul instructed them, "Repent and turn to God that your sins may be blotted out." No man has remission of sins until he repents and trusts Christ. No man has forgiveness of sins. No difference in the term remission of sins and forgiveness of sin until he repents and trust Jesus Christ. Now if he gets remission of sins and forgiveness of sins at the point of faith in Jesus Christ and redemption through his blood is equated with remission of sins as Eph. 1:7 and Col. 1:14 prove then a sinner gets the redemption that Christ obtained when he died. The sinner gets that redemption at the point of faith in Jesus Christ. And no unbeliever has it. Don't you see? All right. Down goes his doctrine of absolute substitution. Yes, Christ obtained eternal redemption for us but no unbeliever possesses that redemption until he repents and trusts Jesus Christ. All right.

I go back to some arguments that I've already presented. I want to admonish my brother once again to answer Jn. 1:29. I plead with him to deal with this. Tell us what one single sin affected all the elect but only the elect. If the term world there means the elect, then you come up here and tell this congregation what one sin is the sin of the elect. (Five minutes) What one sin involved or affected all the elect but only the elect? He hasn't told us that. And if he doesn't, I want you to know that my proposition stands because John the Baptist pointed to Jesus Christ and said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away," what did he take away? "The sin of the world." One single sin that affected all the world but nobody other than the world. I maintain that that one single sin is the Adamic transgression. Yes, you put it down that I believe that Jesus Christ justified all the Adamic race, all of Adam's posterity from the one sin of Adam, the Adamic transgression. And therefore, he died for all of Adam's race. All right.

I presented to you an argument concerning the universal convicting work of the Holy Spirit and I showed you several passages of scripture to prove that the Holy Spirit does convict lost sinners all over the world. Jesus said he shall convict the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgement. I maintain that means all men. And if the Holy Spirit convicts the sinner of sin and of righteousness and of judgement, points them to Jesus Christ, it is because God has a real salvation for that sinner. Else if the Holy Spirit were to convict a man of sin and of righteousness and of judgement, point them to Jesus Christ as a Savior when no salvation has been provided for that sinner, the Holy Spirit would be mocking that sinner and lying to him and the Holy Spirit can't lie my friend. When he convicts men, he means that God has salvation for them. But again, I tell you in spite of the thing my brother intimated in the question a while ago. Again, I tell you no man can be saved on any grounds than the grounds that Christ died for him; and if God has salvation for him it is because Christ died for him. And because the Holy Spirit convicts all responsible sinners and has throughout all the ages of sin and of righteousness and of judgement, is striving with them, wooing them to the Christ that God promised in the covenant of redemption. Then God has salvation for them because Christ died for all of Adam's race. I believe I have abundantly proved my proposition. My brother can go to all the history he wants. Again, my proposition read; the Scriptures teach that the sacrificial substitutionary death of Jesus Christ was on behalf of all men. And I have not gone to history to prove my proposition, I have gone to the word of God. Every argument I've used has been an argument in the word of God. Some of those arguments my brother hasn't touched. I want him to come back to Jn. 1:29. He hasn't touched it. He hasn't told us what one sin involves the entire world but only the world.

All right, now I want to end these closing moments thanking each of you for your kind attention and I join Brother Crawford in saying that when this debate is over we're going to be better friends than we were before it started. I thank God that I can differ with a man doctrinally and I can debate with him from now till Jesus comes and shake hands with him and call him my brother in Christ. He's been born again. God bless you.

CRAWFORD'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Thank you, Dr. Alexander, tonight is a fine spirit and I appreciate your attitude. I appreciate, may I just say this because if one, if I should die before the morning I'd like to go on record as saying this: If I've ever offended one of God's preachers, I'm sorry about it. I don't care who he is, where he is. Now that doesn't mean that I'm going to always agree with the man that's called a preacher, but I'm talking about God's preachers. Because I said in the very beginning of this debate, Jn. 3:27 says, "No man can receive anything except it be given to him from heaven." And if my dear friend doesn't understand what I preach, and I preach the old Baptist Confessions of Faith. And my friend has rebuttable and said that he wasn't going to any Baptist Confessions of Faith. But I've said this, that I if offend one of God's preachers I'm sorry that I offended him if it's just as overt act of my own. And I appreciate the good spirit of Dr. Alexander.

Now, I'm going to answer his speech in just a moment. But I said let's get to those question in just a few minutes. Because I want to make sure that everything this good man has said gets into the record. He said, Mr. Crawford or Brother Crawford, you have not answered Matt. 1:21, where the angel said that "Christ shall save his people from their sins." He said that has to do with the resurrection. Why of course Dr. Alexander that has to do with the resurrection, but how in the world are we as children of God going to get into the resurrection of the just if we're not saved by him before we get there? Matt. 1:21 says, "He shall save his people from their sins." It didn't say he shall save the world or try to save the world or die for the world. And he has abandoned his proposition because the proposition and I'll show you where he said the Jesus Christ, his atonement did not save people but their repentance and faith. It's in his proposition, that's where it is. He said where did I say this. I read and you read it and it's in your proposition my dear brother. Let me go back here. Matt. 1:21 "He shall save his people from their sins." In the resurrection, of course, we will be saved. Rom. 8:23 says, "we groan within ourselves waiting for the adoption to wit the redemption of the body." Now we wait the redemption of the body, but we don't wait the redemption that Christ has paid for our salvation of the soul. I want to get to that in just a moment. Now look at this. Jn. 1:29 he said, what specific sin was it that John; John said, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Now he thinks that Jesus Christ died for all the Adamic sin right there. But hold on dear brother. I've used this time and time again and I'll try to make it plainer. John wrote in I John 1:29; John wrote I John 2:2; John wrote Jn. 11:51,52. Now I don't believe John contradicted himself in John wrote 9:41. Now by the aid of the Holy Spirit and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he told the truth in all those verses. Now if my friend says that Jesus Christ died for the Adamic sin and Jn. 1:29, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." He says that's the Adamic sin. Well now my brother, he did not take away all the s-i-n of the world. How do I know: Christ said in Jn. 9:41; he had opened the blind man's eyes, and he told those Jews that were blind. And they said, "well now are we blind?" And he said, "No because you see, therefore you are blind," And he said, Jn. 9:41, "Therefore your s-i-n remaineth." He didn't take away the sin of those people. Now it we're, (now I know you don't like for me to do this but we're going to be good friends.) In what Baptist Confession do you find your doctrine? It is in the General Baptist Confession. See, this is a dear brother who is a General Baptist in a Missionary Baptist church. And I feel sorry for him because it makes his doctrine uncomfortable. You cannot find your proposition in a Missionary Baptist Confession of Faith. And Tomorrow we'll have this hot and heavy. I'm going to read the General Baptist Confession and you are a General Baptist, Brother Alexander. You people that believe that man's will is free, and the Jesus Christ died for all men, you find that in the General Baptists of John Smith, and I'll prove it. You be here and eat turkey with us tomorrow.

God does not offer, I said that you don't offer Jesus Christ to this world and he does not. And he said, well when you preach Jesus Christ you offer him. No, I don't. I don't offer Christ because Christ is not mine to offer. He didn't call me to offer him, he called me to preach him. But when the Catholic priest give

those people that wafer, he actually offers Jesus Christ to them. You'll not find that in any Baptist Confession of Faith either. All right.

Now, he said a dead man can't hear; that Crawford said a dead man can't hear. No I didn't say that; the Lord Jesus Christ said it. Where did he say it? In Jn. 8:43. Now my friend has never noticed that verse of scripture and he hasn't noticed any of these scriptures on total depravity and tomorrow we're going to have it greater. Because that's the work of the Holy Spirit in total depravity and you brethren want to come. He quoted Is. 1:10 where he said, "Hear the word of the Lord oh Israel." Yes. Then he went to Jn. 5:25 and he says, "The hour is coming when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." And he said that's dead sinners. I agree. But it's the voice of the Son of God, not the voice of Alexander and Crawford. You see Brother Alexander, you think you are the voice of God and some preachers, and I used to think that too, I was the voice of God. But let me say this. That verse says, "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Now while we're on this let's just get a preview of tomorrow. Rom. 10:17 says, "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." That Greek word HREMA means the actual command of God. Now Brother Alexander let me just say this to all our dear brethren. You've been taught and others have been taught that when you preach the word of God and you as a preacher preach the word of God that gives faith to people. If that be so there wouldn't be a lost person leave any of our services because they all heard our voices didn't they? Didn't they? Therefore, if they heard our voices then they heard the word of God and therefore they would all be believers. So, we could take the world for Christ. But Rom. 10:17 says, "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the HREMA" That is the voice of God and he quoted it. Jn. 5:25 says, "The hour is coming and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Not the voice of Alexander and Crawford. But when the Lord God speaks to that sinner, that dead sinner comes alive like those bones over in Ezekiel the 37th chapter. Ezekiel preached but it wasn't Ezekiel that caused them to come alive. It was the spirit of God that brought them alive. And when the spirit of God brings a sinner alive, this is what's missing in most Baptist churches today. This is why they have to have their coke parties and their snow parties, and they have to have dinners and fellowships and ladies' auxiliaries and brotherhoods and youth rallies to keep the people. It's not a spiritual church anymore that we're dealing with my dear brother. Because most churches have offended the Holy Spirit. They have driven him from the services because the preacher thinks that he's God and that he can win the people. Now, brethren I, that's exactly, I don't mean to become emotionally disturbed over this thing. But that is actual fact.

Now, Christ said in Jn. 8:43, he was preaching to people. And he said, "Why is it that you cannot understand my speech? It is because you cannot hear my word." Now deal with that my dear brother.

He said, and I asked him the question: Since you say that repentance and faith actually gives a man, gets a man to heaven and not the atonement of Christ, could not people have gone to heaven without the death of Christ: He said Brother Crawford I've never said that drunk sober or anything else. But your proposition says it my dear brother. It says Christ, now look what it says: "The Scriptures teach the vicarious sacrificial death of Jesus Christ was on the behalf of all men." But he said it didn't say that. In fact he's been affirming that he just took away the Adamic transgression. But I showed him that Jn. 9:41, Christ said, "Your sin, s-i-n remaineth." So those people didn't even have their Adam's transgression paid for, did they? Now listen he said, I've never said that. I know Brother Alexander and forgive me if I said you did say it, your proposition says it. And you're affirming that Jesus Christ died for all men. But that's not enough. You see he died as much for Judas as he did for Paul. What makes the difference? This afternoon he said, well Paul repented and believed on Jesus Christ. Then when Paul gets to heaven he'll say, "Lord stand back over there, I'm here because, not because you died for me, because you died for Judas and Judas went to hell. I'm here because I repented and because I believed on the Son of God." Now brother that doesn't work. Now what did our old, I know he doesn't like this and that he's said that this is not that; he probably likes it he just doesn't like it for me to say it. Article 7 of the Grace of Regeneration. Here's what the old Baptist said in the Baptist Waybook. Let's get back to it brethren. It said, "We believe that in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated or born again. That regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind," giving a holy disposition to the mind; I'll prove that in the morning at a 10:00. "That it is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit"; not by the preacher. That's Campbellism. I'll read

Campbell's Confession of Faith tomorrow morning to you. "To secure our voluntary obedience," that's effectual call. "And that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith and newness of life." Amen and amen. Now where does repentance and faith and newness of life come from? If comes from regeneration. Otherwise you've got a dead mule obeying the commands without life. Now he, I have hooked that mule up with Campbellites and driven him all over the country. Whipped him. Campbellites go out here and tell dead sinners to repent and believe and all of these things. Baptist have always affirmed that the Holy Spirit in his operation works separate and apart from the word. But today we have Baptist churches full of Campbellite preachers. They believe that the Holy Spirit works through the word. And my friend, I, we'll get on that tomorrow morning. Be here.

Now he said, I'm not going to go to a Baptist Confession of Faith. He said, we're justified, Rom. 5:9, we're justified by blood. Tit. 3:7, by grace. Rom. 5:1, by faith. Gal. 2:16, by faith. Now Gal. 2:16, you missed your point there Brother Alexander. That says we're justified by the faith of Jesus Christ. Not our faith but his faith. Now I want him to come up and deal with the subjective genitive in the Greek. Now he can do that. He's a smart man. We'll have it tomorrow.

Rom. 8:3, "Who can lay anything to God, the charge of God's elect." And then he came, and I thought this was the best argument that he's made today. On atonement, reconciliation, redemption, remission and peace. And he said when a sinner gets one of those, he gets all of them, I deny that. Now let me show you something. The Bible doesn't say so. First of all, the atonement was made by Jesus Christ not by the sinner and his repentance. Rom. 5:10 says, "We have received the atonement." Not supposing, not going to get in the future. It's already here. That was back 2000 years ago my dear friend. Listen to this. That's reconciliation, Romans 5:10, now listen. "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." When did the death of his Son take place? 2000 years ago. Then we were reconciled to God 2000 years ago. Now let me say this. Col. 1:14, or 1:20 says, "God reconciled us to himself by the death of his Son." Correct? Why didn't he put in justification also? Justification Rom. 4:29 says, "He was delivered for our transgressions but was raised again for our justification." Redemption, Heb. 9:12. That took place when Jesus Christ died on the cross. Hear it. "Christ hath not entered into the holy place with the blood of bulls and goats, but by his own blood having obtained eternal redemption for us." Not going to but having done. Then we have remission. Lk. 24:47, he said, "Go and preach the remission of sins." How can you preach something that has not already taken place? You cannot preach Lk. 24:47, you can't preach the remission of sins. You've got to tell the sinner that he doesn't get remission until he repents. That's not what the verse says. It says, "Go and preach it," that it has already taken place. Say that's good news. You don't have any good news for the sinner. You have bad news for him. You have news that he must make the atonement work. He must. He must. The emphasis is on the sinner. The sinner must make it work. But we have good news. Now let me say this: Peace is the only thing you get at faith. Now listen to this, because I'm dealing directly with my dear brother and all of you. Rm. 5:1, Rm.4:29 and then Rm. 5:1. The Bible was divided up into chapters by Bishop Hugo in 1250. That should all be read together. Rm. 4:29, Rm. 5:1. Listen to what it says. "He was delivered for our trespasses or transgressions and was raised again for our justification, therefore being justified." And that little Greek conjunction, therefore, refers back to what was said before. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God." The Episcopalians put the commas in the wrong place, my dear friend. The Bible doesn't have any commas in the original scripture. Now we read this like this, dear brethren. I'm not trying to tell you something that's not a fact. Rm. 4:29 says "He was delivered for our transgressions and was raised for our justification." When? 2000 years ago. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God." It's by faith that you have peace with God, not justification. Now if you say that we enjoy the sense of justification by faith, I'll say, all right. Because faith is the sense by which God communicates all his blessings to us. By faith, by faith, by faith we're supposed to live by faith. But not on the account of faith are we justified. I want that to go into this record. I thought that that was a good argument Brother Alexander. But just one other thing while we're on faith and peace. Gal. 5:22 says, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, and faith." Where does faith come from? Faith comes from the marvelous work of the Holy Spirit and our old time Baptist churches would pray for the Lord to send the Holy Spirit, to bring conviction upon sinners and bring them to faith. And we had revival back then when we preached the emphasis on God instead of on man. Today this Arminianism drives

the Spirit of God from the Churches and the churches are dying on the vine. (Ten minutes) All right. Thank you.

I want to go now to some other arguments my friend has made. I answered Jn. 1:29 and here is the thing. Question #5, Did Christ die for the sin of unbelief? He says yes. Well if Christ died for the sin of unbelief, the poor sinner's not going to go to hell because he didn't believe, then is he. Why listen. If Christ died for the sin of unbelief, then unbelief is not going to keep the sinner from Christ. Because unbelief was paid for on the cross. And he says, well that's how we believe then. Well my believing is not unbelief Brother Alexander. And my belief came from the fruit of the Holy Spirit, Gal. 5:22

Now, yesterday I made the argument and my dear friend has not said anything about it. Now one of the things we do when we're in the heat of a debate, we forget to do some things. I made the statement that I would read today from an old Baptist church that sent a letter to another Baptist church and said and told them what they believed about the atonement. I made the argument yesterday. And I want to do that to my friend if he doesn't mind. Because this is a Baptist church. And may I just say this my dear brethren, while we're in the heat of a discussion and we're learning a lot of things. We should take into consideration that these Articles of Faith were not written by a man. They were written by churches and approved by Baptist churches. Baptist churches write Articles of Faith not just a man and pass them off on people. And therefore, if we would return to these Articles of Faith, if we would return to our Articles of Faith there would be no reason why our people could not unite and could not have a solid work against the devil. If we'd return to our Articles of Faith. But the trouble of it is we've got all Baptist preachers writing new Articles of Faith. And so everybody says I'm not going to go to the Articles of Faith, I'm going to the word of God. That's what old, that's what every, pardon this, I'm not referring to you now: That's what every heretic says, Campbellites say, I don't go to the Articles of Faith, I go to the word of God. Pentecostals, holy rollers, everything in the world they try. They say I don't have any Articles of Faith. I prove my doctrine by the word of God. Now brethren Baptist and our old Missionary Baptist preached the Articles of Faith.

Now my friend made an argument a while ago and I'm going to notice this and then I'm going to go to that Baptist church letter. He said that in Prov. 1:29, "I have called and you would none of my reproof. I will laugh therefore at your calamity for your calamity cometh." And he said that is because if God had not called them and if he had not made a universal call there wouldn't have been any response required. But my dear friend. Proverbs, the first chapter says that is wisdom that calls. Now if he says well Christ is wisdom personified let him make an argument that Christ calls everybody. I deny that, Christ did not call everybody. In fact, he said in Lk. 19:10, "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Dana & Mantey's p. 199, an aorist infinitive my dear brothers is this: That it is eventual, it must take place, therefore Jesus Christ actually did save the lost when he was here or else he failed in his mission. That's right.

How much time do I have before I go into this other item? (Five minutes) How much? (Five minutes) All right.

This afternoon my friend made some arguments and some of you were not here and I'd like to just go over them because they are the standard arguments of people who have tried to offset the great and wonderful doctrine that Jesus Christ made a definite atonement. First of all, the word "all" is a term that is used. Those arguments in which "all" and "all men" are misused by people to mean all men or all mankind without exception.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The word "all" is a term of general usage restricted to its text and context for its meaning and in each particular place where it appears.

Example: Those places where the word all cannot mean every individual III John 12, "Demetrius hath a good report of all men."

Fact 1. This could not mean all men without exception but all of a certain kind, that is all those who knew Demetrius.

Fact 2: All is restricted to its context.

Example 2: Those scriptures where all is used to mean all classes without distinction of race, men of all nation and tribes.

1. Jn. 12:32, "If I be lifted up from the earth I will draw all men unto me." A.T. Robertson the great Greek grammarian said, "By all men, pantas, Jesus does not mean every individual, for some as Simeon said (Lk. 2:34) are repelled by Christ but this is the way the Greeks in verse 22 can and will come to Christ, By the way of the cross, the only way to the Father. (Jn. 14:6) (Word Pictures of the Greek New Testament Vol. V, p.229)
2. Rm. 5:18, "Therefore as by the offense of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."

NOTICE:

1. The 'all' in verse 18, means all who received justification, not every individual in the world. Here is one of the greatest Greek Grammarians that ever lived, here is one of the greatest scholars that ever lived; A.T. Robertson said, "Paul resumes the parallel between Adam and Christ beginning in verse 12 and interrupted by an explanation in 13, and contrasted in verse 15-17. Through one trespass (henos paraptomas) that is that of Adam. Through one act of righteousness (henos dikaiomatos) that is of Christ. The first unto all men (eis pantas anthropous) as in verse 12, the second as in verse 17, they that receive."

Not all men as you have put before these people. You skipped verse 17. He reads verse 16, skipped over 17, went to 18. That's, not the way to do that, Brother Alexander.

2. It is not all without exception, but it is all who are justified. As all from Adam become transgressors, so all whom Christ died for received justification. Rm. 3:24. Listen, that's about the fourth time I've quoted this verse, he hasn't noticed it till this day. "Being justified freely by the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." Now and that word freely there is DORAY, is the word without a cause. Jn. 18:25, "So therefore being justified without a cause." He says its repentance that caused God to justify us. That verse says without a cause. That is what it says brethren. That's what it says. And then it means not every individual in the world, but only those given to Christ in the Covenant were the ones that were justified.

He has not to this day said one word about the covenant of redemption that Jesus Christ had with the Father before the foundation of the world. And say that is something, because the A.B.A. prints J.R. Graves' Seven Dispensations they say we believe this. They put it on the stand, in fact, Dr. I.K. Cross wrote the forward and said, "This is what we believe." And my friend has been butting heads with me for two days and he will butt heads with me tomorrow too over that. (Time) Thank you.