

# FOR THE LILY; AGAINST THE TULIP

By James Mr Crumpton<sup>1</sup>

## A Response By Paul Fahy

This is an impassioned article from the *Way Of Life* web-site organised by David Cloud.

The site has much useful information which I have benefited from. Mr Crumpton's sermon is vehemently anti-Calvinist, yet he seeks to champion God's sovereignty in salvation and is opposed to Arminianism, an odd coalescing of two opposite theological systems previously attempted unsuccessfully by Amyraldism. Mr Crumpton is clearly a godly man who wants to serve God, however, his thesis here is seriously flawed and it requires a rebuttal.

[James Crumpton's article is in the smaller sans serif typeface.]

[Read Romans 9:6-24; John 5:36-47 and Matthew 23:37-39.]

I am convinced that the Lord would have me speak tonight on, "I am for the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus Christ, and I am against TULIP theology."

The Lord Jesus is so precious. We thank God for His Person, for His message, for His salvation, His atoning sacrifice on Calvary, and for the salvation He has given us in His own precious Son.

The Word refers to the Son of God as "the Lily of the Valley" He is so wonderful! So precious! So lovely! We want to preach Him, to live Him, and to make Him known to the lost.

But, beloved, while we are for the Lord Jesus, the Lily of the Valley, we are very definitely against TULIP Theology. I say this not with sarcasm of the flesh, but with a broken heart.

### WHAT IS TULIP THEOLOGY?

Some call it Calvinism Some call it Hyper-Calvinism. Some call it Five-Point Calvinism. That is because there is a list that signify the words that present the principles that are involved in TULIP theology.

The "T" in the word TULIP is for Total Depravity.

The second letter in TULIP is for Unconditional Election.

The third letter in TULIP is for Limited Atonement.

The fourth letter in TULIP is for Irresistible Grace.

The fifth letter in TULIP is for Perseverance of the Saints.

Now I, beloved, am for the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus, but I am against TULIP theology--not part of it, not two points of it, not three points of it--but all of it.

### Comment

The acronym, TULIP, arose after the Synod of Dordrecht which met in the Netherlands from 1618-1619. This was an international meeting of Reformed theologians to discuss the problems being caused to the churches by the inroads of Arminianism, especially in

---

<sup>1</sup>James Crumpton is from Westside Baptist Church, Natchez, Mississippi. Mr Crumpton's article is from *O Timothy* magazine, Volume 13, Issue 2, 1996. This material cannot be placed on BBS or Internet sites without express permission from the author. Copyright 1995 by David W. Cloud. All rights are reserved by the author. Way of Life Literature, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061-0368, fbns@wayoflife.org. The Way of Life Internet web site is <http://www.wayoflife.org/>.

Holland. The followers of James Arminius (called ‘Remonstrants’) had formulated five points challenging the Biblical theology of the Reformers which covered the Doctrines of Grace, or how man is saved from sin. These proto-Arminian points were:

- God elects people on the basis of foreseen faith or unbelief. (Conditional Election.)
- Christ died for all men, loves all men, but only believers are saved. (Unlimited Atonement.)
- Man is so depraved that grace is necessary for faith or good deeds. (Early on, they virtually agreed with Total Depravity, later they departed from this.)
- Grace may be resisted. (Resistible Grace.)
- Whether all who believe persevere to the end is uncertain. (Originally unclear on Final Perseverance, later they denied it.)

The 62 Dutch and 24 International delegates condemned the theories of the Remonstrants, which later hardened into an even more destructive theology, and the Canons of the Synod of Dort (short for Dordrecht) were universally accepted as one of the Three Forms of Unity amongst Presbyterian churches (along with the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession). The TULIP acronym grew up after this and it became shorthand for Calvinism or Reformed theology, although the tenets of it can be traced through history to Augustine of Hippo and Paul the apostle. The Remonstrant leaders themselves, who had behaved appallingly in the Synod, strayed further from Biblical orthodoxy and spawned various heretical movements.

### **TOTAL DEPRAVITY**

This theology teaches the total depravity of man, and be sure you add, the total inability of man. Not there is no question but that the Bible teaches we are totally depraved, but it does not teach total inability. The Bible teaches that we came here totally depraved. Passage after passage talks about what terrible sinners we are, how we are lost and undone. But the Bible also teaches that the Lily of the Valley, the lovely Lord Jesus Christ, the Light of the world lights every man who cometh into the world, therefore making him responsible and giving him the ability to accept Christ as Saviour.

"There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light [capital L], that all men through him might believe. He [John the Baptist] was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light, that was the true Light, WHICH LIGHTEST EVERY MAN THAT COMETH INTO THE WORLD" (John 1:6-9).

We are born totally depraved, but the Lord Jesus gives enough light to every man to make him responsible to hear and to reject or accept the Gospel of the Son of God.

In John 12:32 did the Lord Jesus say, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw a few men unto Me"? No, He didn't say that. Instead, He said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw ALL men unto me." Though we are totally depraved, yet the Lily of the Valley gives us enough light to make us responsible and declares that He draws all men unto Him.

Notice John 5:40. Does this verse say, "And ye will not come to Me, because you are not one of the elect"? or, "Ye will not come to Me, because ye are not ordained"? He didn't say that. Rather He said, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." It is not that they were not elected; it is not that they were not ordained; it was that they WOULD NOT COME.

We are born totally depraved, but the Lord give us enough light to make us responsible. He gives light in nature. He gives light through creation. We are told in Romans 1:19,20:

"Because that which may be known of God in manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly see, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse."

He gives light through conscience. Look at Romans 2:11-16:

"For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified: For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;) In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel."

I repeat: We are born totally depraved, but the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus, gives enough light to make us responsible. He gives us light through creation. He gives us light through conscience.

Then we read in Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." If we could not respond, we would think the Lord Jesus was making fun of us to invite us to come. But, praise God, He makes us responsible and makes it possible that we can come.

I repeat: We believe in total depravity, but we do not believe in total inability that TULIP theologians try to force on us. So I am against the first point of TULIP theology and for the Lily of the Valley, our Lord Jesus Christ.

### **Response**

Mr Crumpton makes much a verse known as 'The Quaker's text', so called because Quakers use John 1:9 to justify their heresy that every man has an inner light from God, which is sufficient.

This verse is variously interpreted, Greek scholar Robinson ('Word Pictures') says that it may simply *'mean that all the real light that men receive comes from Christ, not necessarily that each one receives a special revelation'*.

John is not here talking about a personal application of Christ to every created man, but rather that every man is accountable, has a rational appreciation of right and wrong. No one disputes that God gives light to men, especially through creation and conscience, but this is not saving knowledge, it is not the ability to believe, it is not the light of the Gospel. It is enough to make men culpable and guilty before him.

There is no text which states that Christ gives all men the ability to choose or to reject him, but there are many which state that all men are unable to accept him. As if to emphasise this, a few verses later John says:

*But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, to those who believe in His name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. (Jn 1:12-13).*

In other words, only those who are empowered by God can receive (believe in) Christ. It is not their will but God's that is operative. Mr Crumpton makes v9 contradict v13.

Regarding Jn 12:32, the crucial question is 'what is meant by all?' Even in John's Gospel the word all has various meanings; for instance, it does not mean 'all men' in 3:26, 8:2, 10:8 and many other places. Similarly a few verses later 'the world' does not mean every single man in 12:19. The Greek word *pantas* does not mean 'all men' but 'all', in fact it has various meanings depending upon the context and can easily mean here 'every kind of man or tribe'. As in other places in John's Gospel, he introduces the word 'all' to emphasise that Gentiles as well as Jews are recipients of the Gospel.

Mr Crumpton ignores other clear verses which are very relevant:

- *And you He made alive, who were dead in trespasses and sins.* (Eph 2:1). Man is not sick and able to respond by his own strength - albeit an incapacitated strength - he is dead and unable to respond at all.
- *No one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him; and I will raise him up at the last day. ... Therefore I have said to you that no one can come to Me unless it has been granted to him by My Father.* (John 6:44,65) What can be clearer? No one can come to Christ without God's direct assistance.
- *To the pure all things are pure, but to those who are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure; but even their mind and conscience are defiled. They profess to know God, but in works they deny Him, being abominable, disobedient, and disqualified for every good work.* (Titus 1:15-16) Responding to the Gospel, coming to Christ, is a good work. Sinful men cannot do this because their minds are defiled.

Mr Crumpton fails to understand that Christ calls men to do what is impossible for them: to believe and repent. However, in this call, power is given to those whom God has chosen, and so they are able to respond. Christ's healing ministry illustrated this truth when he called me to do that which they could not, such as cripples to 'stand', or to raise up a withered arm. As the infirm obeyed, they were healed and could stand or raise a withered arm. Lazarus was dead when Jesus told him to come forth. Power entered him and he walked out of the grave. The command does not imply ability. Lazarus could not hear let alone walk. It is only the power of God which gives ability.

Natural man is not only totally depraved but also totally unable to respond to the Gospel unaided.

### **UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION**

In the second place, I am for the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus Christ, but I am against unconditional election as taught in TULIP theology. This is one of the most horrible things I have ever heard. You know, beloved, they are saying that when a little baby is conceived in this mother's womb, and another is conceived in that mother's womb, then God hates the one and loves the other. For nine months, while those two mothers carry those babies, God hates one of them and loves the other.

When those precious little babies are born, God hates one and loves the other.  
 When they get to be teenagers, God hates one and loves the other.  
 When they get to be young married folks, God hates one and loves the other.  
 When they get to be middle-age folks, God hates one and loves the other.  
 When they get to be old gray-headed folds, God hates one and loves the other.  
 And He will hate that one through all eternity and He will love this one through all eternity.

Friend, the Bible knows nothing of such a thesis. It is not in here--not from Genesis to Revelation.

In fact, if the TULIP theologians are honest about it, they would go further back that and say, "Back before the foundation of the world, God knew what mothers would have a little baby. Even back there He started loving one and hating the other, and He will love one and hate the other through all eternity to come." How absurd! Beloved, that is close to blasphemy against our God.

Let's put this in the language of what we saw a moment ago in John 5:40. Did Jesus say, "Since before the foundation of the world I determined that you would go to Hell; you cannot come unto Me"? Wouldn't that be a changing of the precious Word of God? He said, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life."

Turn to Matthew 23:37, and put that in the language of the TULIP theologians and see how far they missed what our God has to say. To put it in their language: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and thou which stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often will I have gathered you, but you are not unconditionally elected, therefore you will have to go to Hell. There is no hope for you." Isn't that far from what our Lord Jesus said? What He said is this: ". . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens. . . and ye would not!" He didn't say it was ordained. He didn't say it was predestined. He didn't say you were elected to go to Hell before the foundation of the world. A thousand times, no. Beloved, that theology didn't come out of the Bible.

Turn with me to John 3:16, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son..." Now the TULIP theologians have several worlds. They are saying John 3:16 is not the whole world but the world of the elect. It takes a great stretch of the imagination to try to believe such a thing. "For God so loved the world [everybody], that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

But the TULIP theologians say, "But, Brother James, God doesn't love sinners." You are wrong. I believe what Jesus said. In Mark 10:21 we have the story of the rich young ruler, a lost man who came to Jesus to inquire about eternal life. "Then Jesus beholding him loved him . . ." Jesus, beholding the sinner, loved him! ". . .and [Jesus] said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up thy cross, and follow me." Yes, beloved, let the TULIP theologians say what they will about unconditional election, but God says He loves sinners and He sent the Lord Jesus Christ to die for sinners. When the Lord Jesus was here on earth He loved sinners. He went home with them. He had supper with them. Jesus was known as "a friend of sinners."

TULIP theologians are not very friendly toward sinners, but the Lord Jesus is a friend of sinners. I am glad He is. I got to be one of His children because He loves sinners, because He came to save sinners, because He is a friend of sinners. Yes, He is. Indeed He is. So it is totally unscriptural to say there is unconditional election.

I want you to look with me at a few verses they use erroneously to try to teach this doctrine.

Let me first say this. I wrote a missionary one day: "I want to make emphatically clear that we do not want missionaries to be affiliated with the Maranatha Baptist Mission who believe in the five points of Calvinism." And I added, "There is some question about your theology. Tell me, do you believe that God's grace is irresistible? Do you believe that God arbitrarily begins to love or hate little babies in their mother's womb?" I wrote, "Do you believe that we are saved because of the perseverance of the saints, or because of the perseverance of the Saviour?"

What did he write back? "Who art thou that repliest against God?"

I hadn't replied against God: I had just asked him some simple questions. He was quoting to me from Romans, chapter 9, one of the favorite passages of these who try to teach us this ungodly doctrine. They look at Romans 9:13 and say, "See, 'it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.' Therefore, there is unconditional election."

First, this verse has nothing to do with salvation. It is talking about how God chose Jacob in the Messianic line in contrast to Esau, not about God loving and wanting to save Jacob, and God hating and wanting to damn Esau!

By the same principle, I could look out here at some of you preachers tonight and ask, "Do you have a brother?" "Sure."

"Well, isn't it interesting that God chose you to be a preacher and He didn't choose your brother?" It would be the same thing from the standpoint of principle as to what we have in Romans, chapter 9.

God is not saying, "I want to damn Esau and send him to Hell and take Jacob to Heaven, so I make an unconditional election that Jacob will go to Heaven and Esau will go to Hell." That is gross misinterpretation of God's precious Word.

In fact, "hate" here is the same word the Lord Jesus used when He said, "If you are going to be My disciples, you will have to hate your father and mother and your brother and sister and your wife and your children." What it means is "prefer." Jesus was saying, "If you are going to be My disciple, you must prefer Me and put Me first instead of wife and children and relatives or other folk," God is saying here that He prefers to put Jacob first in the Messianic line and to leave out Esau. That has nothing to do with God's unconditional election, His sending somebody to Hell and another to Heaven back in eternity.

I believe in the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus Christ, but I am against TULIP theology.

Another verse these folks use to try to teach us that God carries out unconditional election is Ephesians 1:4, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." This didn't say a word about Heaven or Hell. It is talking about God choosing us to "be holy and without blame before him in love."

Nobody was arbitrarily assigned in unconditional election to Hell or to Heaven before the foundation of the world.

Again, John 15:16 is a verse these folks use to try to prove TULIP theology. There Jesus said, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye should ask of the father in my name, he may give it you." This is not saying the Lord chose some for Heaven and some for Hell. This is saying the Lord chose and ordained that born-again, blood-washed believers should bring forth fruit to the glory of God. It has nothing to do with the salvation of the sinner.

They say, "Brother James, what about Romans 8:29?" First is that precious verse 28: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." Then verse 29: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren."

This is not saying that God predestinated some to Hell and some to Heaven. This is saying that God predestinated that every born-again, blood-washed believer should be made to conform to the image of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is not talking at all about the Lord assigning some to Hell and some to Heaven in unconditional election before the foundation of the world.

Salvation is always--from Genesis to Revelation--conditional on faith. I didn't say that faith is the work of merit; I said it is the condition to salvation. If there is a condition for salvation, you can't say it is unconditional. There is a condition--the condition is faith. I repeat, it is not merit, it is not work, but it is a condition. God never saves anybody except they come by faith to the Lord Jesus Christ.

I am for the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus Christ, and I am against TULIP theology.

## **Response**

Well, there is a great deal to look at here. Let's list Mr Crumpton's points:

1. *The Bible knows nothing of such a thesis. [God's love and hate] It is not in here--not from Genesis to Revelation. Mr Crumpton is wrong, God does hate sinners:*
  - *You hate all workers of iniquity. You shall destroy those who speak falsehood; The LORD abhors the bloodthirsty and deceitful man. (Ps 5:4-6)*
  - *The wicked and the one who loves violence His soul hates. (Ps 11:5)*
  - *You love righteousness and hate wickedness. (Ps 45:7)*
  - *Esau I have hated. (Mal 1:3)*
  - *Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated. (Rm 9:13)*
  - *You hate the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I [God] also hate. (Rev 2:6)*
  - *My heritage [Israel, as God's son] is to me like a lion in the forest; it cries out against me; therefore I have hated it. (Jer 12:8)*

- *And you shall not walk in the statutes of the nation [Canaanites] which I am casting out before you; for they commit all these things, and therefore I abhor them. (Lev 20:23)*
  - *I dismissed the three shepherds in one month. My soul loathed them. (Zech 11:8)*
2. *Even back there He started loving one and hating the other, and He will love one and hate the other through all eternity to come." How absurd! It is closer to blasphemy to call God's word 'absurd'. He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, having predestined us to adoption as sons by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will (Eph 1:4-5). The elect were chosen 'in love' before time, according to God's own good pleasure. The elect are seen by God as sons united in Christ, and thus are loved before they are even born. But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren beloved by the Lord, because God from the beginning chose you for salvation through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth. (2 Thess 2:13).*
  3. *Matthew 23:37 – O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the one who kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing! This is often used in opposition to true Calvinism, but what does it actually say? It does not say that Jesus wanted to draw certain people but they resisted him. It says that Jesus lamented over Jerusalem, favoured by God throughout the Old Covenant, and wanted to gather the children of Jerusalem (i.e. the elect, the beloved children of God he wanted to gather) but Jerusalem (representing the rebellious religious leadership of the city) rebelled against God and even killed God's prophets. This verse is of no use to Mr Crumpton's argument at all.*
  4. *John 3:16 – We've explained what variations the word 'world' can have, even in John's Gospel. If it meant 'everyone' in v16, then it means that in the next verse: *For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.* So, according to Mr Crumpton, the whole world is going to be saved and hell does not exist. No need for preaching the Gospel then.<sup>2</sup>*
  5. *The rich young ruler – one can only make an argument here if one knows what happened to this man afterwards. Was he saved later – if so, that is the reason Christ loved him, he was an elect man and the Lord, with the gift of knowledge, knew this.*

---

<sup>2</sup> According to standard Greek lexica, the word *kosmos* has a variety of meanings, determined by the context:

- 1) an apt and harmonious arrangement or constitution, order, government
- 2) ornament, decoration, adornment, i.e. the arrangement of the stars, 'the heavenly hosts', as the ornament of the heavens. 1 Pet. 3:3
- 3) the universe
- 4) the earth
- 5) the inhabitants of the earth, men, the human race
- 6) the ungodly multitude; the whole mass of men alienated from God, and therefore hostile to the cause of Christ
- 7) world affairs, the aggregate of things earthly
- 7a) the whole circle of earthly goods, endowments riches, advantages, pleasures, etc, which although hollow and frail and fleeting, stir desire, seduce from God and are obstacles to the cause of Christ
- 8) any aggregate or general collection of particulars of any sort
- 8a) the Gentiles as contrasted to the Jews (Rom. 11:12 etc)
- 8b) of believers only, John 1:29; 3:16; 3:17; 6:33; 12:47 1 Cor. 4:9; 2 Cor. 5:19

Traditionally, he did get saved, but we do not know for certain; but Mr Crumpton can make nothing of this unless he could prove that the man was reprobate. The fact that he wanted to serve God at all implies he would eventually respond to the Gospel.

6. *'Esau have I hated.'*...*First, this verse has nothing to do with salvation.* – Well, I'm afraid it does. Paul's argument in Rm 9 is about who the true seed of Abraham is, and thus who is really of God's Israel. He explains that only those who share Abraham's faith, who are converted and born again are the seed of Abraham. So it is about salvation. Then in v11, Paul specifically states that election has nothing to do with man's choice (not just man's works) but is about God's decree. He proves all this by quoting Malachi where God states that he hates Esau but loves his brother Jacob. In v15, God specifically states that he will have mercy only on those he has chosen to give mercy, the very opposite of what Mr Crumpton claims. Paul then illustrates this by showing how Pharaoh's heart was hardened. He then uses the image of the potter determining the clay pots he makes. Finally Paul categorically states that God decrees in eternity that some will be fitted for hell: *God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,* (9:23-23). God selects some to display his mercy and grace, others to express his justice and wrath. The miracle is that some are chosen to mercy at all since all are sinners.
7. *Hate. What it means is "prefer".* – Well I'm afraid this is just plain wrong. Hated' does not mean 'to love less' (as some claim). The Greek word *miseo* means, 'to hate, to pursue with hatred, to detest', and in some places is connected with murder (e.g. the plot against Jesus, Jn 15:25). The fact that this makes other verses hard to explain is not the point. [In fact, that we are to hate even ourselves is an important matter to understand properly, weakening the force of the word will not help us interpret the verses. (Lk 14:26 and Jn 12:25)]
8. *Nobody was arbitrarily assigned in unconditional election to Hell or to Heaven before the foundation of the world.* – but the choice is God's, therefore the selection is eternal:
  - *"I will have mercy on whomever I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whomever I will have compassion." So then it is not of him who wills, nor of him who runs, but of God who shows mercy.*(Rm 9:15-16)
  - *What if God, wanting to show His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath prepared for destruction.* (Rm 9:22)
  - *The LORD has made all for Himself, Yes, even the wicked for the day of doom.* (Prov 16:4)
9. *John 15:16* – But if God chose us to bear fruit and we did not choose him, it means that the choice was done in eternity. Eph 2:10 states that even our good works were determined by God in eternity: *For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them.*
10. *Romans 8:29* – this argument is typical of Mr Crumpton's sophistry throughout. If God predestined some to be conformed to Christ (i.e. saved and sanctified by grace) some then he did not predestine others to be saved. That is simple logic. It won't do to get out of the meaning of the text by stating that it is just about believers being predestined to be conformed to Christ. The verse states that God foreknew some (not



all, and foreknew here has the weight of being 'loved') and these he predestined to be conformed to Christ, to be part of God's family. This clearly implies that others are not so chosen and are outside God's family by God's sovereign choice. In fact the next verse makes it clear stating that only these are justified and glorified. So, again Mr Crumpton fails to pull the wool over our eyes, it is not merely about good works but about being justified and glorified as a result of God's selection.

11. *Salvation is always--from Genesis to Revelation--conditional on faith.* – No! Faith is everywhere stated to be a gift of God, so salvation is not conditional on a human activity. [See Acts 14:27, 18:27; Eph 2:8-10; Phil 1:29; Jn 6:29] Likewise, repentance is also a gift of God [Acts 5:31, 11:18; 2 Tim 2:25-26] In fact, someone desiring to repent may be completely unable to do so if God withholds grace [Heb 12:17.]

### LIMITED ATONEMENT

I am against TULIP theology that teaches limited atonement. They say that the blood of Christ is not for everybody, just for an elected few. They go further and say that if the blood of Christ is for everybody and everybody doesn't get saved, then it means God failed. It means no such thing! It means people fail to receive what God provided for them. God provided salvation for sinners everywhere, but if they don't come, God has not failed; people have simply limited what God wanted to do for them.

Now, our TULIP theologians would say, "Preacher, you really walked in to a trap. You can't limit God." That 's what they think!

Turn with me to Psalm 78:41. It speaks of Israel and says, "Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and LIMITED THE HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL." They kept God from doing for them what He wanted to do. Even some of these TULIP theologians have kept God from doing something for them that He wants to do.

I believe the blood of Jesus Christ is for ALL sinners. But some poor sinner may come up and say, "How do you know it is for me?" Because it is for EVERY sinner, everywhere.

There are several words in the Bible translated "redemption." *Agoraze, exagorazo, lutroo* speak of redemption. In one case redemption of one who never was saved, though redemption was provided; in another case, saved and taken out of the slave market, but never accepting all that the Lord has for him; the other one, where one was saved from the market and made totally free.

We have a lot of Christians who are not free today. That is sad, isn't it? Let's look at that first word for a moment--*agorazo*. Look at 2 Peter 2:1: "But there were false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them [*agorazo*, redeem them], and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

We go on down to verses 2, 3 and 4:

"And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not. For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment..."

He said they denied the One who bought them, so salvation was for them. It wasn't that it wasn't for them: it was that they didn't accept what the Lord had offered. Nobody will be at the judgment of the great white throne and consigned forever to Hell, for whom the blood of Christ was not shed on the cross.

Look with me at John 1:29. When He saw Jesus coming unto him, John the Baptist said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of"--the few elect whom the Lord has picked out in His limiting the blood of Christ on the cross? No. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the WORLD." "World" means everybody.

Look at Hebrews 2:9. They say "world" doesn't mean the whole "world." The Scripture says, "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." The Word says "every man."

When I wrote an editorial in my paper on "God So Loved Everybody," I got one of the most scorching letters from a man telling me I was either ignorant, hypocritical, or prejudiced against Calvinists. Then he did add, "I don't believe you are hypocritical or ignorant." And I am not prejudiced--I am against TULIP theology!

First Timothy 4:10 says, "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe"--meaning He came and died for all men, that He is the Saviour of all men, and He literally becomes the Savior of the ones who receive Him. That one condition is your faith--not merit but is the condition. And if it is the condition, it is not unconditional election.

Turn with me to 1 Timothy 2:5,6: "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." Now wouldn't I be stretching the Scripture to say that He is the ransom for all the elect, for all the specially ordained, when the Scripture says He is the ransom for A-L-L period?

First John 4:14: "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world"--not the elect world, not the ordained world, not the world within the world, but the world.

First John 2:1,2: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not, And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." The blood of Christ is shed for everybody.

What does the Word of God say in Isaiah 53:6? "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of [some of us? No--] us all."

The story is told of a man who was in a meeting where one of God's fine preachers was preaching in London, England. In the last service of the meeting this man didn't come to the Lord, but he came under terrible conviction.

The meeting was over and the preacher was leaving. This man under conviction ran down to the train station and said, "O preacher, I need to get saved and I need your help."

The preacher hurriedly said, "I have to get on this train to make my next engagement. So go home and read Isaiah 53:6. Go in at the first ALL and come out at the last ALL, and you can get saved."

The sinner went home and read those words: "ALL we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us ALL." The poor sinner said to himself, The preacher said, "Go in at the first `all,'" which says we are all sinners--and I surely have been a sinner. And the preacher said, "Come out at the last `all'"--which says the Lord has laid on Jesus the iniquity of us all. That means my sins are atoned for with the precious blood of Jesus Christ!

Beloved, the blood of Christ is for all sinners everywhere.

A dear friend of mine in South Texas began to preach that the blood wasn't for everybody. One of my preacher brothers said to him, "Brother So-and-So, you know that you are the elect and the blood was shed for you. But how are you going to prove to your little daughter that it is for her also?"

If this doctrine is so, it is a strange thing that everybody who found out about it was in the elect. Seems like some of these preachers would get up and say, "I'm left out. I wasn't in the elect."

I am for the Lily of the valley, the Lord Jesus Christ, and I am against TULIP theology.

## Response

1. *Psalm 78:41... They kept God from doing for them what He wanted to do.* – This verse does not help Mr Crumpton since the word translated ‘limited’ really means: ‘to cause pain, to wound’. The rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness hurt God in the sense that God, as the nation’s Father, was saddened by their sin. To state that mere man is capable of limiting God, from stopping God in his tracks, is a very real; blasphemy as it is an insult upon the dignity of God by stating a lie about his power. I really cannot believe that Mr Crumpton actually makes this statement.
2. *The blood of Jesus Christ is for ALL sinners.* – Every sinner that turns to God for salvation will have the blood of Jesus made available for forgiveness of sins. No one who truly repents will fail to be cleansed. This is different from stating that Christ’s blood was shed for wicked men who never repent and are now (or will be) in hell. Can it be possible that the most precious commodity in the universe could be given to evil people and wasted? Jesus himself stated that his atonement was for his people, and he prayed for those but not for the world. (Jn 17:2,9).
3. *2 Peter 2:1* – This is variously explained. One answer is that Peter is referring to superficial, professing converts who were members of a church for a while and then fell away. This is why *despotes* (‘master’) is used for ‘Lord’ and not *kurios*. *Despotes* is the word used for God the Father as ruler of the world, as a master of his servants; as distinct from Jesus Christ as the Lord of his own people. Redemption by Christ’s blood is not intended here. Whenever Christ’s redemption is mentioned, the price of that redemption is always referred to (Acts 20:28; 1 Corinthians 6:20, 7:23; Ephesians 1:7; 1 Peter 1:18,19; Revelation 5:9). *The word “bought” regards temporal mercies and deliverance, which these men enjoyed, and is used as an aggravation of their sin ... [being] derogatory to the glory of the divine perfections, and which deny one or other of them ... being disobedient and reprobate.* (John Gill, Comm., in loc.)
4. *John 1:29; 1 John 4:14; 1 John 2:1,2* - We have already explained that the word ‘world’ has many shades of meaning in the NT, even within John’s Gospel. It certainly does not always mean everyone, it is ludicrous to suggest that it does. God is redeeming the world in the sense that he is saving a race of people to populate the new world (heavens and earth) he is going to create. He will then have a world that obeys him. But that doesn’t mean that every man who ever lived is going to be saved. Imagine a general called to save a town from an invader. He besieges it and then captures the town relieving the townspeople. The news is proclaimed that he saved the town, and he did; but in doing so many of his own men were killed and not a few of the town’s population. Saving the town did not equate to saving everyone in it. This is just simple logic. Again, if Jesus took away the sin of the whole world, there is no hell and no sinners.
5. *Hebrews 2:9* – ‘taste death for every man’. Firstly, the word ‘man’ is not in the text at all. The Greek words *huper pantos* mean ‘for the whole’ and may refer to the whole church (v12), or ‘for everyone, i.e. all of the sons he is bringing to glory (v10), all of the brethren (v11), all God’s elect children (v13). The words cannot be forced to mean something alien to the context of the passage, the epistle or the rest of the NT.
6. *1 Timothy 4:10* – God is the saviour of all men in the sense of his providential goodness to ensure the necessities of life: sun, rain, harvest etc. If it meant the saviour of all men in the sense of redemption, then all would be saved and hell would not exist. If God saves, then people do not fall away or else God is no saviour. If God saves all, all are saved. Since this is palpably not the case, ‘saviour’ here must apply

to providence and not redemption. This is especially true of those who believe; God's providence is especially in action to safeguard the lives of those who later believe. Once they are converted, God's care is still safeguarding them and protecting them from evil. Since this is true, there is great reason to trust that God will fulfil all his promises.

7. *1 Timothy 2:5,6* – Again the point is what the word 'all' means in context. Like 'world', *pantas* does not always mean every single living (or dead) person. It can mean: all of one kind, all of every kind, all of some kinds, some, all, etc etc. Five verses earlier, Paul asks that converts pray for 'all men'. If that means every living person how can it be done? He means pray for all types of people, including rulers who persecute the church. [Some in the church found it difficult to pray for certain types of people: oppressive leaders, the rich etc.]. In Matt 20:28, Jesus stated that his life would be '*a ransom for many*'. If one insists that Paul means 'everyone', then Paul is contradicting Jesus. If Jesus meant everyone, he could have said so. What Paul means is all of the elect.

### IRRESISTIBLE GRACE

I am against TULIP theology in teaching irresistible grace. Such a thing is unheard of in the Bible. Let's read Matthew 23:37 in TULIP theology language: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered you, and you sure are going to have to come, because you can't resist My grace. You will have to be saved because I want you to."

Does the Bible say that? No! There is no irresistible grace there. Turn to Acts 7:51, and let's see what Stephen said: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." It sounds like this grace is resisted. Emphatically yes--it is resisted.

Well, our TULIP theologians say that the Lord gives a general call and He gives a specific call--"effectual" is what the call is. In other words, are you theologians trying to tell us that God is a hypocrite--that He gives a general call and doesn't mean it? It sounds like blasphemy to me! God never issues any calls without meaning them! Don't come to me with some "general call" and some "effectual call." When He says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden," He means every heavy laden and burdened person can come. Jesus is not insincere. God forbid that we should even think it, much less advocate it.

The TULIP theologians remind me somehow of the evolutionists, who think that they are more accomplished academically than are the rest of us.

Well, any fool could believe the truth of creation in the book of Genesis ten times easier than he could the theory evolutionists try to force on him. The TULIP theologians pose as superior to most of us academically. But it is a lot easier to believe what Jesus said than it is to believe what the TULIP theologians say. I don't find it hard to believe what Jesus said, but I do have a hard time believing what TULIP theologians say.

Now, they say, "Brother James, what about Matthew, chapter 20?" Well, let's look at Matthew 20:16: "So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen." Where is this verse? At the end of a parable. This parable has to do with service and rewards, not with salvation from sin. So they yank it right out of context and try to make it mean something it doesn't mean.

It is about as silly as the story I heard of the fellow who was dating his girlfriend. She was spiritual and he wasn't. But he still wanted to impress her with his "spirituality." So everywhere this traveling salesman went, he would send her a telegram and stick a verse of Scripture on it. He had read a verse over in 1 John, chapter 4, that said, "Perfect love casteth out fear," so he thought that would be a good one for her. But he didn't know there is a difference in 1 John and the Gospel of John. So when he made up the telegram, instead of putting 1 John 4:18, he put John 4:18, which reads, "Thou hast said well, I have no husband: For thou hast had five husbands!"

When you start pulling a verse out that talks about rewards and service and make it apply to salvation, you, too, are far off.

Now in the same book, Matthew 22:14, we come to those same words again, "For many are called, but few are chosen." Let's go back and see the parable as the Lord Jesus gave it. This one is on salvation. Here He is comparing salvation to a big banquet. The goodman of the house invites all the folks to come to the wedding feast. But one is inside without a wedding garment. When the goodman of the house asks him where it is, "He was speechless." The goodman instructed, "Cast him out."

What is the message of this parable? Beloved, in those wedding feasts over there, when one was invited to the wedding, a wedding garment was bought and given to the invited one. But this guy strutted up to the wedding thinking, I'll go in my own garments. I'll not accept the garment provided. But the goodman of the house said, "Cast him out!"

Now that is true of the message of salvation. God demands perfect righteousness if we are to go to Heaven. And here we are in our tattered rags and nakedness of sin. But our God provides, as a free gift, imputed righteousness, which is a robe given to all sinners who come to Christ. And if you refuse the robe, you will be cast out. That is not TULIP theology, that is the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus, saying, "I have provided redemption for all sinners everywhere. So come, sinners, come, for all things are now ready. The feast is prepared. O taste and see that the Lord is good!"

## Response

Acts 7:51 – 'resist' only appears here in the New Testament and means 'to fall upon, to oppose, to be adverse'. It does not mean that men were able to stop God in his tracks, but that they opposed his message.

That there is a general call and a special call is clear from a reading of scripture. The call of the Gospel goes out to everyone, that is clearly the general call, yet scripture shows us that there is a separate activity within this (a call) when God draws certain people to him, people who heard the general call along with others. In fact the word 'church' means 'the called out ones'.

- 1 Cor 12:3: *no one can say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit*. If no one can confess Christ unless the Holy Spirit gives him power, and if some do not believe, then the Holy Spirit has given power to some (the elect) but not to others (the reprobate). That is an obvious fact.
- Jn 5:21: *the Son gives life to whom He will*. If Jesus only gives life to those he chooses, then there are some who hear the Gospel who are saved, while others are not. The call of the Gospel separates: it results in life to some and hardens others in unbelief (2 Cor 2:16).
- 2 Tim 1:8-10: *the gospel according to the power of God, who has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before time began*. God saved us when he called us by his grace. This grace was secured when it was given us in Christ in eternity. It was not given when we chose to believe in our own strength. We had this grace allotted to us before we were born.
- Heb 9:28: *... those who are called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance*.
- Jude 1: *To those who are called, sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ*.
- 1 Pt 2:9: *Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light*.
- 2 Thess 2:14: *He called you by our gospel*.

From these, and many other texts, we see that there is a calling of the Gospel message, but there is also a calling of some to eternal life. The Gospel call, then, separates men: some respond some reject the message. Logically, there are only two reasons for this: 1) men choose to accept or reject the Gospel, 2) God empowers some to respond and passes others by. Scripture shows that the latter is true (as we have seen in this paper). Just one verse is enough to prove this: Jn 6:44: *No one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him.* The separation of men is decided by God not man. Therefore, there is a call of some within the Gospel call. Scripture makes this obvious, in fact, this is why Jesus said that many are called (in Gospel preaching) but few are chosen (by God's effectual call).

The Bible says that God draws individuals to Christ, that the Son gives life to whom he will, that only the Holy Spirit can enable a person to make Jesus his Lord. The Trinity is behind drawing individuals to eternal life. Mr Crumpton says that everyone is drawn, but some reject that offer, thus making man greater than God. Such a theology is clearly unbiblical.

Regarding the Gospel call being genuine: I totally agree that God always means what he says, he is no hypocrite. This is why we must be careful in our speaking when we evangelise. The apostles never used the methods the church uses today. They never said 'God loves you so accept him in your heart'. Nothing like that was ever used, in fact the word 'love' does not appear in the book of Acts at all. God does not issue calls without meaning them, this is why we must also speak correctly. We cannot say to a stranger, 'God has chosen you for eternal life', or 'Jesus has died for you personally', or things like that. Our language should be Biblical: God calls every man to repent, if you believe in Christ you will be saved, call upon God, seek God's mercy. These are the sorts of things we should be saying.

### **PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS**

I am for the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus, and I'm against TULIP theology. I am against TULIP theology that says it is the perseverance of the saints that gets us to Heaven. You are not here tonight as a Christian because of your perseverance. You are here because of the perseverance of the Lord Jesus.

Listen to Isaiah 41:10: "Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness." Some of our charismatic friends, some of our holiness friends, talk about holding on and holding out. We don't hold on and hold out; it is Jesus who holds us.

Suppose my Bible could talk and say, "You folks pray for me that I'll hold out and won't fall and get skinned on the corner of this pulpit." no need to pray for this Book to hold out; pray for my arm to hold out! Brother, no need to pray for you and me to hold out: we are held by the right arm of His righteousness! Praise God, He will never fails!

I got saved by the power of Jesus Christ; I am kept by the power of Jesus Christ; and I am going to Heaven by the power of Jesus Christ--not by the perseverance of James W. Crumpton.

Deuteronomy 33:27: "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." We are not holding out. "The everlasting arms" are hold out. The Lord Jesus said, "No man is able to pluck you out of My hands, and He is in the Father's hands!" That doesn't sound like our perseverance.

Look with me at Jude. This is a very interesting verse about perseverance. Verse 1: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ." Their perseverance? NO! " ... "preserved in Jesus Christ."

Turn to 1 Peter, chapter 1, verses 4 and 5. He says we are saved "to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, Who are kept by the power of ... "--the perseverance of the saints? NO! We are "Kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time."

"Well, Brother James, what are you?" A Bible-believing preacher! And if you are a Bible-believing preacher, you will be neither a Five Point Calvinist nor an Arminian.

Some fellow in Ohio wrote me, "Brother James, if you are not a Five-Point Calvinist, and you believe that the blood of Christ is for everybody, you have to be an Arminian."

No. A thousand times no! I am not an Arminian. We don't help God save us. God does it totally and altogether by Himself.

He said, "Well, if you believe the blood is for everybody, you have to be an Arminian."

I said, "Oh, no. It is true the Arminians believe that the blood is for all, but they have certain additives along with the blood." The Arminians believe that you must have the blood--plus certain dos and don'ts, and when you lose the dos and don'ts, you have lost your salvation. Which means they are depending on the dos and don'ts, not the blood. I believe we are saved by the blood of Christ and saved forever. It is totally a work of God. We are a lost bunch of poor, Hell-deserving sinners saved by the precious grace of the Son of God. Don't let anybody browbeat you and say you have to be an Arminian or a Five-Point Calvinist. Be a Bible-believing Christian and you won't be either one. We had the Bible a long time before there was a John Calvin. We had the Bible a long time before there was an Arminius. And both of them are wrong on the subjects with which we have been dealing tonight.

Oh, I am so glad I'm saved! But when I get to Heaven, I won't be able to brag on Mr Crumpton, because it is totally a work of the Lord Jesus. I was just a lost, no-good, Hell-deserving sinner, without God and without hope. One brother said, "He just gave me something for nothing." The grace of God is beyond our comprehension.

If we could go up tonight--up, up, up to the third Heaven and kneel down at the throne of God's grace and listen to the heartthrob of God's love; if we could go down, down, down to Calvary and see the torn, beaten, bruised body of the precious Son of God suffering all Hell for all sins, for all sinners, for all eternity, the Hell we would have suffered in the lake of fire and brimstone; then if we could go down, down, down to the charred walls of the damned and listen to the shrieks of damned souls in Hell-fire and brimstone; then if you can tell me how far it is from the highest Heaven to the lowest Hell by the way of Calvary, I can tell you how much is in that little word "grace."

Oh, the unmerited, unconstrained love of God toward poor Hell-deserving sinners like us! Lost, undone sinners on the slave block being sold and bought back by the precious blood of the Son of God!

I am for the Lily of the Valley, the Lord Jesus Christ, and I am against TULIP theology. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, ACCORDING TO the riches of his grace." Amen!

## Response

I entirely agree that the final perseverance of the saints is dependent upon the Lord Jesus Christ. So do all true Calvinists. Mr Crumpton is mistaken to believe otherwise. For instance:

- [It is the] *power of God, who confirms and preserves true believers in a state of grace.* (Canons of Dort, 5, Art 4).
- *That the only strength by which the Saints are enabled to encounter with all opposition, and to overcome all afflictions, temptations, persecutions, and trials, is only by Jesus Christ, who is the Captain of their salvation, being made perfect through sufferings, who hath engaged his strength to assist them in all their afflictions, and to uphold them under all their temptations, and to preserve them by his power to his everlasting Kingdom.* (London Baptist Confession 1644, XXXII)

- *God is still the same, and they are sure to be kept by His power until their salvation is complete, when they shall enjoy the purchased possession which is theirs, for they are engraved upon the palm of His hands, and their names have been written in His Book of Life from all eternity. This perseverance of the saints does not depend on them - that is, on their own free will. It rests upon the immutability of the decree of election, which flows from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father. It also rests upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ, and upon the union which true saints have with Him. - It rests upon the oath of God, and upon the abiding of His Spirit. (Baptist Confession of 1689; 17)*

Unfortunately his theological position, then expressed above, is logically untenable. If one fully believes that God is sovereign in salvation, that we can do nothing to contribute (as Calvinists teach) and if Arminianism believes that man must co-operate with God in salvation (man believes, man repents, man is not so sick in sin that he is unable) then there is no middle ground between the two.<sup>3</sup> If God does it all, man can do nothing. If man does something, God has not done it all. There is no logical middle ground. Mr Crumpton has expressly stated that man still has spiritual ability, that man must believe – therefore he sides with the Arminians. That is a plain and simple logical fact. To state otherwise is to delude oneself.

His final preaching about the grace of God is excellent, and I join with him in extolling that grace which lifts us up out of our sinfulness and weakness.

### **Conclusion**

Mr Crumpton's objections to Calvinism follow well-worn lines, arguments which have been used by Arminians and then discredited by sound theologians for centuries. His arguments mainly reduce to the following points: the word 'all' always means 'all' and the word 'world' always means 'everyone alive or dead'. As anyone with a concordance can verify, it is a simple matter to discover that 'all' does not always mean everyone, neither does the word 'world'. Furthermore, if these words were always to be applied in a universal way, then the Bible must teach Universalism, the heresy that everyone will be saved in the end, a doctrine too far for Mr Crumpton I suspect.

Also, Mr Crumpton's repeated use of ridicule is unhelpful to sound reasoning; that is his interpolation into scripture of what a Calvinist would have said. This is a cheap trick used to focus the mind of hearers, but it avoids the issue. There are plenty of real scriptures which state exactly what Mr Crumpton's sarcastic caricatures ridicule.

As a Baptist, Mr Crumpton should realise that the formal emergence of his denominational stream began on Calvinist lines. Most of the early UK Baptist confessions of faith were strongly Calvinistic.<sup>4</sup> It is a great shame that Mr Crumpton has abandoned the surer faith of his fathers. I find it a great sadness that someone who

---

<sup>3</sup> A system was proposed by Moses Amyrald (1596-1664) called Amyraldism, whereby God elected men but there was also a hypothetical universalism. The system is illogical and irrational and was condemned by all major sound theologians. However, variations of this false system is popular to day, although folk don't realise that they are following it.

<sup>4</sup> The London Baptist Confession, The 1689 Baptist Confession.



obviously loves the Lord Jesus and seeks to honour the truths of the Bible should so vehemently condemn what is clearly taught in scripture.

I understand that this article was originally a sermon, which would never have been meant for detailed dissection. However Mr Crumpton has agreed to put this into the public domain, indeed on a web-site for the viewing of anyone in the world, and it must, therefore, be presumed that it will be analysed. It is no defence to use the fact that it was a preached message to mitigate criticism.

My contention is that TULIP, as the Calvinistic interpretation of the Biblical doctrines of grace, is safe and sound from Mr Crumpton's attack; indeed, they are the true reflection of the teachings of the Lily of the Valley.

**The Response is Copyright Paul Fahy © 2003**

**Understanding Ministries**

<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

## Appendix One

### Selections from the London Baptist Confession of 1644

XXI

That Christ Jesus by his death did bring forth salvation and reconciliation only for the elect, which were those which God the Father gave him...

XXII.

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 ... 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 workings and operations; and thereupon are enabled to cast the weight of their souls upon this truth thus believed.

XXIII.

Those that have this precious faith wrought in them by the Spirit, can never finally nor totally fall away...

XXIV.

That faith is ordinarily begot by the preaching of the Gospel, or word of Christ, without respect to any power or capacity in the creature, but it is wholly passive, being dead in sins and trespasses, doth believe, and is converted by no less power, than that which raised Christ from the dead.

### Selections from the 1689 Baptist Confession

#### 3 God's Decree

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life through Jesus Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace. Others are left to act in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His glorious justice. ...

Those of mankind who are predestinated to life, God chose before the foundation of the world was laid, in accordance with His eternal and immutable purpose and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will. God chose them in Christ for everlasting glory, solely out of His free grace and love, without anything in the creature as a condition or cause moving Him to choose.

As God has appointed the elect unto glory, so, by the eternal and completely free intention of His will, He has foreordained all the means. Accordingly, those who are elected, being fallen in Adam:

- are redeemed by Christ,
- are effectually called to faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season,
- are justified, adopted, sanctified,
- and are kept by His power through faith unto salvation;
- neither are any but the elect redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved.

#### 5 Divine Providence

As for those wicked and ungodly men whom God as a righteous judge, blinds and hardens for former sin, from them He not only withholds His grace, by which they might have been enlightened in their understanding and affected in their hearts, but sometimes He also withdraws the gifts which they had and exposes them to certain objects which their corrupt state will make the occasion of sin.

- God gives them over to their own lusts, the temptations of the world, and the power of Satan, so that eventually they harden themselves under the same influences which God uses for the softening of others.

**The Response is Copyright Paul Fahy © 2003**

**Understanding Ministries**

<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>