

ALEXANDER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen, I come to my last speech, affirmative speech in this, relative to this proposition: The Scriptures teach that men can resist the grace of God that brings salvation to men. I want to notice briefly some things that my opponent said in his speech and then I'll proceed with my arguments.

First, he says my proposition is a contradiction. I deny that. The proposition simply reads: That the Scriptures teach that men can resist the grace of God that brings salvation to men. It does not say that men can resist the grace of God after it has saved them. Does not say that. It says that men can resist the grace of God that brings salvation to men. Tit. 2:11, tells us and I read this yesterday, this is not new material at all, my opponent has used it: That the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men. Now, so my proposition is not a contradiction.

My Opponent doesn't like these lost sheep of the house of Israel. He's pitted them against those whom Christ called his sheep. He referred to Jn. 10:26 and said, "Ye are not of my sheep" and so on. As I said to you, "My sheep hear my voice." Well my question is, and my argument was built on this; could those lost sheep of the house of Israel be saved? Now I'll proceed with that little bit further in just a moment.

He said, how can the thing created assist in its creation? It can't. It can't. And if you'll recall I stated in my first speech this morning that I do not believe that, that a sinner resists the spirit of God giving him life. There's the creation. When eternal life is imparted to the spirit of a sinner. But the question that needs to be settled is, and this is what I have been trying to get my opponent to tell this congregation all day: When is a sinner regenerated? Now yesterday he had sinners in Christ all the way from eternity. He had them in Christ today all the way from eternity. Today he added something to it, he has them sons of God all the way from eternity. And a while ago he quoted Eph. 2:10 where, "We're his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works." I believe that with all my heart. What I want to know is when is a sinner created in Christ Jesus? He hasn't answered this yet. Now this is going on the records. He can camouflage his arguments and his replies all he wants to by going back to all those people like Pelagius and so on, I have nothing to do with Pelagianism and he knows that. I don't care how much of his time he spends reading about Pelagianism and all of those other fellows. This proposition says the scriptures teach that men can resist the grace of God that brings salvation. And I'm going to spend my time showing by the scriptures that this proposition is true. Now, I want him to tell us when is a sinner created in Christ Jesus? He hasn't done that yet. All right.

I take up my arguments again. When my last speech closed, I was, I had begun an argument based on Matt. 15:22 concerning the woman of Canaan and the words of Jesus to his disciples when they, when his disciples tried to get him to send that woman away. Jesus said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Now my opponent doesn't like those lost sheep of the house of Israel." He likes the term sheep when it fits his theory but when the term sheep is against his theory, he doesn't like it. Now Jesus said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Now if he will accept the grammar of this I'm going to say that this negative statement affirms that Jesus was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. My opponent will not deny that a negative sentence can affirm a positive thing. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." This is equivalent to saying, "I am sent unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Now my brother Jesus was either sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel as a Saviour or else a judge. One or the other. But in Jn. 3:17, and Jn. 12:47 both of them, Jesus affirms that in his first coming into this world he came not to judge the world. Therefore, Jesus was not sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel as a judge and if he was not sent to them as a judge then he was sent to them as a Saviour. Now I want my opponent to deal with this argument. I'm not dealing with some history back there. I'm dealing with God's holy word. Jesus was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and was sent to them as a Saviour. But some of the lost sheep of the house of Israel did not get saved. Jn. 8:42-44, Jesus told some of them, "You are of your Father the Devil." Matt. 23:33-37 Jesus wept over the city of Jerusalem, "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee. How

often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings.” But you, but no salvation was provided for you? Noe that isn’t what it says. “How often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not.”

Matt. 11:20-24, the cities of Bethsaida and Chorazin and Capernaum went to hell because they would not repent. These are some of the lost sheep of the house of Israel to whom Jesus was sent as a Saviour. But they resisted the grace of God that brought salvation to them. Yes Brother, you can tell this congregation that Brother Alexander believes that he brought salvation to them, laid it right at their heart’s door, he offered it to them. But they rejected it. They resisted it.

My next argument is based on Matt. 23:25, 26, “Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites for ye make clean the outside cup and platter but within are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisees cleanse first that which is within the cup and the platter that the outside of them may be clean also.” Now if want you to know if my friend’s doctrine is true, unconditional election of a certain number to salvation; the limited atonement that Christ only died for the elect; and that those for whom Christ died cannot resist the grace of God that brings salvation to them, no man can: Then these Pharisees could not cleanse first that which was in the cup and the platter that the outside of them may be clean also. Now I want to know if Jesus was using vain empty words when he gave them this instruction? What he was teaching the Pharisees doctrine was that they were to clean up their outside life their outward life, their good works and thereby earn their way to heaven. And Jesus taught them this is the reverse order. Your heart must be cleaned up first. How is a man’s heart purified? In Acts 15:17, if I have the right passage, it said God put no difference between us and them purifying their hearts by faith. Until the sinner has faith in Jesus Christ, he doesn’t have a pure heart. Now Jesus was telling these Pharisees inasmuch as he instructed them to clean up the inside, he gave the instructions to the people of Israel through the prophet Jeremiah to circumcise the foreskin of your hearts and be no more stiff-necked. All right, that was an instruction to repent. Now he’s telling these Pharisees to clean up first that which is within the cup and the platter, clean your hearts up first. How? Through repentance and faith, the heart is purified through faith. But his instruction were empty words if these Pharisees could not be saved. Jesus sent his prophets to them and presented, preached the salvation to them, presented, offered salvation to them and they rejected it.

My next argument is based on Matt. 23:33-37, “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers how can ye escape the damnation of hell. Wherefore behold I sent unto you prophets and wise men and scribes.” Well what did the prophets preach to them? I want to tell you that God never had a prophet that told the people that if you’re not of the elect there’s no salvation provided for you. God never had a prophet that told people that. Every prophet God ever called, preached as Peter informs us in Acts 10:43, “That through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive the remission of sins.” Jesus sent these prophets to these Jews, these serpents, these generation of vipers as he called them, and those prophets preached the salvation of God to these people. “And some of them ye shall kill and crucify and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues and persecute them from city to city that upon you may come the righteous bloodshed upon the earth from the blood of the righteous Able unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you all these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee. How often I would have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not.” Now if those prophets were not sent to the people of Israel for the purpose of preaching salvation to them, I want my opponent to tell us to what purpose they were sent to them. Why did God send his prophets to them if it was not for the purpose of preaching salvation to the people offering them salvation? But he did send them to them. Those prophets preached remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ and at the point of faith in Jesus Christ. And many of these people resisted that offer of salvation, died in their sins not believing that Jesus was the Christ and they went to hell.

My next argument is based on Acts 14:12-17, “And they called Barnabas Jupiter and Paul Mercurius because he was the chief speaker. Then the priest of Jupiter which was before their city brought oxen and garlands unto the gates and would have done sacrifice with the people which when the apostles Barnabas

and Paul heard of, they rent their clothes and ran in among the people crying out, 'sirs why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God which made heaven and earth and the seas and all the things that are therein, who in time past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness in that he did good and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons filling our hearts with food and gladness.'" Let me begin by saying that Paul in all the ages past, or pardon me, God in all the ages past when he was allowing the nations to walk in their own ways never did leave himself without a witness in that he did good and gave us fruitful seasons from heaven, rain and fruitful seasons from heaven. Now Paul tells us in the 2nd chapter of Romans that the goodness of God leads men to repentance. Repentance is unto salvation, as I told you this morning, II Cor. 7:10, "Repentance is unto life." And in all wherever salvation God has had a witness of his goodness designed to lead men to repentance, God had had salvation for them because repentance to God ends in salvation. Now, while Paul and Barnabas went here before these people, these idol worshippers, people that were lost, unregenerated; Paul said, "We preach to you that you should turn from these vanities unto the living God." I want to know Brother Crawford is it right to preach to every lost sinner you find to turn from the vanities of this world, idol worship and so on? Turn unto the living God? Is it right to preach that to lost sinners? Do you preach that to lost sinners? Can you conscientiously and scripturally preach that to every lost sinner that you find? I'll tell you I can. All right. Paul preached this to these people. But the question is would they have been saved if they had repented? Well now if my friend's doctrine is true, this doctrine of unconditional election, limited atonement and irresistible grace; well how did Paul have any assurance that if these men turned to God that it would do them any good? But Paul knew that when a sinner turns to the living God, he receives eternal life. He receives the remission of sins because Jesus instructed his church to preach repentance and the remission of sins. (Ten minutes) All right. When Paul and Barnabas preached to these people that they should, that they should turn from these vanities unto the living God then they did successfully resist the Holy Spirit, resist the grace of God that had brought salvation to them. Salvation was offered to them in the preaching that Paul and Barnabas did to them. All right.

My next argument is based upon Acts 13:38-41, "Be it known unto you therefore men and brethren that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Now watch these words to the same people that Paul preached the remission of sins. He said, "Beware, beware therefore lest that come upon you which is spoken in the prophets. Behold ye despisers and wonder and perish for I work a work in your days a work which ye shall in no-wise believe though a man declare it unto you." Now Paul would have had no reason to admonish them to beware lest that come upon them if there was nothing they could do about it. Paul and Barnabas preached the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ to these Jews. Then Paul warned those same Jews to whom they had preached the forgiveness of sins, "Beware therefore lest that come upon you which was spoken of in the prophets. Behold ye despisers and wonder and perish for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no-wise believe though a man declare it unto you." God inspired a prophet to prophesy that the time would come when some of the Jews would not believe the works of God that was worked in their day. Now some of these Jews would not believe it, but Paul believe that these Jews could prevent themselves from being a part of that group who would not believe it and he warned them. "Beware lest that come upon you." What was he telling them? You make sure you repent toward God and put your faith in Jesus Christ. And in that way, you'll receive the remission of sins.

Argument, my next argument is based on Acts 13:44-47, "The next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God but when the Jews saw the multitude they were filled with envy and spake against those thing which were spoken of or spoken by Paul contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold and said, 'it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you but seeing ye put it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo we turn to the Gentiles for so hath the Lord commanded us saying I have sent thee to be a light unto the Gentiles that thou shouldest be for salvation to the end of the earth.'" Now here's some people to whom Paul had preached the gospel and it was preached to them that they might have everlasting life. But Paul said, "You put it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life." This would be an absolute impossibility if

these people could not have been saved. If the gospel was never meant to offer salvation to them. If no salvation was provided for them. Then there was nothing for them to put away from them. But inasmuch as God has provided salvation for these Jews and he let them know about it through the preaching of the gospel. Offered that salvation to them, they put it from them. They resisted it, they rejected it, they resisted the grace of God that brought salvation yea to their heart's door if you please and they died in their rejection. Because Paul turned away from them. And Paul affirmed in his argument here (Five minutes) that, that God had let him know that I have sent you to be a light of the Gentiles that thou shouldest be for salvation to the ends of the earth wherever he went and found lost sinners he was to proclaim salvation in Jesus Christ. He proclaimed it to these Jews. He preached salvation to them, he preached remission of sins to them, but they put it away from them. If there was no salvation for them there was nothing for them to put away. If there was no way they could be saved, there was nothing to put away. There was nothing for them to resist, there was nothing for them to reject. But Paul taught here that they did reject the gospel of Christ, they did reject the salvation in Jesus Christ. They did resist the grace of God that offered salvation to them. They put it away from them and counted themselves unworthy of everlasting life. And they died in that condition and went to hell and therefore they did successfully resist the grace, the grace of God that brought salvation to them. All right.

I want to close my arguments with an argument based on Acts 26:27-29, I read it in the revised version,

"King Agrippa believeth thou the prophets, I know that thou believeth. And Agrippa said unto Paul, 'With but little persuasion thou wouldest feign make me a Christian' and Paul said, 'I would to God that whether with little or with much not thou only but also all that hear me this day might become such as I am except these bonds.'" I avow to you that Paul was affirming here that he wanted to see Agrippa saved, he preached to Agrippa and Agrippa knew that Paul was trying to persuade him to become a Christian. How? Persuade him to repent of his sins and put his faith in Jesus Christ. And if Paul was doing that, if Paul was speaking for the eternal God then God was offering salvation to this King Agrippa. And Agrippa resisted it, turned it away and was not saved. Agrippa is another example of a man who did resist, successfully resist the grace of God that brought salvation unto him. I'll tell you as Paul stood there and preached to him, you'll remember Paul was sent to be a light unto the Gentiles that he should be for salvation to the ends of the earth. That didn't mean that Paul was to save anybody but that meant that Paul was to tell lost sinners how to be saved. Paul told Agrippa how to be saved and Agrippa could have been saved. Agrippa was aware. I know you Calvinist think that, that a lost sinner cannot respond unto the Holy Spirit until God first gives it eternal life. But here was a lost sinner who was aware that God's man was doing his best to persuade him, to persuade him to repent of his sins and put his faith in Jesus Christ. But Agrippa would not do it. And I'll tell you when Agrippa comes to judgement, he'll never be able to stand before God and say, I didn't know how to be saved or I didn't know that I needed to be saved, the apostle Paul preached it to him. He had salvation offered to him and he did verily resist it. He did die as far as the Bible record reveals he died without salvation and therefore he did successfully resist the grace of God that brought salvation to him. I have presented some arguments that I believe, and I have many more here that I believe amply... (Your time is up)

CRAWFORD'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Ladies and gentlemen, gentlemen moderators and my worthy opponent I come before you for the last speech this afternoon. And then tonight we will have another session. I would like to take up my honorable opponent's speech in the order in which he has given it and you have heard as good a delivery of that side of the question as you'll ever hear. And I want to commend my opponent on being such a gracious man and a good -natured man. There is one thing that I wondered why he didn't do in his speech. Why didn't he tell us what confession of faith his church adopted when it organized, and if it adopted the confession of faith that we have been reading from here, I wonder why we're at loggerheads. Because I'd like to know that and I'm not jibing him, and he knows what I would like to have.

Now I believe that last part of my opponent's speech was Acts 26:27, 28 where Agrippa said, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." But my dear friend you should notice that he was making fun and pointing and Paul in jest and in the original he is saying, "It takes more than this to make a Christian of me" and he's laughing at God's man. Now my friend has a difficulty in separating God's preachers from God. There's no doubt that Paul preached to Agrippa, but it wasn't the word of God. God's word wasn't spoken to Agrippa or Agrippa would have responded. How do I know? John 5:25, Christ said, "The hour is coming and now is when all the dead," and my friend said that means dead sinners, dead in trespasses and in sins "shall hear the voice of God, or the voice of the Son of man and they that hear shall live." Not the voice of the preacher, Brother Alexander, Dr. Alexander you're having a difficult time separating your voice, my voice and other preachers' voices and even Paul's voice from the call, the inner call of the Holy Spirit of God.

And then I want to take care of this. He said Acts 10:43, "Unto him give all the prophets witness that whosoever believeth in his name shall receive the remission of sins." I say amen, he said where is there a prophet that preached that election of, a man is elected? Well here's one. Acts 2:30 says David was a prophet, the prophet David. And David said in the 65th Psalm and verse 4, he said, "Blessed is the man whom thou hast chosen." That's what we call a perfect in Hebrew. And it means that God has chosen the man and that's the Hebrew word BRASSHERS which means elect. Brother Alexander. I don't know why we get into all these things, there's no reason why we should.

Just before dinner, my friend brought up the rich man and Lazarus and that was in his last speech and I didn't have an opportunity to reply because that was new material but that's all right, we'll be in this thing until tomorrow if he wants to bring up anything that's all right with me. In Lk. 16:19-31 we have a rich man who went to hell lost. Now he said that he resisted the Holy Spirit. If you'll write on a sheet of paper and pass it up here the verse that says the rich man resisted the Holy Spirit, I'll quit the debate this afternoon. We can spend the rest of the time fishing. And Uncle Ben if he's here he can cut bait. Now you write it down and I'll quit the debate. Now you can't find that. Now let me, let's go to this rich, brethren. This is a good thing. This poor man died and went to hell, we shouldn't ever speak lightly of this man. I don't believe in a flippant way of talking about people who go to hell. And you'll never find Lawrence Crawford does this. Here's a rich man that went to hell and while he was in hell he was confused about the way of salvation. Here is a lost man in hell and he's preaching a lost sermon. He said, "Father Abraham send Lazarus back to my five brothers and they'll repent." He had this Arminian idea that repentance will keep you out of hell. That's what he thought. Abraham said it's not a question of repentance, friend. He said, "They have Moses and the prophets let them hear them. If they will not hear Moses and the prophets, then they would not hear if though one rose from the dead." Now listen here, friends. You've got a man in hell and he's a lost man and the professors in our seminaries today teach the same theology that this lost man taught. This lost man thought that, that would keep him out of hell. Now the Lord Jesus Christ used this sermon to show that if a man doesn't hear the word of God he will not repent and be saved. Now you get this. Because Jn. 8:43, Christ stood before those people and said this: Now here's what he said, "Why is it that ye cannot understand my speech, it is because you cannot hear my words." See they were hearing the sound. Now Brother Alexander you're a bright man and when I'm debating a Campbellite I have to go over this with them because they're

dense. But Baptist shouldn't be that dense. There is a sound that the preacher preaches, and the word comes forth from the preachers and the preachers preach but that doesn't convert people. It is the work of the Holy Spirit and when we're debating Campbellites we affirm the Holy Spirit does a work separate and apart from the word. And that man introduced all these scriptures.

He said a sinner can hear. Ex. 19:9, Duet. 6:4, Isa. 1:10, Matt. 15:10, Lk 8:12, Lk. 16:29, Jn 12:47, Acts 15:7 and on and on. Why he can hear the sound of the words brother Alexander, but brethren Christ said in Jn. 8:43 he said, "Why is it that ye cannot understand my speech, it is because ye cannot hear my words." He said a sinner can seek the Lord, Acts 7:24, Duet. 4:27, Isa. 55:6. Why I used that in my argument this morning, that's in the Hebrew jussive. It says, "Let the unrighteous man forsake his way and return unto the Lord for he will abundantly pardon." And that's in the jussive, and the Hebrew jussive is the one that is the creative acts of God in Gen. 1:3 which he never noticed. "Let there be light and there was light." And Brother Alexander, evidently this wicked man did return unto the Lord because down in verse 11 he said, "My word shall not return unto me void but it shall accomplish that whereunto I have sent it." I went over that this morning. He used all these scriptures about what the sinner can do, he can repent, he can do all of this. I agree.

And he asked me, he said, "Brother Crawford is it right to preach to every sinner?" Brother Alexander, I have, I have, well I won't bring myself into this. There sits or stands, the city missionary of this church he and his wife go out and hand out tracts, talk to lost sinners every day here in this community. This church has put as high as \$25,000.00 a year in mission work. Now my dear friend, sure I go anyplace and preach to sinners. Why? Because I'm not trusting in my word, I'm not a Campbellite. I believe the Holy Spirit turns the sinner to God separate and apart from the word.

Now, now my friend I'm going to get back to some of this in just a moment. May I take up where he said my proposition reads just like Tit. 2:11. It does not Brother Alexander. You wrote out these propositions, I tried to help him by correspondence and we're brothers and we're going to be if we die tonight and we go before the Lord. And I love him, and he loves me. But I tried to help him write out some propositions that made sense. These, these are not going to look very pretty in print. Because they are going to say those fellows have degrees and they can't use the English language. They use a demonstrative adverb for a noun or a demonstrative pronoun for a noun. Well I can't help that. But listen to this: The Scriptures teach that the grace of God that brings salvation can be successfully resisted by those to whom it is extended. That beloved, that is not a 42nd cousin to what Tit. 2:11 says. Titus 2:11 says, "It appeared, the grace appeared." It didn't say the salvation that appeared it said the grace appeared. My friend doesn't know the difference in a direct object. Now forgive me for saying that.

Now the lost sheep he said Christ said, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Amen. In Matt. 15:19 the poor woman came trembling to the Lord down at his feet wanting to be saved. Now how could she come? Jn. 6:44 says "No man can come unto me except the Father that sent me draw him." Evidently the Father had sent the Holy Spirit to draw this woman to the Lord Jesus Christ or she wouldn't have come because Jn. 6:44 says, "No man can come unto me except the Father that sent me draw him." And there she was down at the feet of the blessed Lord saying "Lord I am just a dog, have mercy on me." I believe, that's the way a sinner comes to the Lord Jesus Christ instead of coming down the aisle chewing gum and saying I believe on Jesus Christ. And then you fill your church full of unregenerated people. Now what about the lost sheep of the house of Israel? My dear brethren, did all of them believe, were all of them sheep? Christ said they were not in Jn. 10:26, he spoke of those same people. My friend said they were the children of the devil, Jn. 8:44, Christ said, "Some of you are of your Father the devil." And then he said, "They are the children of the devil." Yes, but they were not the sheep of the Lord then were they? And then in Jn. 10:26 Christ said, "Ye believe not because you are not of my sheep." So, they were not of the lost sheep of the house of Israel were they? No sir.

Now my friend went to Matt. 23 and read 37, "O' Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that stonest the prophets and them that are sent unto thee. How often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen doth her chickens and ye would not." And I want you to notice brethren in a simple sentence the one

speaking is first person, the one spoken to is second person and the one spoken about is third person. Now, let's do that in this. O' Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that stonest the prophets," That's the one he's speaking to isn't he? He said, "How often I would have gathered, thy children together," The children of Jerusalem, then he must have not been speaking to all the people of Jerusalem was he? He was speaking to the rabbis that were in charge of Jerusalem. Now listen to this. He said, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem thou that stonest the prophets and burnest them are sent unto thee how often I would have gathered thy children," That's the third person. "Thy children together, and ye" that's the second person, the rulers, "would not." So, he said ye rulers would not permit and I would have gathered thy children together, you are the poor of Jerusalem and ye would not. Now get that. Jesus Christ wasn't trying to save Jerusalem and Jerusalem wouldn't let him save them. It was those wicked ungodly rulers that nailed him to the cross that he was preaching to, Brother Alexander.

And then he said, in Christ. Eph. 1:4 and he said not he (Crawford) had them in Christ yesterday and he had them in Christ before the foundation of the world and he had them over there in Christ. Well I didn't have them in Christ, he's got, he has me mistaken with Paul. Paul is the one you need to argue this thing with Brother Alexander. Paul said in Eph. 1:4, now get this "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world." And I quoted Dr. Weust on this. Dr Weust said this is the locative of sphere. Now there is a locative of place, locative means location, Brother Alexander. A locative of place, a locative of time, this is a locative of sphere. And Dr. Weust the great Greek grammarian, great teacher of Greek, he said these people were in Jesus Christ before the foundation of the world. All the elect were in Jesus Christ before the foundation of the world. Then my friend came and said but hold on Crawford in the 2nd chapter and verses 12, 13, 14 says, "At that time ye were without Christ being strangers to the covenant." Why of course that's in time. We know we were lost. Didn't I, my argument this morning, the man doesn't notice my arguments. In Rm. 16:7 Paul says, "Salute Andronicus and Junia my kinsmen who were in Christ before me." Dr. Weust ways and all grammarians say that's the locative of time. We were in Christ in the locative of sphere before the foundation of the world. And then when we were born and when we were lost the Holy Spirit came to us and put us into Jesus Christ in time. I Cor. 1:30 says "Of him," that's God, "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus." Who puts us in Christ Jesus, he thinks our repentance put us in. No, it says in Eph. 2:10, "You're created in Christ Jesus unto good works." And I asked my dear brother if in creation the creation helped the creator. He said no. Well thank you we're getting some place in this debate.

Now he said either mediate or immediate, the Holy Spirit works upon the sinner. I deny that, I deny that completely. I believe in the immediate, the Holy Spirit must touch the heart of the sinner or he'll die and go to hell. Now Alexander Campbell and his people believe that the Holy Spirit works through the word and through the churches and through preachers. I don't believe that. I believe the Holy Spirit, the old Baptist doctrine that the Holy Spirit works separate and apart from the word. Distinct from the word. And then Acts 11:18 where it says, "Repentance is unto life." You remember yesterday you who were here yesterday, repentance "eis" life that word "eis" there means because of, because of life. What happens to the dead mule out here? You go out and harness up the dead mule and say all right mule you're dead. Now I'm going to give you some commands and work you until you become alive. Now hear the word, mule. I've driven a mule all over the country debating Campbellites. Dr. Barr has too. I don't see why Brother Bar doesn't straighten out his dear friend. We're all friends around here. Let me tell you something beloved, that mule will never do anything until he's alive. That's the old Baptist argument, that's the Bible argument, that's my argument. He's got to be made alive by the Holy Spirit. If he's made alive by the Holy Spirit, then he repents as Article VII of our old Articles of Faith states. That the life comes into the sinner and because of life he repents. Acts 11:18 says repentance unto life, it means that life must produce repentance. Not repentance life. And Ben M Bogard and every other Baptist debater that ever lived has used that to prove it. My, my, my, I'm surprised beyond end. I answered that lost sheep of the house of Israel.

Now my friend just a moment, my friend quoted in Acts 13, 14th chapter where Paul said that God had done good to those sinners giving them all the good things. I made this statement the other night. My friend wasn't listening he should have listened a little to his opponent, maybe we could make a better debate out of this. I try to listen to him. Rm. 2:4 says, "Knowest thou not that the goodness of God leadeth men to

repentance.” And Greek scholars tell us that is a conative present, i.e. that it is trying but it’s unable to do it. Say Brother Alexander, if the goodness of God leads people to repentance and since God’s been good to everybody, everybody would repent, wouldn’t they? No, because it must, it must be that the Holy Spirit brings a direct work of grace upon the heart to produce repentance. It’s not enough to have fruitful seasons. God has been good to this nation, but she doesn’t repent does she? (Ten minutes) Thank you sir.

Now, I noticed what he said about repentance. I’ll take every scripture that he ever produced on repentance, but how is repentance produced? Repentance is produced by the Holy Spirit. Article VII of our great Articles of Faith. Now he brought up in his closing moments of his speech Acts 13 and he quit just before. I want to read his entire argument from Acts 13th chapter and then I want to read where he stopped. If he would have kept reading, he would have explained his own argument. Here it is in Acts 13th chapter: “Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold and said, ‘it was necessary that the word of God should first be preached or spoken to you but seeing ye have put it from you, judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded saying I have sent thee to be a light unto the Gentiles that thou shouldest be for salvation to the end of the earth,’” and he stopped right there. But the next verse says “And when the Gentiles heard this they were glad. And glorified the word of the Lord and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.” Why didn’t you read that next verse, it would have explained your own predicament? But I want to preach on this in the 13th chapter of Acts, he read another scripture up hear. Acts 13:38, 39, “Be it known unto you men and brethren.” Now notice who he said; “Men and brethren that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins for by him all that believe are justified from all things, which it could not be justified by the law of Moses.” Beloved I would like to just preach on that just a few minutes or talk to you on it, I don’t want to preach to you on it necessarily. But this is a dear verse of scripture, it says, “Be it known unto you that through this man is preached the forgiveness of sins.” Now first of all this word preached unto you through this man, “is preached,” is a present tense. The forgiveness of sins there is the object of what is preached. Now this is a present tense, but I want you to just notice how beautiful this verse is. Dana and Mantey says concerning this present tense, he said, “the present approaches its kindred tense, the perfect when used to denote the continuation of existing results.” That’s Dana and Mantey, p. 122. It’s a perfect, is preached unto you, is preached unto you what? The forgiveness of sins. When did the forgiveness of sins take place? It took place when Jesus Christ died of the cross when he shed his precious blood and we went over this last night but it’s a good thing here. He shed his precious blood for his people. Matt. 1:21, “Thou shall call his name Jesus for he shall save his people from their sins.” Now I just want to go to two or three other things that I mentioned. I’ll not bring up some new material in my last speech. I want to go over some things that I mentioned. He did not mention this I want it to be fresh in the record.

First of all, my opponent’s proposition was adopted by the General Council of Trent by the Roman Catholics in 1545-1563. Now here’s what it says in Session VI, Cannon V: “*If any one saith that man’s free will moved and excited by God by assenting to God exciting and calling, no-wise cooperates toward disposing and preparing itself.*”

Didn’t he say that Christ said to those Pharisees, you can clean up ye may clean the outside and have left the inside full of filth. Thought the Lord was teaching cooperation there. No, the Lord was showing how pitifully they were inside. But listen: *the Catholics say, “if anybody says that a poor sinner nowise cooperates toward disposing and preparing itself for the attaining the grace of justification, that it cannot refuse its consent,”* that is resist isn’t it. “*If it would, but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever and is merely passive,*” that’s what I say, I said that man is passive. “*If you say that, let him be anathema.*”

And they went out and cut our peoples’ heads off. Maybe we can cut your head off, you agree with it my dear brother.

Here’s cannon V: “*If any one saith, that since Adam’s sin, the free will of man is lost and extinguished,*” my friends says that man has a free will, he says it; “*Or that it is a thing with only a name, let him be anathema.*”

Cannon VII: *"If any one shall say that all work performed by a man anterior (before) justification from whatever reason performed, are true sins which merit the hatred of God;"* my friend said a sinner can do a lot of things before he's saved that's not sinful, oh brother. *"Or that the more vehemently ones strive to dispose himself of grace, only the more grievously he sins, let him be anathema."*

Baptist have lost their heads down through the ages because: (Five minutes) I have five minutes. Baptist have lost their heads down through the ages, but now some Baptist are preaching exactly what it cost us.

I say to my dear friend and I'm not accusing you of anything Brother Alexander, you're a product, Brother Alexander you're a product of an age of ignorant preachers that didn't preach the Confessions of Faith. And our Baptist preachers today, they are the salt of the earth. I won't go as far as Brother Pink did in his book, he says in Matt. 5:13 ye are the salt of the earth, he says that's Baptist preachers. I believe that's the church, but I will say that without true Baptist preachers we're not going to have true churches very long. And my dear brother you and other brethren are preaching, brethren don't get angry at me. You're preaching exactly what the Council of Trent adopted. The Roman Catholic church adopted it and you have been preaching it and you have sided in with them because you say that man can do something to help God in the act of regeneration. I do not accuse you, but history accuses you. And I hope and pray that we can be friends and if I have offended you out of just being egotistical, I apologize before my God. In fact, I'd give my life today for the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ. I'd like to see my brethren turn back. Wouldn't it be something if our churches would turn back to the old Confessions of Faith and quit trying to be Billy Grahams and John R. Rice and we're trying to be like these people in the world that don't know our Baptist heritage. When we get home, we will see the martyrs and we will brush shoulders with those who died. They died for what we should be preaching instead of preaching what the martyrs have preached, we're preaching what has been hatched out of some little Bible school someplace and that is not our confession of faith. And my dear friend can't find a Baptist church 200 years ago that preached his doctrine. Now that offer still goes, I made it the first day, Brother Alexander. God bless you. If you'll find a Confession of Faith that agrees with you 200 years ago, I'll quit this debate, I'll run a full-page ad in the paper up here admitting that R. L. Crawford is wrong. I'll crawl on my knees throughout this state and I'll apologize for preaching this doctrine that I've preached these years. But you'll never find where our Missionary Baptist preached this General Baptist doctrine. They did not preach it and I hope that they will never preach it. And I asked you dear brethren that though we get hot in a debate and though we preach our doctrines, let us not become angry at one another but let us pray for one another. Because I stand here, and I will answer to God for what I've preached and what I've taught. I'll answer for the way I've treated you and behaved toward you. And if I've mistreated you I'll have to come before the Lord and ask and at the great judgment of the saints at the judgment seat of Christ, God is going to get his Baptist bride in order or he's going to get his people straight. And if we have wronged one another we're going to have to apologize for what we've done. But I do not apologize for the old Articles of Faith. I do not apologize for the doctrines of the Lord Jesus Christ. And I hope and I pray, and it is my desire that we will be better men and better women and more godly and we'll not become so petty that we hold grudges against one another. (Time) Thank you.

THIRD DAY

November 21, 1979

6:00pm

PROPOSITION: The Scriptures teach that there is an effectual call to Salvation which is extended only to the elect, and that they cannot successfully reject it.

Affirmative: R. Lawrence Crawford

Negative: J. R. Alexander

CRAWFORD'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Ladies and gentlemen, gentlemen moderators and my honorable opponent, I come before you to affirm the proposition in your hearing just a moment ago. The Scriptures teach that there is an effectual call to salvation which is extended only to the elect, and that they cannot successfully reject it.

Definition of Terms.

1. By Scriptures, I mean the sixty-six books known as the Bible as it was originally written in Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek.
2. By teach, I mean the Bible sets forth by precept and convey in words to instruct, to cause to know.
3. By effectual call, I mean what the Particular Baptist of England said in 1689 in the Confession of Faith Chapter X, "Those whom God hath predestinated unto life, he is pleased, in his appointed time, and accepted time, effectually to call by his word, and Spirit, out of that state of sin, and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ..."
4. By the term "they cannot successfully resist it," I mean what true Baptist have always meant and in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1689 Chapter X, "...renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so they come most freely, being made willing by his grace."

ARGUMENT #1

There are two calls in our Baptist Confessions of Faith, one is the universal call to all men, but because men are so depraved he will not come to Christ; therefore, God does use an effectual call by taking away the hatred toward God in the hearts of those who were elected (because Christ died for and paid for their sins of hatred, I Pet. 2:24; 3:18; II Cor. 5:21) and by this effectual call they are brought to salvation.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The London Confession of Particular Baptist (1689) sets forth the effectual call. (Dr. Roy M. Reed in his presidential address before the A.B.A. in 1976, said these were Missionary Baptist. Minutes of the A.B.A., 1976 p.19.) So according to the president of the American Baptist Association I'm reading what Missionary Baptist said.

The London Confession of 1689 Particular Baptist: "Those whom God hath predestinated unto life (Rom. 8:30), he is pleased in his appointed time (Rm. 11:7; Eph. 1:10, 11) effectually to call by his word, and Spirit (II Thess. 2:13, 14), out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation (Eph. 2:1-6); enlightening their minds, spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone (Eze. 36:26; Eph. 1:17, 18; Acts 26:18) and giving them a heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them (Deut. 30:6; Eze. 36:27; Eph. 1:19) to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely (Ps. 110:3; Cant. 1:4) being made willing by his grace."

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #1

Syllogism #1

1. The Particular Baptist Confession of 1689 sets forth the effectual call in Chapter X which cannot be successfully resisted by those to whom it is extended.
2. But Dr. Roy M. Reed in his presidential address to the A.B.A. in 1976 said, "The Particular Baptist were Missionary Baptist." (Minutes of the American Baptist Association, 1976, p.19)
3. Therefore, all Missionary Baptist once believed there was an effectual call which was not successfully resisted by those to whom it was extended.

Syllogism #2

1. The Particular Baptist Confession (1689) clearly sets forth the effectual call for those whom God had predestinated to life. (See chapter #4)
2. But these were Missionary Baptist and the baptism and church succession of our American Baptist churches came from them.
3. Therefore, if they were heretical or unscriptural then our churches have heretical and unscriptural Baptism.

ARGUMENT #2

The Ancient Anabaptist Confession of Seven Churches under the sentence of death in London in 1644, this was four years before the Presbyterian's set forth their Westminster Confession of Faith, said their churches believed in election and the effectual call.

FIRST PROPOSITION: London Confession 1644, is styled as an Anabaptist Confession.

1. The title page reads: The Confession of Faith of those churches which are commonly (though falsely) called Anabaptist.
2. Article XXII, p.180, (Baptist Confessions of Faith, By McGlothlin, says, "That faith is the gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Spirit of God, whereby they come to see, know and believe the truth of the scriptures, and not only so, but the excellencies of them above all other writings and things in the world, as they hold forth the glory of God in his attributes, the excellency of Christ in his nature and offices, and the power of the fullness of the spirit in its work and operations; and therefore are enabled to cast the weight of their souls upon the truth thus believed.

SECOND PROPOSITION: Historians state the fact of church succession back to Christ is only possible through churches which taught election and effectual call by the Holy Spirit which could not be successfully resisted.

1. Baptist Waybook by Bogard, p.61, quotes from Kenworthy's History of the Baptist Church at Hill Cliff. "The origin of the Welsh Baptist is accounted for by Davis in his history, page 6, as follows: 'In AD63, while Paul was a prisoner at Rome, a Welsh lady and her husband, whose name was Pudens, visiting in Rome, were converted under Paul's preaching. They are referred to in Acts 28:30, II Tim. 4:21. These people carried the gospel into Wales.' Thus, by the Welsh route, we find Baptist go back to the Apostle Paul. These Welsh Baptist have always been Missionary Baptist. Davis' History, p.187; 'Every minister was both a pastor and a missionary.' Kenworthy's History of Hill Cliffe Church, p. 46 (1653); 'Mr. Tillman, also at this time, was commonly commended to the grace of God (Like Paul when he left Antioch) in proceeding to Cheshire on a missionary or evangelical tour.'"

But this church and all Welsh Baptist churches believed in election and the effectual call and were called

Calvinistic, *Kenworthy's History of the Baptist Church at Hill Cliffe*, p. 54, 60-61. The fact that one was a particular Baptist would render one in danger of fine and imprisonment, while no reference is made to any General Baptist suffering the slightest persecution: "...being a Calvinistic Baptist rendered him (Pastor J. Fenton) constantly liable to fines and imprisonment...During the greater portion of the ministry of the Rev. Francis Turner.

Mr. Samuel Smith was the treasurer of the church, and was eventually one who was very particular and exact in his church work...Baine's History of Liverpool says, "The original Calvinistic Baptist congregation in Liverpool was a branch of a society at Hill Cliffe, near Warrington, and came to Liverpool about the year 1700."

2. *Davis' History of the Welsh Baptist*, p. 87 says: "South Wales, in Great Britain, the church of Jesus Christ, meeting at Swansea, in Glamorganshire, owning believer's baptism, laying on the hands, the of doctrine of personal election and final perseverance..."
3. The Particular or Missionary Baptist who believed in election and limited atonement had no fellowship within The General Baptist who began with John Smith in 1611 and believed that Christ died for all men. *Davis' History of the Welsh Baptist*, p. 152 says:

"The Craigforgoed Church, in the country of Glamorgan. In 1750, Charles Winter, and 24 members of the church at Hengoed, imbibing the sentiments of the General Baptist, left that church, and built a new meeting house, of the same name, within four miles of the former house. C. Winters preached and administered the ordinances to them, until he died in 1773, aged 73. He was baptized in 1726, ordained about 1738. He was a pious and intelligent man, of mild and easy and peaceable disposition. Thomas Williams was an assistant preacher in the church for a short time. Morgan Thomas, from Newcastle, was an assistant, and died in 1774. After the death of these ministers, the Particular Baptist ministers were invited to supply them, but they refused to administer the ordinances to them on account of the difference in sentiments."

Showing clearly that our Missionary Baptist had no dealings with General Baptist. Now brethren, we're in a class. This is a seminary that's going on here two or three days. If we're going back to Jesus Christ, we have to go through people that believed in the effectual call.

THIRD PROPOSITION: Christ promised His church succession, perpetuity and continuity.

1. Matt. 28:19-20, "Go ye therefore unto all the world and teach all nations, Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."
2. Matt. 16:18, "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."
3. Eph. 3:21, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end."

Our Baptist churches have a succession back to Christ. But it's through the people who are despised and ridiculed by some people who call themselves by their name.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #2

Syllogism #1

1. The true churches of Christ have a succession from America back to the Sea of Galilee (Matt. 16:18; 28:19-20; Eph. 3:21).
2. But the succession of churches from America back to Christ is through churches which believed in election and effectual calling.
3. Therefore, if modern churches denounce those churches as heretical and unscriptural, they denounce their right to succession.

Syllogism #2

1. Historians have stated that American churches came from the Particular Baptist churches in Wales and England (Davis' History of the Welsh Baptist. p. 39-40; The Baptist Waybook by Bogard, p. 63)
2. But the Particular Baptist confession of 1644 clearly states election and the effectual call. ("Baptist Confession of Faith, McGlothlin. P. 180)
3. Therefore, the churches who have departed from the ancient confessions of Faith have no right to claim succession through churches they despise and call heretical.

ARGUMENT #3

The Confession of Faith found in Bogard's Baptist WayBook and used by our churches in the American Baptist Association clearly sets forth a work of grace in the hearts of those who are saved which is effectual to their salvation.

FIRST PROPOSITION: Article VII of The New Hampshire Confession of Faith, found in Bogard's Baptist WayBook, p.83 sets forth the effectual call.

1. Article VII of the New Hampshire Confession, 1834: "We believe that in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated, or born again (Jn. 3:6, 7; I Cor. 1:14; Rev. 8:7, 9; 21:17); That regeneration consist in giving a hoy disposition to the mind (II Cor. 5:17; Eze. 36:26; Duet. 30:6; I Jn. 4:7); That it is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit, in connection with divine truth (Jn. 3:8; 1:13; James 1:16-18; I Cor. 1:30; Phil. 2:30) so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel. (I Pet 1:22-25; Eph. 4:20-24; Col. 3:9-11) and that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance and faith, and newness of life (Eph. 5:9; Rm. 8:9; Gal. 5:16-23; Eph. 3:14-21; Matt. 3:8-10; 7:20; I Jn. 5:4, 18).
2. Notice the items in Article VII of The New Hampshire Confession of Faith found in Bogard's Baptist WayBook, p. 83. "We believe the sinner to be saved must be regenerated." Now notice this:
 - a. "We believe sinners must be regenerated.
 - b. The sinner must be made alive or quickened to spiritual things: I Cor. 2:14 says, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them. Because they are spiritually discerned.)
 - c. The sinner is given "a holy disposition of the mind." The mind is called the heart in Ezk. 36:26-27, the Bible says, "I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will give you a heart of flesh, I will put my spirit within you and cause you to walk in my judgements, and do them."
 - d. This is accomplished by the "power of the Holy Spirit." This is the same statement as in the 1689 Confession of the Particular Baptist and given in many scriptures. Eph. 1:19, "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power."
 - e. "So as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel." Is the effectual call. If it "secures our voluntary obedience" it is effectual (Eph. 4:20-21; Col. 3:9-11).

SUMMARY:

Syllogism #1

1. The Confession of Faith by which the churches of The American Baptist Association are organized are found in Bogard's Baptist WayBook, p. 83 sets forth the effectual call in Article VII in these words:
 - a. "Is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit."
 - b. "To secure our voluntary obedience."
2. But to "secure our voluntary obedience means that it is always effectual.
3. Therefore, the confession found in Bogard's Baptist WayBook teaches the effectual call.

Syllogism #2

1. All scriptural Baptist say they believe in an effectual call by the Holy Spirit in their confessions of faith.
2. But some modern preachers ridicule this work of the Holy Spirit.
3. Therefore, those who deny the effectual call of the Holy Spirit have departed from the faith. (I Tim. 4:1; Matt. 24:12)

ARGUMENT #4

The Scriptures distinguish between the Holy Spirit's work upon the heart of the elect and the preaching of the gospel.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them.

I Cor. 2:14, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

SECOND PROPOSITION: The preaching of the Gospel or the outward call is not enough, but the Holy Spirit brings power upon the heart of the elect with an effectual call with brings them to Christ.

I Thess. 1:4-5, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance, as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sakes."

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #4

Syllogism #1.

1. The Bible declares plainly the "natural man receiveth not the things," i.e. prayers, preaching, witnessing, songs, things "of the spirit of God." (I Cor. 2:11)
2. But Paul said the elect of Thessalonica were saved not by the word only but by the power of the Holy Ghost (I Thess. 1:5).
3. Therefore, the outward call never converts the sinner, but the power of the Holy Spirit is always effectual.

(Ten minutes) Thank you.

ARGUMENT #5

The Baptist have always believe in the effectual call of the Holy Spirit bringing power upon the hearts of God's elected people because the preaching of the gospel is done with human power which is powerless to bring life to the dead soul; however, the Campbellites, and the General Baptist believe in only the gospel or outward call and not the effectual inward call.

FIRST PROPOSITION: Alexander Campbell stated clearly the Arminian position when he said "all power" was in the preaching of the gospel.

Mill. Harb. Vol. 2, p. 397 (Alexander Campbell) said, "All the moral power of God or of man is exhibited in the truth which they propose. Therefore, we may say that the light of truth contains all the moral power of God, then the truth alone is all that is necessary to the conversion of men, for we have before argued and proved that the converting power is moral power."

SECOND PROPOSITION: The General Baptist who originated with John Smith in 1611 deny the effectual call of the Holy Spirit; in fact, the work of the Holy Spirit is never mentioned in the conversion of a sinner but only the sinner's work of believing. Now I'm going to read to you, beloved, the General Baptist Confession of Faith of 1660, Article III tells how sinners are saved and if you find the word Holy Spirit in here then I quit the debate. Here's what they said:

"God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, II Pet. 3:9. And the knowledge of the truth, that they, might be saved, I Tim. 2:4. For which end Christ hath commanded the Gospel, to wit, the glad tidings of remission of sins should be preached to every creature, Mk. 16:15. So that no man shall eternally suffer in hell (that is, the second death) for what, or want of a Christ that died for them, but as the Scripture saith, for denying the Lord that bought them, II Pet. 2:11 or because they believed not in the name of the only begotten Son of God, Jn. 3:18. Unbelief therefore being the cause why the just and righteous God will condemn the children of men; it follows against all contradiction, that all men at one time or other, are put under such a capacity, as through the grace of God they may be eternally saved." Baptist Confessions of Faith (McGlothlin, p. 112-113.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #5

How much time do I have please? (Seven minutes) Thank you.

Syllogism #1

1. The Bible clearly declares the fact the Holy Spirit actually brings power upon the heart and not by the word of the preacher only. Paul said, "Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sakes." I Thess. 1:5.
2. But Alexander Campbell said, "Truth alone is all that is necessary to convert men..." (Mill. Harb. Vol. 2, p. 397)
3. Therefore, to deny the effectual call and work of the Holy Spirit and rely on the outward call of the preacher is Campbellism

Syllogism #2

1. The General Baptist which originated with John Smith in 1611 plainly state the sinner is converted without any direct work of the Holy Spirit upon his soul. (Gen. Baptist Confession 1660 in McGlothlin's Baptist Confessions of Faith, p. 112-113)
2. But the Bible clearly teaches the Holy Spirit actually touches the heart of the sinner in conversion, "Lydia whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul," Acts 16:14.
3. Therefore, to deny the effectual call and work of the Holy Spirit is to side with the heretical General Baptist and deny the truth.

ARGUMENT #6

The old Baptist Confessions of Faith such as the Anabaptist Confession of 1644 clearly state the doctrine of the effectual call.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The effectual call of the Holy Spirit is set forth in The London Confession or Particular Baptist (1644) Article XXII.

1. Baptist Confession of Faith by McGlothlin, p. 180.

“That faith is a gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:8; Jn. 6:29; 4:10; Phil. 1:29; Gal. 5:22) whereby they come to see, know, and believe the truth of the Scriptures (Jn. 17:17; Heb. 4:11, 12; Jn. 6:63) and not only so, but the excellency of them above all writings and things in the world, as they hold the glory of God in his attributes, the excellency of Christ in his nature and offices, and the power of the fullness of the Spirit in its workings and operations; and there upon are enabled to cast the weight of their souls upon the truth thus believed.”

SECOND PROPOSITION: Dr. Roy M. Reed in his address as President of the American Baptist Association said, “The Particular Baptist of England were true Missionary Baptist;

Minutes of the American Baptist Association (1976) p. 19. “Dr. John Clarke was a Particular Baptist from England; the Particular Baptist were Missionary Baptist.”

THIRD PROPOSITION: True Missionary Baptist teach the effectual call because Particular Baptist teach it, and Dr. Roy M. Reed, President of The Missionary Baptist Seminary at Bellflower, California and past President of The A.B.A., said the Particular Baptist were Missionary Baptist.

The London Confession of 1689 of Particular Baptist, Chapter VIII, Section 8 says, “To all those for whom Christ hath obtained eternal redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply (Jn. 6:37; 10:15-16; 17:9; Rm. 5:10) and communicate the same, making intercession for them; uniting them to himself by his Spirit, revealing unto them, and by his word, the mystery of salvation (Jn. 17:6; Eph. 1:9, I Jn. 5:20), persuading them to believe and obey, governing their hearts (Rm. 8:9, 14) by his word and Spirit, and (Ps. 110:1; I Cor. 15:25, 26) overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom; in such a manner and ways as are most consistent to his wonderful and unsearchableness (Jn. 3:8; Eph. 1:8) dispensing with all their enemies and all of free and absolute grace, without any conditions foreseen in them, to procure it.”

How many minutes please? (Two) Thank.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #7

Syllogism #1

1. The Old London Confession of Faith (1644) of the Particular Baptist states emphatically the doctrine of effectual work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of his elect. (Art. XXII)
2. But Dr. Roy M. Reed, President of the American Baptist Association in 1976 said these Particular Baptist were Missionary Baptist.
3. Therefore, Missionary Baptist once believed the doctrine of effectual call in the hearts of the elect.

Syllogism #2

1. The Particular Baptist Confession of Faith (1689) clearly sets forth the effectual inward call of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the elect. (Chapter VIII, Section 8)
2. But Dr. Roy M. Reed, said that these people were Missionary Baptist.
3. Therefore, the true churches believed in the doctrine of effectual call.

Syllogism #3

1. The Particular Baptist of England were Missionary Baptist and believe the doctrine of the effectual call.
2. But the General Baptist were organized by John Smith and not of Christ, did not believe in the effectual call.
3. Therefore, those Baptist who do not believe in the inward work of the Holy Spirit or the effectual call are not Missionary Baptist but General Baptist.

Syllogism #4

1. The Particular Baptist were Missionary Baptist and believed in the effectual call of the inward work of the Holy Spirit.
2. But our baptism and church organization came from the Particular Baptist.
3. Therefore, if the Particular Baptist were heretical, the Missionary Baptist have heretical baptism, heretical churches, heretical Lord's supper, heretical succession.

And I deny that I'm a heretical Baptist.

Now beloved that is six arguments. I go now to my seventh argument.

ARGUMENT #7

Because of the denial of the effectual or inward work of the Holy Spirit is a path into rank modernism, every true minister of Christ should preach and teach what the old Baptist Confessions have set forth, i.e. the effectual or inward work of the Holy Spirit.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The London Confession of the Particular Baptist. I just read that, its items state:

1. That faith is a gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:8; Jn. 6:29).

(Time) Thank you.

ALEXANDER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen of the congregation, I come before you to deny the proposition that has been read in your hearing. And to which my opponent has presented his first speech. That proposition reads: The Scriptures teach that there is an effectual call to salvation which is extended to the elect and that they cannot successfully resist it. Now all the way through this debate you, those of you who have been here in each session, you have no doubt noticed because I have emphasized that each proposition states "the Scriptures teach" and so does this proposition state, "the Scriptures teach that there is an effectual call to salvation which is extended only to the elect and that they cannot successfully resist it."

Now before I proceed further with noticing my opponent's speech, I have some questions I want to present to him, and I hand him a copy of them. The first question is this:

Question #1, Is the effectual call made to the elect person before eternal spirit life is imparted to his spirit or after?

Now I'll let that register. Is the effectual call that my opponent talks about made to the elect person before the eternal spirit life is imparted to his spirit or after?

Question #2, Is the effectual call made by the same means and in the same way to all the elect?

Question #3, Does God call anyone to salvation apart from, and independent of the gospel or the word of God? If so, please show the Bible record of such a call.

Question #4, What attribute or quality in God moves him to deal with the non-elect in extending to them what is called common grace and the common ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit.

Let me repeat that question: What attribute or quality in God moves him to deal with the non-elect in extending to them what is called common grace and the common ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit. And:

Question #5, What end or goal or result does God intend to accomplish in the non-elect as he deals with them in common grace and the common operations of the Holy Spirit?

All right. I will await an answer to these questions from my opponent.

And my opponent has said in the beginning of his speech that there are two calls. Two calls to salvation. One which he referred to as a universal call, a call extended to all men if I understood him right. But that to that universal call men will not give heed. And then there is as he said an effectual call which he claims is made only to the elect. And that they cannot successfully resist it. But I'm going to pass that up for right now, but let it go in the record that he has said that there are two calls.

Now my opponent went to the London Confession, Particular Baptist Confession of 1689, London Confession of 1644 and some other Baptist confessions of faith to prove his proposition. He's done this consistently all through this debate. Now I want Brother Crawford, what I want to, to get before these people, I remind you that the proposition requires you to show by the Scriptures that this doctrine is true. The proposition says the Scriptures teach that there is an effectual call to salvation which is extended only to the elect and that they cannot successfully resist it. If these confessions of faith, these Baptist confessions of faith to which you have referred prove your proposition, then most of those same Baptist confessions of faith prove the universal church theory: The universal church doctrine because many of those Particular Baptist back there did believe in the universal church doctrine and you know that as well as I do. That universal church doctrine was in their Articles of Faith. Now he didn't want you to know that because he wants to prove his proposition by those confessions of faith but if those confessions of faith prove his proposition then on the same grounds, they prove the universal church doctrine. And I, I declare to you, I think I'm representing my

brother right when I say he does not believe the universal church doctrine. Furthermore, most of those Baptist Confessions of Faith has amillennialism in them and if they prove his proposition, they prove amillennialism. He knows better than to try to prove a proposition by Confessions of Faith. I want him to prove them by the scriptures. He hasn't done that.

Now in reading some of his historical matter, Brother Crawford read about some Particular Baptist preachers back there who refused to administer the ordinances to some General Baptist, and if you'll recall he emphasized because of differences of sentiments. You remember that Brother Crawford? But while Brother Crawford has repeatedly called me and Baptist of my kind, General Baptist he still wants to have fellowship with us in the American Baptist Association. Now this is some more inconsistency of my opponent's doctrine. Oh, he went back and proudly presented those Particular Baptist who refused to administer the ordinances to some General Baptist because of differences of opinion and I'll tell you I think they were right. If they had differences of opinion, they ought not to have had church fellowship. That is difference of sentiments on fundamental doctrines. They ought not to have church fellowship. And I believe that principle is right today. When Baptist churches do not agree on fundamental doctrines, they ought to not have church fellowship. Because it is on fundamental, on the principle of fundamental doctrines that fellowship is built and maintained.

Now, I want to proceed with some negative arguments. And then I'm going to the scriptures my brother, not the confessions of faith. I'm going to God's word.

ARGUMENT #1

Argument #1 is based on the universal work of the Holy Spirit in striving with men. Reproving them of sin, of righteousness and of judgement. 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." Prov. 1:23, "Turn you at my reproof, behold I will 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. 16:8-11, "And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgement. Of sin because they believe not on me. Of righteousness because I go to my Father and ye see me no more. Of judgement because the prince of this world is judged." The Holy Spirit reproves every responsible sinner of sin and of righteousness and of judgement. He has done this in all history of the human race. The work of the Holy Spirit in reproof and the call to salvation accompany each other. Without one the other would be of no benefit to the sinner.

Now my opponent has tried to make it appear to you that I do not believe in the inward work of the Holy Spirit. That is not true, I do believe in the inward work of the Holy Spirit. And I said at least twice in this debate that when the Spirit of God imparts eternal life the sinner doesn't resist that impartation of eternal life. But it is the work of the Holy Spirit in conviction and drawing a person to Christ, bringing him to repentance and faith that the sinner does resist. This is the question, is resolved on whether regeneration precedes repentance and faith. And I said to you before that if my brother is right in his doctrine, that regeneration necessarily precedes repentance and faith then the sinner would not resist the impartation of eternal life before he repents and trust Christ. But if his doctrine is wrong, if the doctrine that I teach is right, that regeneration happens at the point of faith in Jesus Christ and that the Holy Spirit convicts the sinner, reproves him of sin and of righteousness and of judgement and influences him to repent and trust Christ, the sinner can and does resist the Holy Spirit in that work. Now without the reproof of the Holy Spirit the call to salvation would mean nothing to the sinner. On the other hand, if the Holy Spirit did reprove a sinner but did not extend to him a call to salvation it would be the worst kind of mockery. The sinner is absolutely helpless in his lost, ruined condition. And he's altogether dependent upon God to deliver him from his lost, ruined state. If the Holy Spirit should reprove a sinner and make him aware of his guilt and condemnation from which the sinner is helpless to deliver himself and should make him aware of God's righteousness which the sinner is helpless to attain and should make him aware of the judgement to come which the sinner is helpless to escape and yet did not call him to salvation with a call sufficient for the sinner to be saved; the Holy Spirit would be practicing mockery and adding unnecessary grief and suffering to the helpless man. But

I'll tell you God does not practice such despotism. The prophet Jeremiah declared in Lam. 3:23-26, "But though he caused grief yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly nor grief the children of men to crush under his feet all the prisoners of the earth to turn aside the right of a man before the face of the Most High. To subvert a man in his call the Lord approveth not." Now if God extends only to the elect a call sufficient to result in the sinner repenting and coming to Christ for salvation which he reprove all responsible sinners of sin, of righteousness and of judgement then he is mocking some helpless sinners and extending mercy to others when there is no difference between them. This is not in keeping with the character of the just and merciful God.

ARGUMENT #2

Is based on the fact that the gospel of salvation is to be preached to all men in general not to the elect only. Matt. 28:19, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations." Mk. 16:15, "Go ye unto all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Lk. 24:46-48, "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and arise from the dead the third day and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem, and you are witness of these things." Matt. 24:14, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations and then shall the end come." Christ commissioned his church in this age to preach the gospel unto all men. In all ages past he had prophets to preach the gospel to men. And all of God's prophets preached "That through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. It is God's design in the gospel to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith in Jesus Christ. Acts 26:18, when God called Paul, Saul of Tarsus to be an apostle, gave him his commission he instructed him that he was sending him to the gentiles for this purpose, "To open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." Now God sent Paul to preach the gospel. I Cor. 1:17 he said, "Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel." Here Acts 27:18, he told him that was to do. Now Paul wasn't to miraculously open their eyes. God didn't give him the power of the Holy Spirit to regenerate souls, but he was to open their eyes by preaching the gospel to them. He was to turn them from darkness to light by preaching the gospel to them. He was to turn them from the power of Satan unto God by preaching the gospel to them and Paul was to be a light and for salvation to the ends of the earth. I read that this afternoon. This makes it clear that God's design in the gospel is to turn men to Jesus Christ for salvation. To enlighten them. Their minds. And I'll tell you the Holy Spirit works with the gospel. My opponent intimated in his speech a while ago that sometimes the Holy Spirit works with the preaching of the gospel, sometimes he doesn't I want him to tell us on what occasions when Paul preached the gospel was it that the Holy Spirit didn't accompany the gospel. On what occasions did Paul preach that the Holy Spirit did not accompany the gospel. All right, now if the Holy Spirit accompanies the gospel and carries it to the hearts of men, then tell us why isn't it a call to salvation sufficient for them to be saved? The Gospel is God's call to salvation. Paul wrote to the Thessalonian brethren, "But we have bound to give thanks always to God for you brethren, beloved of the Lord because God had from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." (Ten Minutes) "Whereunto he called you by our gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." II Thess. 2:13, 14. Now if the gospel was the call to salvation to those Thessalonian brethren why isn't it the call to salvation to all others who get saved? If the gospel is God's call to salvation and it's preached to all responsible sinners, then God calls all responsible sinners to salvation. My opponent must prove not only that the Holy Spirit makes the gospel call effectual only to the elect but also that the Holy Spirit does not make the gospel sufficiently effective to the non-elect for them to be saved.

ARGUMENT #3

Is based on the fact that it is the design and purpose of the gospel to bring men to Christ for salvation. Rm. 1:16, "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." I Cor. 1:21, "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 believed." If God has the gospel preached to a sinner, it is that he calls that sinner to salvation. It is not a gospel of judgement and condemnation it is the gospel of salvation. It is the gospel of remission of sins through faith in Jesus Christ. And to every sinner to whom it is preached it tells the message that Christ died for sins according to the scripture, that he was buried and that he rose again on the third day according to the scriptures. I Cor. 15: 3, 4, If God calls any sinner to sin by the gospel that sinner can be saved. The Holy Spirit accompanies the preaching of the gospel in his work of conviction and since his work of conviction is universal that is to every responsible sinner, the call of the gospel is universally sufficient for every responsible sinner to come to Christ for salvation. Therefore, there is not any kind of call to salvation that is made only to the elect.

ARGUMENT #4

Is based on the fact that men will be judged by what they do with the gospel. I Pet. 4:6. "For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead that they might be judged according to men in the flesh but live according to God in the spirit." II Thess. 1:7, 9, "And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." Now Peter said, I Pet. 4:6, "For this cause was the gospel preached to them that are dead." This refers to those who are physically dead. Now don't you misunderstand me. God does not have the gospel preached to people after they die a physical death. There is no opportunity for salvation after physical death. But Peter is affirming that all those who have died a physical death, responsible sinners you understand, had the gospel preached to them while they lived in the flesh and it was preached to them for what cause? That they might be judged according to God in the Spirit. And that living, according to God in the spirit is eternal spirit life. The gospel was preached to them that they might have that eternal spirit life. This shows us that the gospel calls men to salvation that they might have eternal spirit life. And Paul declares the Christ is coming back to take vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ. (Five minutes) But one can neither obey nor disobey the gospel until it is presented to him. The scriptures, this scripture proves that all of those who go to hell, those on whom Jesus will take vengeance did have the gospel presented to them and if the gospel accompanied by the Holy Spirit is sufficient to call men to salvation those who go to hell could have been saved. They were called with a sufficient call so that they could have repented toward God and trusted Jesus Christ. The gospel instructed them to believe on Jesus Christ for salvation. The gospel instructed them to repent toward God and believe on Jesus Christ. And those who go to hell will go to hell because they did not obey the gospel. But I wanted my opponent to tell us how one can obey the gospel that's never been presented to him or how he can disobey the gospel that's never been presented to him. All right.

ARGUMENT #5

Argument #5 is based on God's call to Israel, as extended in Eze. 33:11, "Say unto them as I live saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked but that the wicked turn from his way and live." Now listen to this. God was talking to the wicked in Israel. "Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways for why will you die oh house of Israel." Whose voice was this? He talked about the preacher's voice. He said we preachers get to thinking that we're God's voice. Well brother this was God's voice calling Israel. "Turn ye." God swore by his own life. "I have no, as I live saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked but that the wicked turn from your evil ways for why will you die oh house of Israel." Now was that a call sufficient for them to be saved. Now I want my brother to take the position that all those to whom that call was extended did get saved. I just want him to take that position.

ARGUMENT #6

Now my next argument, argument #6 is based on the fact that the scriptures warn men not to harden their hearts at the voice of God. He's, he's talked about the voice of God and he said as he referred to Jn. 5:25, "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of man and they that hear shall live." He's intimated that when a sinner hears the voice of the Son of God, he can't resist it, he can't turn away. Well let's see about that. Ps. 95:7-11, "For he is our God and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand. Today oh that ye would hear his voice, harden not your heart as at Meribah as in the day of Massa in the wilderness when your fathers tempted me, proved me and saw my work, forty years long was I grieved with that generation and said it is a people that do err in their heart and they have not known my ways. Wherefore, I swear in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest." This is the revised version of Ps. 95:7-11. Then Heb. 3:7-13, "Wherefore even as the Holy Ghost saith." This is not the voice of the preacher this is the Holy Spirit saying it. "Today if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. As in the provocation like as in the day of the temptation in the wilderness for when your fathers tempted me by proving me and say my works for ..." (Your time is up)

CRAWFORD'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Ladies and gentlemen, gentlemen moderators and my honorable opponent. I come before you with a thankful heart for God's providence and I'm sure all of us can say amen to those boys and that song, "When King Jesus Comes Again." Now my dear opponent, the only attention he paid to my affirmative was that I made the sin, it was a sin for me to go to our old ancient Confessions of Faith and trace our Baptist back through the ages showing that all scriptural Baptist believe in the effectual call. And that book which is to be published This is a book people, we're making a book, and this is why we want to conduct ourselves in the highest possible manner. And this is why I want my opponent to know that I appreciate him and that in this book we want to put forth the best we have. And I think the best we have has gone before us. I don't think that Baptist today have improved on the Baptist of yesteryears that died at the stake. And therefore, if it's a shame for me to make my arguments on the Baptist Confessions of Faith back to Christ, the book and the readers will know that I have done the subject justice, I did not stand here and tell you what I believed; I told you where our baptism came from, I told you where our ordination came from, I told you where our churches came from and these are the people, and if you don't believe that Brother Alexander; and evidently you don't or you wouldn't be arguing with me. You would just say Brother Crawford, let's agree and stop this debate and all go fishing. Evidently, he doesn't agree with me and therefore, I'm sorry but you have just unchurched yourself. You are unbaptized. You have declared non-fellowship for the baptism that you have.

Now let me make this perfectly clear. When Jesus Christ was here upon the earth in Jn. 4:2 we read when the Pharisees heard how that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John the Baptist. Now if a man came to be baptized by the church of the Lord Jesus Christ and they appointed Peter to do the actual baptizing for the church, or James or John; and John went out into the water and he baptized that man for the church and our Lord Jesus Christ was the pastor standing there on the shore and yet that man didn't believe what that church taught, he just got wet. Even if he was saved and he didn't believe what that church taught, he just got wet. Paul said in Acts 19, when he met some disciples he said, "Unto what were ye baptized." Beloved when you've baptized in this Baptist church, we teach you that you're baptized to what Baptist have believed back to Jesus Christ and if you don't believe that, we don't baptize you. And I'll say this that if you don't believe what Baptist have taught down through the ages you just unbaptized yourself. You got wet. And you may be in a Missionary Baptist church when you don't believe the doctrines of that church, you are just wet. You did not have scriptural baptism. I want that to soak in because we're going to eternity.

Now my friend asked me some questions and I'm so happy to answer the questions. He said"

Question #1, Is the effectual call made to the elect person before eternal spirit life is imparted to his spirit or after?

At the same time Brother Alexander. Rm. 5:5 says, it's so simple brethren this is not complicated. He said, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given to us." Now when the Holy Spirit sheds the love of God abroad in the sinner's heart at that time the Holy Spirit has taken up his abode in the heart and therefore there is life there. My dear friend that's elementary in Baptist circles.

Question #2, Is the effectual call made by the same means; it's made by the same person, the effectual call is made by a person, the Holy Spirit. And in the same way to all the elect?

The Holy Spirit calls, the Holy Spirit regenerates every child of God. I just read the scripture Rm. 5:5 says, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us." When the Holy spirit comes upon the sinner; let me be very, very clear in this. The Holy Spirit comes upon the sinner he brings the love of God. That's why I wanted those boys to sing that great song. The love of God. A poor sinner can't be saved until he loves God. He can't love God because he's a sinner and therefore the Holy Spirit puts the love of God in his heart and then because he has love in his heart he says, Lord I'm sorry I've sinned, I'm sorry that I have trampled under my unholy feet the precious blessings. . I come and I'm sorry. He is repentant. Why? Because he's been regenerated. That's what Baptist teach, that's not Campbellism. Brethren you heard a Campbellite speech here tonight and I want it to go into the record, I'm charging my

friend and I'll read it out of history. Brother Alexander you would be excluded from a real Baptist church 100 years ago for making that kind of a speech.

Question #3, Does God call anyone to salvation apart from, and independent of the gospel or the word of God? Is so please show the Bible record of such.

Well, that's an old Campbellite argument. Campbellites say you show me one place where somebody was saved without the word of God and so the old Baptist argument is I Pet. 3:1, where it talks about the wife it says, "If your husband, if any obey not the word they may without the word..." Brother Alexander what you need to do is to tangle horns with some good Campbellite. You know what he'd say? He'd say let's go, this man's preaching exactly what I preach. That's what he'd say. Listen, Baptist believe that a sinner is saved separate and apart from the word. Campbellites always have said that the word of God must be preached to the man. Now we believe that the word of God is God's actual word to that heart. Rm. 10:17 says, "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the HREMA," now that's not EIPON and that is not LOGOS, that his HREMA and it means a command. When God commands that soul to respond it will respond because the Holy Spirit does the work, Rm. 5:5, "Sheds the love of God abroad in the heart." The heart responds, I Jn. 4:7 says, "He that loveth is born of God and knoweth God for God is love." I'll say.

Question #4, What attributes or quality in God moves his to deal with the non-elect in extending to them what is call common grace and the common ordinary operation of the Holy Spirit?

Why does God do that? Well I do not want to be misunderstood, I quote a scripture. When Jacob got ready to leave Laban, Laban was a non-elect. That man uses that term so I'll just use Old Laban down there. He was a non-elect. But Jacob was one of God's elected people. God said Jacob get up and leave your uncle and get back to Bethel. Laban came to him in Gen. 30:27 and says Oh listen you stay with me for I have experienced; now get this Brother Alexander, you do a lot of writing when I'm speaking and then we bore the people going back and forth arguing with one another when we're not listening. We should listen to our opponent and then it wouldn't bore the people to go over these things several times. Gen. 30:27 Laban said to Jacob, "I have experienced that God has blessed me for thy sake." And I'll say, while God does bless the common grace of God is given to the non-elect because he has his elect here upon the earth. And I'll say this that if it weren't for the elect of God living upon this earth, the non-elect would not have anything. God has blessed this earth with fruitful seasons, blessings, blessings, blessings, because he has his people down here. He's going to bless us and provide us with food and raiment and these others are the Laban's that have been blessed because we're here. All right.

Question #5, What end or goal or result does God intend to accomplish in the non-elect as he deals with them in common grace and the common operations of the Holy Spirit?

Well Brother Alexander, I'm not God and I don't know the mind of God and I don't know why he does a lot of things, but I think I understand what you mean here. Why does he let a non-elect be born into this world when he doesn't intend to save them? Because that non-elect person may be the father of one of his elect. Let me explain this. We have no record; we have no scriptural record of Paul's mother and father being saved. But we do read in Gal. 1:15 where Paul said, "When it pleased God who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace." And so, if Paul's mother had not been born Paul would not have had a means to come into this world Brother Alexander. I don't know the mind of God but I do know this, that he has a plan; tomorrow I will be preaching on the marvelous plan of God how that predestination is not a hated doctrine, but it is a doctrine that gets all the redeemed home and there is not one lost on the way. I don't know whether that answers that man's question or not.

I made a speech here from our old Baptist confessions, he glanced over them. He said the scriptures teach, not the confessions and I quoted in those Confessions over 160 verses of scripture and you didn't make one answer to any of them. But you did say those Baptist believed in the universal church. I deny it. Now listen brethren. Here's one thing we're going to come to loggerheads right here. I deny that they believed in the universal church and I'll say this right here. I hold before me, I read this today, I guess he

wants me to kill my time filling the book with something I said today, but here is the great book The Pillars of Orthodoxy by Ben M. Bogard and on p. 194 is the defense of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith by T.T. Eaton and since he brought it up and he's charged those brethren of believing in the universal church I'll just read this brethren. Though it's going to take from my time, and I hate to do it because it's boring if you were here today and you heard it once before. Bear with me.

"The Philadelphia Confession of Faith is not responsible for the wild interpretations put upon it, any more than the Bible is responsible for the same thing. That confession is a venerable and, in many respects, a noble document and we hope the wild interpretations some are seeking to put on it will not bring it into disrepute."

My brother said it taught the universal, the universal church. He said they taught amillennialism. I deny that, in Graves' Seven Dispensations, I'm not here debating on the millennial question. Every one of them was pre-millennial. Where do you come up with these wild ideas? You need to get those confessions and read them Brother Alexander and you wouldn't make such and that's in the book. See this is coming out in a book. I'll say this. I'll have to publish this book; this man will never publish this book. I promise you I will publish it. Now listen: Pillars of Orthodoxy (Bogard) p. 194.

"The attempt is made to make it appear that the Philadelphia confession invisible church should exist in all ages and also that the confessions opposes the view that Baptist have existed in every age since the apostles. This is a gross and groundless misrepresentation of that venerable document. It says the Catholic or universal church which with respect to the internal work of the spirit and truth of grace may be called invisible, consist of the whole number of the elect that have been, are or shall be gathered into one body under Christ, that head thereof and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all. Let this language be noted. The Romanist, (That's the Roman Catholics) claim that their hierarchy was the Catholic or the universal church and these Baptist in Philadelphia contradicted that claim by declaring that only the whole number of the elect that have been, are or shall be gathered into one can rightly be called the Catholic or universal church. It takes all of the elect of all ages to make the Catholic or universal church. Of course, then the little fraction of them alive at any given time cannot be called a church of course. Then this church cannot exist in every age. Because its material except a part of it and perhaps a very small part has not come into existence when our Baptist fathers adopted that language. If the world shall continue 10,000 years longer and the last man saved will be part of the universal church which this document declares to be composed of the whole number of the elect that have been, are AD 1742, or shall be gathered into one. To talk about all the elect as existing through the ages is ridiculous and grotesque. It is likely that only a small fraction of them have every yet, AD 1899, come into existence and certainly those born since 1742 could not have continued in existence before that date..."

I read that now my friend listen this is published by the A.B.A. Now my friend says, if he says that this is heresy, if he says this is heresy then I charge the American Baptist Association with printing heresy and not only that , they have pushed out and handed out a book, THE PILLARS OF ORTHODOXY by Ben. M Bogard and they did it for one of two reasons. #1, they could of have said that we want to claim kinship to A.C. Dayton, Richard Fuller, William Bond, A.P. Williams, James Pettigrew Boyce, Wm. E. Penn, J. B. Moody, T.T. Eaton, J.R. Graves, J.B. Jetter, S.H. Ford, J.M. Pendleton, John A. Broadus, J.S. Coleman, J.T. Christian, W.P. Harvey, J.N. Hall and Ben M. Bogard. Now here we have it. Now if they want to claim kin with those brethren and if they want to say here are our preachers then why not start preaching what they preached? Instead of ridiculing them. Instead of counting them as the filth of the earth. Now I say this my dear brethren we are making a book. I am going to print this book. My friend will never let this thing go to print with his statements in it. I intend to print it if he doesn't. We'll jointly print it if, if that's the way that he wants to do it. But I intend to print it and when I do, I want you to know that the American Baptist Association has preachers in it today that don't even know what they're printing in Texarkana. And they claim to be that type of preacher but when they come into a debate and they ridicule them and call them all types of names and all of that kind of business and then try to put out a front here that they are the church of the Lord Jesus

Christ. I say brethren it's time we should be in prayer, and I have no rancor in my heart, in fact, my heart is bleeding for the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ. And I want you to pray for me because I wouldn't offend any of you. These Baptist churches today are claiming something they do not have, and if they don't come back to it, they'll disintegrate.

Now I'm going on with my arguments, because until my friend notices mine I have no reason to spend my time with that thing that he offered here which is not Baptist doctrine at all. Argument #7, I believe I touched on this. How much time do I have please? (About fifteen) Thank you sir.

ARGUMENT #7

Because the denial of the effectual or inward call of the Holy Spirit is the path into rank modernism, every true preacher of Christ should preach and teach what the old Baptist Confessions have set forth, that is the effectual or inward call of the Holy Spirit.

FIRST PROPOSITION: The London Confession of the Particular Baptist 1644, which was four years old before the Presbyterian Westminster Confession clearly states the effectual call of the Holy Spirit in the souls of God's elected people in Article XXII.

1. Baptist Confessions of Faith (McGlothlin) p. 180:

"That faith is a gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:8; Jn. 6:29, 4:10; Phil. 1:29; Gal. 5:22) whereby they come to see, know and believe the truth of the Scriptures (Jn. 17:17; Heb. 4:11-12; Jn. 6:63) and not only so, but the excellency of them above all writings and the things of this world, as they hold the glory of God in his attributes and the excellency of Christ in his nature and offices, and the power of the fulness of the spirit in its workings and operation and thereupon are enabled to cast the weight of their souls upon this truth thus believed."

2. The items in this confession:

a. That faith is a gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:8; Jn. 6:29; 4:10; Phil. 1:29; Gal. 5:22)

b. Whereby they come to know, know and believe the truth of the Scriptures. (Jn. 17:17; Heb. 4:11-12; Jn. 6:63)

SECOND PROPOSITION: The Presbyterians formed the Westminster Confession in 1647 and stated nearly the same in Article X. I want you to get this brethren. That the Presbyterians mocked us Baptist. They came out with the Westminster Confession four years later.

The Confessions of Faith by A.A. Hodge, p. 20. "They (The Westminster Assembly) presented in a body the finished confession to Parliament, dated December 16, 1646 this day March 22, 1648 it was adopted.

THIRD PROPOSITION: The Presbyterians, congregationalist denied the effectual inward call of the Holy Spirit because Nathaniel W. Taylor (1786-1858); Charles G. Finny (1792-1875); Nathaniel Emmons (1745-1840) and others which modified the views (denied man's hopeless and helpless condition) on depravity and thus denied the work of the Holy Spirit.

1. Nathaniel W. Taylor denied man was so depraved he was helpless and hopeless, lost in sin and must be effectually called by the Holy Spirit. He said, "He held the power of contrary choice. Adam had it, and contrary to the belief of the Augustinians, he never lost it. Man, not only can if he will, but he can if he won't." Systematic Theology by Strong p. 319.

2. N. W. Taylor, Nathaniel Emmons, Charles G. Finny and others denied man is born a transgressor and stranger from God.

a. Isa. 48:8 says, "Yea, thou heardest not; yea thou knowest not, yea that the time of thine ear was not opened; for I knew that thou wouldest deal treacherously, thou was called a transgressor from the womb."

b. In Ps. 58:3, "The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies. Their poison is like of a serpent; they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear; which will not harken to the voice of the charmers, charming never so wisely."

My friend says the gospel can charm them. He said that. He made a beautiful Campbellite argument. That the gospel can charm sinners. I deny it. The Bible says they stop up their ear like a deaf adder and they will not harken to the voice of the charmers charming never so wisely. Christ said in Jn. 8:43, "Why is it that ye cannot understand my speech, it is because ye cannot hear my words." He hasn't dealt with that.

3. Taylor, Emmons and Finney and others led millions into Unitarianism because they denied man's inability to because of depravity:

"Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor, of New Haven, the prince of the American New School of Theology, taught that sin consists solely in the acts of the will." Outlines of Theology by A.A. Hodge p. 335.3

4. Students of history know that thousands went into Unitarianism and into heresies and then like Theodore Parker, left Christianity altogether and became an atheistic infidel.

(Five minutes) Thank you.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #7

Syllogism #1

1. The old Baptist Confessions of Faith clearly set forth the doctrine of the effectual or inward call of the Holy Spirit because man is impotent without the ability to come to Christ. (London Confession, 1644, Article XXII).
2. But our Missionary Baptist got their baptism and church organization from the old Baptist who believed in Holy Spirit effectually calling the elected people of God by an inward work of the Holy Spirit.
3. Therefore, to deny the hopelessness and helplessness and that condition of the sinner, and to preach the lost man can come if he wants to, and then deny the need for an inward work of the Holy Spirit is to depart from our ancient Baptist Faith.

Syllogism #2

1. The Presbyterians and Congregationalist went into rank heresy when they followed the New England Theology of N.W. Taylor, Nathaniel Emmons, Charles G. Finney and others.
2. But these men denied the depravity of man was such that it completely rendered him a helpless and hopeless victim, but that man not only can if he will, but he can if he won't.
3. Therefore, if the Baptist ministers deny the hopeless and helpless condition of the depraved sinner and the necessity of the Holy Spirit's effectual call, they will go into the same rank modernism and finally become unitarians.

And that's where you're heading my dear brother. That was argument #7

ARGUMENT #8

The effectual call is the work of God whereby all those given to Christ in the everlasting covenant (Heb. 13:20) will be made willing (Ps. 110:3) to come to Christ (Jn. 6:37) and thus be saved.

FIRST PROPOSITION: When Christ preached on the subject of salvation, he emphasized the fact that he (Christ) personally called those who were his elected people.

1. Jn. 10:2-3, "He that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the porter openeth and the sheep hear his voice; and he calleth his own sheep by name and leadeth them out."

2. The Shepherd knows his sheep.

John 10:14, "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep." II Tim. 2:19, "the foundation of God standeth for sure having this seal; that the Lord knoweth them that are his."

He calleth his own sheep by name because he knows that they were given to him. Jn. 6:37, "All that the Father giveth unto me shall come unto me and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."

SECOND PROPOSITION: The people given to Christ will not follow false doctrine because they were elected by God to be saved.

1. Jn. 10:5, "And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of strangers."
2. God's elected people shall not be deceived by false prophets. Matt. 24:24, "For there shall arise false Christ's and false prophets and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect."

THIRD PROPOSITION: The effectual call is the only way Christ called us (the Gentiles) to salvation.

Jn. 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."

a. He knows each one of his sheep, verse 3, "He calleth his sheep by name."

b. He keeps his elected people from hearing calls of false religions which lead to hell (verse 5, "A stranger they will not follow, but they will flee from him; For they know not the voice of strangers.")

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT #8

Syllogism #1

1. Christ said he personally calls his sheep not by preaching but by his personal call. Jn. 10:23 "...He calleth his own sheep by name and leadeth them out."
2. But the Holy Spirit came to do the work of Christ, Jn. 15:13-14, "Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come ...He shall glorify me for he shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you." Jn. 6:44, "No man can come unto me except the Father that sent me draw him."
3. Therefore, the holy Spirit personally calls each one of the elect by name to salvation.

Syllogism #2

1. The effectual call of Christ is a personal call, and it is the only call, which protects the sheep from the power of false Christs and false prophets. Jn. 10:5, "A stranger they will not follow because they know not the voice of strangers."
2. But the false Christs and especially the antichrist and the false prophets shall deceive the whole world. Rev. 17:8; 13:8.
3. Therefore, the effectual call is the only means whereby the elect of God are protected from the power of false doctrines and false prophets.

(Time) Did you say my time? Pardon me. Thank you.

ALEXANDER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Crawford, brethren moderators, ladies and gentlemen of the audience, I come before you to present the closing speech on this proposition which you have heard read in your hearing several times. The Scriptures teach that there is an effectual call to salvation which is extended only to the elect and that they cannot successfully resist it. My opponent seemed to think that I accused him of sinning in reading from Baptist Confessions of Faith. Now this was his own choice of words. I did not say you were sinning by reading from Baptist Confessions of Faith Brother Crawford. I have no objection to my opponent reading from any book he may choose to read from. That's his business. But I wanted this congregation to know that the proposition that you and I both signed requires that you prove by the Scriptures that there is an effectual call which is extended only to the elect and that they cannot successfully resist it. I reassert to you that a doctrine cannot be proved by Confessions of Faith. If we prove a doctrine it must be proved by the word of God. That's the only infallible thing we have. Now I stated a while ago in the , in my speech that if the Baptist Confessions of Faith from which my brother has read and referred to and to which he was referred quite a number of times to prove his propositions then most of them prove the universal church doctrine. And if I understood him right he denied that any of them have the universal doctrine in them. Well let's just see. I have in my hand a book title Baptist Confessions of Faith by W.L. Lumpkin and I'm going to read from the London Confession of Faith, it was printed in the year 1677. This quotation is found on p. 285 of this book, Baptist Confessions of Faith by W.L. Lumpkin, Chapter 26 on the church. Here's what those Baptist of London said:

"The Catholic or universal church which with respect to internal work of the spirit and truth of grace may be called invisible consist of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one under Christ as the head thereof and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

That sounds like the universal church doctrine to me Brother Crawford. (I just read that.) Now don't go off and tell people that Brother Alexander falsely accuses those Baptist Confessions of Faith when I tell you that they had the universal doctrine in them. They had it. And by the same confessions of faith he's trying to prove, has tried to prove every proposition we've discussed so far. And every proposition we've discussed has stated that the scriptures teach. All right.

I want to proceed with my arguments. That's as far as I'm going with his speeches, his speech because it's simply a matter of reference to the Baptist Confessions of Faith and I'm going to the scripture to conclude my arguments concerning this proposition. I had introduced the argument, argument #6 based on Ph. 95:7-11 and Heb. 3:7-13, I want to read these scriptures. "For he is our God; and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand even as the Holy Ghost saith today if ye, if ye shall hear his voice harden not your hearts as in the provocation like as in the day of the temptation in the wilderness for when your fathers tempted me by proving me and saw my works forty years wherefore, I was displeased with this generation and said they do always err in their heart. But they did not know my ways as I swore in my wrath they shall not enter into my rest. Take heed brethren, let's haply there shall in anyone of you an evil heart of unbelief in falling away from the living God. But exhort one another day by day so long as it is called today lest anyone of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin." Now as it is recorded in Ps. 95:7-11 God either called some Israelites to salvation who did harden their hearts and would not heed his call or else they lost their salvation. For God swore in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest, verse 11. God even plead with them, "Oh that ye would hear his voice harden not your heart." Now this wasn't the voice of the preacher Brother Crawford, this was God's voice. Now my brother has said that when the sinner hears God's voice, he cannot resist it. But this was God's voice they heard, and God plead with them, "Oh that ye would hear his voice harden not your heart." But according to the doctrine of Calvinism it would have been impossible for any of them to harden their hearts if God called them. If God called them to salvation with a call sufficient for them to give heed to him and be saved, according to Calvinism; God's pleading, "Oh that ye would hear his

voice" and his warning, "Harden not your heart" were only so much empty vain talk. According to Calvinism if God called them, they could not help giving heed to his voice. But God did call them, and they did not give heed to his voice. They did harden their hearts. And God swore in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest. Brother, they did not get saved because Paul said in the Hebrew letter, "We which believe do enter into rest." But these people did not enter into rest and God swore that they would not enter into his rest. But it was after he called them with his own voice, and they had hardened their hearts and would not heed his call. There is a call coming from God's own voice sufficient for sinners to be saved, yet they resisted it.

Heb. 3:7-13 warns the New Testament people. Now Ps. 95:7-11 showed this principle in the Old Testament. Heb. 3:7-13 warns New Testament people. Today, that is in the New Testament dispensation. "If ye shall hear his voice," his voice not the preachers voice, his voice, God's voice. "Harden not your hearts as in the provocation." So, it is still possible for those whom God calls to salvation to harden their hearts and not give heed to that call. To confirm this the writer of the Hebrew letter gave solemn warning, "Take heed brethren lest haply there shall be anyone of you an evil heart of unbelief in falling away from the living God. But exhort one another day by day so long as it is called today lest anyone of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin." I say with all the gravity that such a warning would be empty and vain and without any foundation if there were such a thing as my opponent claims to be; an effectual call to salvation which is extended only to the elect and that they cannot resist it successfully. If the non-elect cannot heed the call to salvation which is extended to them so as to be saved, and the elect cannot successfully resist the call to salvation which is extended to them: Then God is speaking empty words to warn anyone not to harden his heart. According to Calvinism if one is not elect, God will harden his heart and if he is one of the elect God will subdue his heart and his will in spite of himself and save him. But of course, the teachings of Calvinism are in direct conflict with the Scriptures.

I ask my opponent to show to this congregation that the call God made to the Israelites as recorded in Ps 95:7, 8 and Heb. 3:7, 8 was any different in kind or quality than the call to salvation which is extended to the elect which he says they cannot successfully resist. I want him to show, I want him to show this congregation that the call that God extended in Ps. 95:7, 8 and Heb. 3:7, 8 was any different in kind of quality than the call that he extends to the elect.

All right, before I go to my next argument, I took up that argument because I had already begun it in my, in the closing part of my last speech. Before I proceed with my next argument now, I want to notice his answers to my questions. The first question was:

Is the effectual call made to the elect person before eternal spirit filled life is imparted to his spirit or after?

And he said at the same time. Then brother it is not a call to salvation. Now just a minute. I think this audience is of average intelligence. What would you think if I were to stand here and extend a call to all of you, "Come inside this building," but you're already here? And if you're already here then it would be vain for me to call you to come into this building. But this is the sense or the senselessness of my brother's proposition. When one is already in salvation, God calls him to salvation my brother says. No sir. It wouldn't be a call to salvation. That's a call to one who already has received salvation. And I want to tell you I wrote some articles and published them in the Baptist Monitor on and used just about every scripture that Calvinists use concerning this effectual call and I want to tell you that not one of those scriptures that they use pertains to the call to salvation; but to the call to those who are already saved. Called to his kingdom in glory, called to an inheritance to obtain an inheritance and so on. But it's a call that is extended to those who are already saved. The call to salvation is extended by means of the gospel and the Holy Spirit accompanies the gospel and convicts the sinner and brings him to faith. Now Question #2

Is the call, is the effectual call made by the same means and in the same way to all the elect?

He said the Holy Spirit calls, the Holy Spirit regenerates. Well I know that but that wasn't what I asked. I asked is the effectual call made by the same means and in the same way to all the elect? Now if you

think it's made separate and apart from any means, you can at least tell me whether it was made in the same way to all the elect. But you didn't do that. You just said that the Holy Spirit calls, the Holy Spirit regenerates. Well I know that. But I want to know does it call in the same way to all the elect? Question #3

Does God call anyone to salvation apart from, and independent of the gospel or the word of God? If so please show the Bible record of such a call.

And my brother cited I Pet. 3:1, let's read this scripture. I Pet. 3:1, "Likewise ye wives be in subjection to your own husbands that if any obey not the word they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear." Then it's the wife that calls her husband to salvation. If you're going to use this scripture, it's the wife that does the calling. The wife does the winning of her husband apart from the word by her chaste conversation but it's the husband that would not obey the word. He has had the word preached to him and he would not obey it. He may be won by the wife, but this doesn't say that God calls him to salvation apart from the word of God. All right, Question #4

What attribute or quality in God moves him to deal with the non-elect in extending to them what is called common grace and the common ordinary operation of the Holy Spirit.

He says for the sake of the elect. God deals with them in common grace and the common operation of the Holy Spirit. This universal call to salvation that he mentioned a while ago and he admitted is made to all men in general, to all men a universal call. But he said nobody heeds it. This universal call is extended to men for the sake of the elect. Now can you imagine that. This every work of the Holy Spirit, every influence of the Holy Spirit, his goodness to those people, which goodness is designed to lead them to repentance is for the sake of the elect. But I want you to know that if the Spirit of God influences them to come to repentance and faith when there is no salvation for them then the Holy Spirit has lied to them and the Holy Spirit doesn't lie. (Ten minutes) When he influences men to come to repentance and faith it is because God verily has salvation for them. Because Christ died for them and he verily and sincerely calls them to salvation and they can be saved. Question #5

What end or goal or results does God intend to accomplish in the non-elect as he deals with them in common grace and the common operations of the Holy Spirit.

And he said well the non-elect may be the parents of some of God's elect. No record of Paul's parents having been saved. This fact I don't dispute that a person may be saved whose parents were not saved. No quarrel here. No quarrel here. But this does not require any of the common operation of the Holy Spirit nor of common grace. This does not require the Holy Spirit to call on them to salvation when there's no salvation for him. This does not require the Holy Spirit to influence a man to repentance when he can't be saved. This does not require any influence of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit could leave the non-elect alone. Not be good to him, not influence him to repentance and faith and still save his children. Yes, he could. All right.

I want to proceed with some other arguments at this point. My next argument is based on Matt. 22:1-14, this is the scripture that likens the call to salvation to the call to a marriage supper and Jesus answered and spake unto them again by parables and said, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son and sent his servants to call them, sent forth servants to call them, they were bidden to the wedding and they would not come. Again, he sent other servants saying tell them which are bidden behold I have prepared my dinner. My oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all these are ready. Come unto the marriage. But they made light of it and went their ways, one to his farm another to his merchandise and the remnant took his servants and entreated them spitefully and slew them. But when the king heard thereof he was wroth and he sent forth his armies and destroyed those murderers and burnt up their city. Then saith he to his servants, the wedding is ready but they which were bidden were not worthy. Go ye therefore, into the highways and as many as ye shall find bid to the marriage. So those servants went out into the highways and gathered together all as many as they found both bad and good and the wedding was

furnished with guest. When the king came in to see the guest he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment and he saith unto him friend how comest thou hither not having a wedding garment and he was speechless. Then said the King to the servant, to the servants bind him hand and foot and take him away and cast him into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth for many are called but few are chosen." In this parable Jesus likened the call to salvation to the call or invitation to attend a wedding feast and eat the benefits the banquet prepared. In verse 3 it is shown that some were called who would not come. Was the call that was extended to them sufficient for them to come to the wedding feast and partake of its benefits? If this parable does teach the call to salvation, then it is made clear that some are called to salvation who will not come. This alone ruins my opponent's doctrine that there is an effectual call to salvation that is extended only to the elect and that they cannot successfully resist it. If those in verse three who resisted the call and would not come were elect then there were some elect people who did successfully resist God's call to salvation. (Five minutes) If they were non-elect then there were some non-elect people who received the call to salvation sufficient for them to be saved. Either way it ruins my opponent's proposition and his doctrine of the effectual call. Now verse 14 nails it down. You listen to it. "For many are called but few are chosen." Will my opponent deny that verse 14 refers to the call to salvation? If he does, I ask him to tell us what it does refer to. Since there is only one kind of call mentioned in verse 14. That verse 14 says, "For many are called but few are chosen." Only one kind of call mentioned in verse 14. I ask my opponent to tell us how that call was different to the few who were chosen and to those who were not chosen. Now brother you've got a job on your hands. You've got to explain the difference in the one call that was extended to many. How was it different to the few who were chosen and those who were not chosen? When it was the same call. It cannot be denied that more were called than were chosen. And it cannot be denied that they were all called with the same call. Only one call mentioned in verse 14. Now I want to know how was the call different. What made the difference? Was it different in kind, the kind of call to those who were chosen? Was it a different kind of call to those who were chosen? Was it a difference in degree? Was it a difference in quality, what was the difference? Or was the difference found not in the call itself but in the response of those to whom the call was extended? There's the key to it. There's the answer. The difference was not in the call itself; the difference was in the response of those to whom it was extended. Those who were chosen received the call. Those who were not chosen did just what was shown in the parable, they would not come. Many were called. This verse has to do with that parable. That, in which an invitation was not extended to many people to come to the marriage many of them were invited or called to the marriage but some of them would not come. Only those who came were chosen or accepted. Now I want him to deal with this. I wanted him to deal with this. I want him to tell us the difference in that call. Verse 14 teaches clearly that the call to salvation is extended to many sinners who will not heed the call and therefore they're not chosen to salvation. Those who heed the call of God to salvation, the call of the gospel if you please are chosen to salvation. All right let us go on.

My next argument. (You don't have time for an argument, you got 35 seconds) All right. Thank you.