

CHAPTER EIGHT

HYPER-CALVINISM VS. FULLER/SPURGEONISM

BY STANLEY PHILLIPS

One of the greatest and most precious works of Christ was His suffering and death to satisfy the justice of God on behalf of those He loved that they might not suffer the penalties due their sins, iniquities, and transgressions. This "satisfaction" for the broken law of God is called "**the atonement.**" The Particular Baptists of England and the Particular and Old School Baptists of the United States have always believed in "*limited atonement,*" or "*Particular Redemption.*" Plainly written, they have always believed that the Lord Jesus Christ suffered and died for the sins of a *particular people*, the elect, which stood "*hid in Christ in God,*" eternally in seed-substance, and that His *atonement was limited* to them only. This is exactly what the Scriptures teach. It is rather fool-hearted to say that Christ died for the *goats*, when He made it clear that He "***laid down His life for His sheep;***" or, that He died for those for whom He prayed to His Father, "I *pray NOT for the WORLD, but for those Thou hast given Me out of the world*" (John 17:9.)

The apostle, in the only place in the New Testament where the word "atonement" is used, said: "*And not only so, but **we** also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we **have NOW received** (not, "accepted," and it is in the past tense.) **the atonement.**" (Romans 5:11). Before proceeding, note the word "*now*". The Hyper-calvinists, as one might have realized, believe this as it is stated. The atonement is not something preachers will help Him do in this time period. Note also, the word "received." In the English of 1611, the words "receive" and "accept" have distinctive meanings. A "gift" is *given* and *received*. If it is never "received," then it was not given. It was only "offered". If something is "offered:" it may be *accepted* or *rejected*. To illustrate: "To as many as *received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God.*" (John 1:12.) In this case, He was the "gift of God" and they had*

"received" Him internally. They did not "accept" Him because He was not "offered" to them. Christ is God's "gift" to His people. He is never "offered" to any *man*. But He was *offered* to His Father as a sacrifice for the sins of His people, and the Father was well pleased. Look at the text more closely. "We," the believers "*joy in God.*" They must have heard "glad tidings"! Why? It is through our Lord Jesus Christ, whom "we **have received**" something **given**. And that something was the *atonement*. They have *now* received this free gift of God. They already, now, have received it. They are not going to receive it when they hear about it; or when they believe it; yet let alone when they mentally decide to "accept" it. Is this the truth? Test it. Has everyone of Adam's race *received* this *gift*? Unless you are a Universalist, you cannot answer "Yes." The apparent truth is that most have not! "*We received the atonement.*" The "we" clearly shows it to be a *limited* atonement, for "we" is a personal pronoun. It is limited to the people represented by this personal pronoun "we" in this text. It is a *particular* redemption, because of the "we" in particular, who are *redeemed* thereby does not include "*all*". One may do what one will; he cannot give this atonement to the "*world of the ungodly.*" That world may, and some do, join religious societies believing that Christ's death was "for everybody;" but they cannot *receive* something that is *not given* to them. The "evangelist" or "soul-winner" may *offer* the "*children's bread to dogs,*" (Matthew 7:6) and the "*dogs that are without*" (Revelation 22:15) may attempt to *accept* his most generous *offer*, but since it is not his to offer, it avails nothing as far as salvation is concerned until God *gives* it and the sinner *receives* it. And this is evident in the lives of those who nominally "accept Christ as their personal Helper" and "got saved." It is evident, abundantly evident, that it does not work. If it did, their lives and conversations would be much different. All this seems simple enough, but highly intelligent minds have stumbled on it. Truly, it "*is hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes.*"

This writer recently listened to a Mormon theologian (Philosopher) on Joe Smith and the Atonement. He was not

surprised to hear that Joe believed the atonement was for all mankind. He had heard this all his life. But he was surprised to hear the atonement was for all animal life on earth. Keenly listening now, he was even greater surprised that the atonement reached to the angelic creatures around the throne of God. But this was nothing compared to his shock is hearing that the atonement covered the devils in hell! Boy, you talk about **universal atonement** ! It became obvious that Peep-Stone Joe had no idea what the word “*atonement*” meant. But neither did the Arminians, nor do the present-day Pelagians and “four-point” Calvinists! Jesus said, “***I lay down my life for My sheep.***” He also said of others, “***Ye are not My sheep.***” Hence, the atonement is limited and it is particular.

Before going into this subject further, it would be well to show how very gifted believers can err, and still be led into the sweetness of the truth over time. Perhaps the greatest and best known twentieth century Calvinist writer was Arthur W. Pink. None in this century can come close to him on his presentation of the “*Sovereignty of God,*” and his “*Satisfaction of Christ.*” Both books show his leanings toward Fullerism, yet at the same time show his magnificent growth in grace and knowledge as his studies in the Scriptures progressed. In “*Letters From Spartenburg:1917-1920;* [published by Richard P. Belcher, 215 Spartan Drive, Columbia, SC 29212- Richbarry Press, P.O. Box 302, Columbia, SC 29202.] written when Mr. Pink was thirty-three to thirty-six years old, we read this:

"It is necessary to use the second term, *sufficient* in order to fully enforce the sinner's accountability. On the cross Christ did a work which has made it, abstractly or hypothetically possible for God to redeem whosoever He pleases. There a sacrifice was offered which was infinite in value, hence, "sufficient" to redeem the *entire world* had God so pleased." –That is St. Thomas Aquinas (Catholic) and Andrew Fuller’s (1782) heresy. Yet watch Mr. Pink:

In this, and following letters, He is clearly a Fullerite of the original cloth, holding to particular redemption and general atonement. But even this early, he was constantly in prayer, and having others in prayer for him, that he would be able to present the truth of God's grace. And God apparently heard his humble plea. The above quotation was written even as he was led into the sweetness of the truth as he was finishing his masterpiece: "*The Sovereignty of God*," and as he was working on his Studies in Scriptures in the "*Gleanings In Genesis*" series. This latter is riddled with hyper-dispensationalism, which was also greatly modified over time. In later years and with greater advantage of Scriptural knowledge and revelation, he wrote the following, which is close to the position of this writer:

"The *design* of **Christ's satisfaction** as made known in Scripture reveals its *scope* It is because a right view of *this point* is absolutely essential, if God is to be honored and Christ is to be glorified by us therein. The *enmity of the Serpent* against the Seed of the woman has been inveterate throughout the ages, and perhaps at no *other point* has he so persistently attacked the glory of Christ. While it is impossible for Satan to either undo the **finished work** of the Savior, or to *destroy* any of its fruits, yet he is permitted to *misrepresent* it, and nowhere has his subtlety been more exercised and manifested than in the means employed here. His very attempts to *discredit* the satisfaction of Christ has been made under the *guise of magnifying it*, and that is why he has succeeded in getting many men reputed as "orthodox" to **do some of his foul work for him.**" . . . "Which seems to have the greater tendency to *exalt* Christ: to say that He died because He desired and sought to *make possible* the salvation of *all mankind* or to say that He died only for God's elect, the "little flock"? Which seems to display the more His compassion for sinners? Which seems to bring out the more the value of His blood: to say that it avails only for a "few"? Or, to say that its merits are so infinite that every member of Adam's race would be redeemed did he or she but put their trust in it? The very fact that every one of us

would answer the question in the *wrong way* until we are *taught aright* from Scripture, not only evidences the *worthlessness* of carnal reasoning upon spiritual things, but also shows to what a terrible extent our minds have been *poisoned* by the venom of the Serpent. If it can be clearly shown that, in *reality*, the wider view *dishonors* Christ, then the consummate guile and malice of the Devil therein should be plainly apparent." "The fact is that those who advocate the *scheme of general redemption* are so far from magnifying the grace of God, that they, really, *degrade both Divine grace and Christ's sacrifice.*" ("Satisfaction of Christ," Bible Truth Depot, Swengel, Pa., pages 241 & 243.) What a transition of doctrine! Would to God all readers could be so blessed.

Here Mr. Pink is solidly on Biblical ground. This is not Fullerism! In fact, it is what Neo-calvinists charge as being "Hyper-calvinism." Granted, Mr. Pink will not go as far as Hyper-calvinists, but on this point they are agreed. In his "*Satisfaction of Christ*," he still maintained that the atonement did not mean "*at-one-ment*," which it certainly does, for by that satisfaction sin was removed and the elect sinners reconciled to God by Christ *IN WHOM* they have their subsistence as the "Body of Christ." It is possible he changed in latter years, for one blessed characteristic of Mr. Pink was that he was never satisfied to become "settled on the lees," as Moab! (Jeremiah 48:11.).

This book will be rather *sharp* with Mr. Spurgeon because of a dishonoring duality in his preaching. Unlike Pink, he never became clearer in his views. "Calvinism" to him was only another view-point of Christianity, maybe *more conservative* than Arminianism, but to him, both seem to have been viewed as the "truth." It appeared to him just another equally contending "plan of salvation." He most frequently advocated a general atonement when attempting to get "decisions." Then he sometimes denied it outright! It is not evident that he was ever really settled on one point or the

other, but at least once he stumbled on the subject and got it right: He wrote,

"Many divines say that Christ did something when He died that enabled God to be just and yet the Justifier of the ungodly. What that *something* is they do not tell us. They believe in an atonement made for everybody; but then, *their* atonement is just this: that Judas was atoned for as much as Peter, that the damned in hell were as much an object of Jesus Christ's satisfaction as the saved in heaven. Though they do not say it in proper words they must mean that, in the case of multitudes *Christ died in vain*, for they say He died *for all* and yet so *ineffectual* was His dying for them, that many were *damned afterwards*. Now, such an atonement I *despise* - I reject it. I had rather believe a *limited atonement that is efficacious for all for whom it was intended*, than a universal atonement that is not *sufficient for anybody* except the will of man be joined with it. Why, my brethren, if we were only so far atoned for by the death of Christ that anyone of us might *afterwards save himself*, Christ's atonement were not worth a farthing, for there is no man of us able to save *himself* - no, not under the Gospel." (C.H.Spurgeon on Isaiah 53:10.) That quotation is true; it is Hyper-calvinism at its best!

As Mr. Pink said: " ... it is the office of the Holy Spirit to *GIVE saving faith to everyone of those for whose sins Christ atoned.*" (ibid. page 245.) All the above truth, those people charged with "Hyper-calvinism" believe, except the one point: that the Hyper-calvinists believe all the elect are **already "judicially" saved**. For Mr. Spurgeon, this was one of his better days.

The quotations above illustrate the fact that one can be long in error, yet be brought to a more clear view of salvation by grace. A child of God does "*grow in grace and knowledge of the truth.*" For our Neo-calvinist readers, it is one design of this work to present the most consistent doctrine of the Christian faith, and to point out the glaring inconsistencies of Fullerism. If one is called of God, he *will grow* in grace. However, our next

example is one where an "orthodox" Baptist lost his sight, and followed Fuller into doctrinal ruin. This, too, is possible, as we shall show. Invariably this happens when ministers become impatient with the Lord's work of "*adding to the Church daily such as should be saved.*" By nature, man just cannot leave matters in God's hand and time! This impatience is the source of most departures from the Christian faith.

J. M. Pendleton, the well known American Baptist leader, published his "Christian Doctrines," in 1878, during the "*down-grade period*" in America. He first stated the doctrine so well that no Calvinist or Hyper-calvinist would have taken issue with him. Notice this first part of his statement on the atonement:

"What is it? It is the expiation of sin by the satisfaction rendered to the law and justice of God, through the obedience and death of Christ. I know of no better definition than this." (ibid., page 223.) That is very good, Mr. Pendleton! That is Christian and Baptists' doctrine! But watch how he *improves* on this definition, of which he says: "I know of no better definition than this":

"As to the *sufficiency* of the provisions of the atonement for the salvation of the *world*, there can be no doubt, and there need be no controversy. If as has been shown, the value of the atonement arises chiefly from the dignity of Christ's person [which it does not-SCP]. . . it is a grand impertinence to attempt to limit its *sufficiency*. . . **It places the world in a *savable state*.** It makes salvation an *attainable object*. That is, *all men* in consequence of the atonement occupy a position where *saving influences will reach them.*" (ibid. page 242.)

Unfortunately, the man was not a rational thinker. Every thought in the second part of his statement contradicts everything in his first part! If he put the two thoughts together in his reasoning, he cannot but proclaim the universal salvation and the extinguishing of the fires of hell! Gilbert Beebe once wrote: "It must be good to be a doctor!"

Look at the word he used in his first part: "*expiation*." That word means "to make atonement; the act of expiating". The word "atonement" means "*to exchange*;" i.e., "restoration to favor; to change mutually, to compound a difference; to reconcile." To "expiate" sin is to put sin away and to reconcile the sinner to the offended party- in this place, to God. So, according to Mr. Pendleton's definition, which cannot be "stated better," the atonement was made to render satisfaction to the law and justice of God by our Lord; and this atonement "exchanged something mutually," "reconciling" someone back to God. In other words, Christ is our Substitute, and He exchanged His righteousness for our sins. This part is Biblically correct.

But, given over to spiritual blindness, the doctor sees no contradiction in the two parts of his statement. As Fuller before him, and his contemporary fellow proselyter, Mr. Spurgeon, Pendleton considered himself to be a "Calvinist," when in reality, he and they were much more Arminians. The above quotes prove that point. In this century, that position of Arminianism rapidly slid into freewill Pelagianism. Few, if any, Arminians now remain.

Following Fuller, Pendleton says that Christ *expiated* our sins; but they are *not yet* expiated! He *satisfied the law* for all mankind; but He is still very unsatisfied because most will perish! Christ's *atonement*, did not *atone* for anything or anyone! It merely put men in a "*savable state*" whereby *saving influences* can reach them. He did not say what these "saving influences" were; but whatever they are, they are more effectual than anything Christ has done for them! According to this doctrine, Christ did not save *us by His blood*; we have not now *received the atonement*, Christ is *not now the Savior*, and others must find some "saving influences" to reach our case! They have invented a truck load of these *saving influences* this past century! Baptism for the dead by their loved ones, indulgences by the Catholic society, limbo, purgatory, intercession for the living by the departed spirits of the dead, and such things as Christian swimming pools, tennis courts,

little league base ball for Christ, "Tee" ball, parties, singles clubs, revivals, choirs, brass bands, youth-for-Christ, vacation Bible schools, praise bands, praise stomping for Jesus, *etc.* But one has reason to question whether these "influences" are really "saving" or not. All these are predicated upon the belief that Christ miserably failed to accomplish His purpose for coming into the world. As pointed out earlier, this strange illogical and unscriptural theory is *not Calvinism* and never has been! Yet the followers of Fuller call themselves "Calvinists" and call Calvinists "Hyper-calvinists"! We hope that anyone reading this that follows the "evangelical and benevolent movement" and has come to an understanding of Calvinism will earnestly question the thesis upon which that Pelagian error was founded. Faithful Calvinists see no need whatsoever for a *non-savable* (so-called) *atonement*.

The very great High Priest of the "Evangelical Calvinists" is Charles H. Spurgeon. [Applaud, kneel, and weep for joy!] To them, he is the only divine authority for what is "supposed" to be Calvinism and what constitutes "Hyper-calvinism," and what unscriptural methods should be employed in "winning souls" to Christ for Calvinists! Arminians love him as much as Calvinists and even Pelagians bow before his grace! It is interesting that every "Calvinistic" sounding sermon he has preached has been gleamed from that enormous library of his freewill sermons, and selectively republished. No one has needed to selectively republish his freewill sermons. All one has to do is buy his "*Pulpit Sermons*" and that is what he will get! Spurgeon served the church that John Gill had served. It seems to this writer that Spurgeon felt that occasionally he had to throw a Calvinist bone to the few "Gillites" which still remained in that apostate congregation.

When one reads the sermons of Spurgeon, he can easily find the Arminian element underlying his basic concepts. Just to select one book at random as an illustration, we picked up one which should be Calvinistic:

"*All of Grace*," (Moody Press.) Since Freewillers do not believe in free grace, this book must be Calvinistic. The title indicates that it is. That is the reason this writer bought it, and wasted his money! He thought it was a "sovereign grace book."

Here is the very first sentence in the little book: "The object of this book is the salvation of the reader." Wow! There it is! Spurgeon wasted no time getting to the core of his doctrine! That is his opening statement! Talk about ignorance of the way of salvation by Christ, this is a glaring instance! This book must be one of those "*saving influences*" Neo-calvinists talk about. Its implication is that Christ has not saved His people from their sins, but this little book can! According to this, He has failed! "And thou shalt call Him All-of-Grace, for it shall save the world of the ungodly from their sins." (Jude 15:110). Since apparently Christ was unable to "*save to the uttermost them that cometh to Him by faith*," this little book may do it. We must conclude that Spurgeon believed the readers of his little book were in Pendleton's "*savable state*." It seems clear, in that first statement, that salvation is not of the Lord, but is of proselyters. What Christ did was not effectual; but what this little book can do is! Maybe the little book will get better.

Second sentence: "He who spoke and wrote it will be greatly disappointed if it does not lead many to the Lord Jesus Christ." No. It did not get better! This little book may lead many to the Lord Jesus Christ that Christ was unable to call to repentance! Surely one would rather believe that their salvation, from start to finish, was of the Lord, than of a little lifeless book. To a Hyper-calvinist, this man, howsoever great and popular he was, did not know how or when God saved His elect people. In fact, it seems as if he did not believe that He had; or that He had an elect people either.

Mr. Spurgeon begged thousands down the aisles. He claimed to be a Calvinist. But today's Neo-calvinists have never learned the lesson that Spurgeon finally discovered. He had added thousands of "freewillers," dead sinners, to the Baptist Union in England. He saw many sliding into Socinianism (universalism) and became alarmed. He

realized, too late, that Calvinism among the proselytizing Baptists was almost dead. He attempted to get the Baptist Union to write Calvinism into their constitution of union. When it finally came down to a vote, approximately five to six thousands of delegates and visitors voted it down with cheers, whistles, and a deafening roar of joyous applause. One informed Mr. Spurgeon that only seven delegates stood with him! It appeared a sad day he left the Baptist Union, and a very short time later, his health failed, and the great Compromiser, Charles Haddon Spurgeon died. His lasting legacy goes mostly unheeded today by Neo-calvinists. He warned Baptists of where they were drifting in his last series of articles on, what he titled, "**The Down Grade.**"

Interestingly, the Southern Baptists' State Baptist Convention of Kentucky wrote a letter to Spurgeon supporting him and his call to Calvinism. They did not know that in 1892, it was too late for them too. They also slipped onto the "**Down Grade**" into the abyss of freewill Pelagianism very shortly thereafter. The Down Grade swept throughout the Fullerite factions, and by 1900, the once Particular Baptists, had become Freewill Baptists. The first president of the Southern Baptist Convention preached his last sermon on Election and Predestination just before he died in **1886**. The revival of the Old School Baptists between 1886 and 1910 was due, in part, to the exodus of thousands of free grace believers out of the Fullerite churches; and these believers wanted no part of "conditionalism" any more.

Fuller and Spurgeon's "evangelical motive" was based upon what they *thought* about the atonement of Christ. **The message was, and still is, that Christ wanted to save everybody;** and made the dreadful mistake of leaving it up to carnal minded preachers to do the most necessary part. It is noteworthy, that the three disciples that waited upon Him in the garden, while He prayed, "fell asleep." "Can you not watch and pray an hour?" And finally He said, "Sleep on."

In the Fuller/Spurgeon view that Christ' death was sufficient "for all men," the main blind spot in their understanding was what the Godhead had accomplished. They failed to believe that what the Godhead engaged in was

according *"to His eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."* (Ephesians 3:11) The obtaining of an inheritance among the saints is *"predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."* (Ephesians 1:11); and *"this is the will of God, even your sanctification."* All those who are called by the Holy Spirit to life and salvation are *"called according to His purpose."* (Romans 8:28.) The election of one person and not another, as in *"Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated"* is *"that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works (as the Neo-calvinists press upon their hearers), but of Him that calleth."* (Romans 9:11.)

We stated that this was their "blind spot," for they surely could not help but know what these verses said, they being educated, and considered "Calvinists." But God gave them over *"to blindness in part,"* that they *"could not see with their eyes, or hear with their ears, or perceive in their hearts, and be converted and healed."* To any sound man, it should be as evident as the noon-day sun on a cloudless day, that GOD never purposed to save all men; or all men would be saved; or else God is not GOD! It was not the eternal purpose of God to give all men "a chance to be saved," for salvation has never been "by chance," but "by grace." God does not play the casino! Surely the great Creator of the universe did not create man before He knew whether He could control him or not! He did not loose control of His work. It still, daily, operates by Him by *"which all things consist"* (Colossians 1:17,) and is still *"upheld by the Word of His power."* (Hebrews 1:3.)

At the time that Christ died for His people, those who had *"perished in the gainsaying of Korah;"* those who perished in the flood during the deluge of Noah's day; such as the rich man who did not give any help to poor Lazarus, Esau, and Balaam, to name but a few, were *already* in Hell. They certainly were not in a *savable state*? Nor could *saving influences* reach them there. Some very articulate men are not necessarily bright in spiritual things, for the *"natural man receiveth not of the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to them, neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned."* When given over by God to judicial

blindness, it is impossible for them to comprehend the plainest declaration of truth thereafter. Jude put it this way: "*For there are certain men crept in unawares who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.*" (Jude 4) The Greek word for "Lord" in this text is "Kurios," which means "supreme in authority, i.e., controller. (Strong's Concordance.) It is this characteristic of God that Fuller and his followers to this day deny to our God. They present Him as an ignorant, helpless, and defeated god out of one side of their mouth, and say they believe He is sovereign out of the other. Thus they proclaim "free grace or "freewill," as it best suits their particular needs at the time.

If one wonders how they could arrive at such a contradiction in doctrine, it should be noted that they based their views on a false premise. Their *prima facie* is that the Gospel is an invitation. This throws them completely off of the truth. They *assume* this without any Scriptural warrant, and even contrary to the very definition of the word Gospel. As highly educated as these men were, the only explanation which seems possible for their lack of understanding of the plain meanings of words is that "*God gave them up*" to this "*strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they might be damned, who hold not the truth*" (2 Thessalonians 2:12.) They introduced among the Baptists, and the "evangelical groups" which thereafter splintered from them, the very sword Satan needed to destroy the purity and power of Christianity. The moral decay in Western society can be traced philosophically directly to this pernicious freewill theory that God loves everyone.

Watch J.M.Pendleton's conceptual development: "It is a fact;" says he, (without any citation of scriptural support,) "that the Scriptures rest the general invitation of the Gospel upon the atonement of Christ." **Is this the truth? Of course not!** The scriptures nowhere speak of a "general invitation of the Gospel." "But," says he, "if there were not a sufficiency in the atonement for the salvation of sinners without distinction, how could the ambassadors of Christ beseech them (i.e., all

men without exception) to be reconciled to God, and that from the consideration of His having now made sin for us, ("us" who? all mankind? Then the *pronoun* should be "*them,*") "*who knew no sin, that we* (what "we"? - all mankind? If so the pronoun should be "*they.*") "*might be made the righteousness of God in Him.*" (Pendleton's quote from Fuller). How is it possible for all mankind to be made the "*righteousness of God,*" unless their sins were imputed to Christ? And if they were, then in return, the righteousness of Christ would be imputed to the whole world. That is universal salvation as surely as Christ died! Now, Paul assures us in that very same text that "*Christ was made sin for us.*" When was He made sin for us? While He was here under the law fulfilling it in behalf of His people by imputation! **Not** when they were given faith to believe that it was true. He Himself knew no sin. Why did He do it at all? For the whole world to have a chance? Paul said why: "*That we might be made the righteousness of God IN HIM.*" Who then, in the final analysis, are actually made "righteous" by Christ's keeping the law and dying for them, not imputing their sins to them; but imputing to them His righteousness? Was it the world of the ungodly? Impossible! The Scriptures teach it was done for those included in the "**US,**" the "**WE,**" - or the elect only. Whatever Christ did, **He did it while here in the flesh.** He does not do it when or after one hears the Gospel about it. The Gospel is not an invitation to anyone, the elect or the reprobates to accept or reject. It is the publication of glad tidings to those for whom He made righteous.

J. M. Pendleton particularly liked Mr. Fuller's analogy between fallen angels and fallen men:

"What would you think of the fallen angels being invited to be reconciled to God from the consideration of an atonement having been made to fallen men? You would say, 'It is inviting them to partake of a benefit which has no existence? the obtaining of which, therefore is naturally impossible.'" (That is the best consideration one can have for repudiating his doctrine. It seems he is opposing himself. But watch this twist:) "Upon the supposition of the atonement being insufficient for the salvation of any more than are actually saved, the non-elect, however, with respect to a being

reconciled to God through it, are in the same state as the fallen angels; that is, the thing is not only morally, but naturally impossible ..."

(Perfectly stated, isn't it? That much is consistent and true. Now, here is the rest.) Watch this:

"But if there be an **objective fulness** in the atonement of Christ, sufficient for any number of sinners, were they to believe in Him, there is no other impossibility in the way of any man's salvation, to whom the Gospel comes at least, than arise from the state of his own mind." (Christian Doctrines, J.M. Pendleton, page 243.)

He did not see that his own twist would also include the fallen angels, devils, that surely believe. According to Mr. Pendleton, they can't, but they can! The writer does not recall a mission board being established to evangelize the devils but if there can be any money to be made by it, don't be surprised if someone starts one!

Analyze his departure point above. "If there be an objective fulness in the atonement of Christ, sufficient for any number of sinners." See how he departed from "*particular*" redemption. He made the atonement a *generalized*, nebulous, something. His "if" is too large. **There isn't!** Christ "*laid down His life for His sheep*." He died specifically for the elect; if not, there was no need for election to begin with! Of course, his followers today deny that there was an eternal election. But, for Calvinists and Neo-calvinists readers, why should He elect any and then die for everybody? If He died for "every body," divine election is of no benefit whatsoever to anyone. Now Fuller and Pendleton both said that it was to give "*an honest invitation*." But it seems ridiculous for Christ to knowingly suffer for so many who would go to hell, merely to give hireling preachers grounds to give what they *think* is "an honest invitation" to the world of the ungodly. And just how *honest* is a *general* invitation to all?

This twisting is found on almost every page of Fuller's works. He takes words with standard meanings, and gives them new definitions, and then makes the Scriptures say exactly the opposite of what it says. Reading behind him one thinks, "How could this man deceive anyone?" Anyone he deceived *wanted* to be deceived! The sectarian schools that sprouted as mushrooms everywhere Fullerism went turned out such irrational men in great abundance. It is a remarkable testimony to the total depravity of the carnal mind! As stated in the question above, Andrew Fuller, J.M. Pendleton, Charles H. Spurgeon, and company believed salvation to be "a mental" act, - "of his own mind." Here, was a cardinal departure from the Christian experience! Salvation is applied by a **birth**, not by a mental act! If one takes the false assumption that the Gospel is an *invitation*, and believes that Christ saved us from our sins, then Fuller's own argument is a perfect argument to use against his own teaching! It is as foolish as it is unscriptural, to "offer" salvation to *dead* men, and especially to reprobates. One could just as easily conclude that Christ died for fallen angels as well, for they too, are "sinners." No Calvinist and certainly no Hyper-calvinist can hold to Fuller's universalistic position consistently. It was this very position which was used by Satan to strengthen the Anti-christ by the invention of a "modern missionary movement," simultaneously with the international socialist movement. One, the political arm, was a "beast," while the other, the religious arm, was a "false prophet." (Think that one on out in light of Revelation!) Those two movements have brought the world to where it is today!

The large Calvinistic denomination known as the Reformed Church, embraced the same spirit of duplicity in claiming there was a "*common grace*," which did not regenerate, but was given to all men alike, both elect and reprobates. Without pursuing this, it is sufficient here to note that it resulted in a similar division among the Reformed bodies, and the one known as the Christian Reformed Church rapidly went into Mystery Babylon's heresy of Pelagianism; while, as the Old School Baptists in America and Gospel Standard churches in England, the

smaller and sounder body, the Protestant Reformed Church remained supralapsarian Calvinists as were their forefathers. Among the Baptists, the ones holding to the "Old School" were termed "Hardshell" and "Hyper-calvinists." The Fullerites were often called "Freewillers," "Soft Shells," "Conditionalists" and "Limited" (at first, meaning "limited predestinarians"- they are no longer predestinarian at all). Among the Reformed bodies, the Neo-calvinists are often referred to as "Arminians" or "Hypo-calvinists." In both camps, the ones modifying Calvinism to accommodate the world of the ungodly, plunged into the hell of heresy.

Notice Fuller's language in the next quotation. It rings familiar with all those present-day Neo-calvinist writers who try so hard to reconcile God's sovereignty with man's supposed "freewill;" or, God's sovereignty and the theory of "human responsibility." The Bible says nothing about "human responsibility," and the very word is contrary to Calvinism, Hyper-Calvinism and Baptists' doctrine. The doctrine teaches that in the spiritual realm, man is totally depraved and unable to save himself by his own will and effort. It, as "general atonement," and "invitations," is a false assumption. Fuller wrote: "I do not deny that there is difficulty in these statements, but it belongs to the general subject of reconciling the purposes of God with the agency of man." Fuller has a problem separating the things of God from the theories of men. Here he speaks of the purposes of God, as if He were a mere man. God "*is of one mind who can turn Him?*" He has but one eternal purpose. He has no "purposes"-plural. In all five places where the word purposes (plural) are used in the Bible, they refer to the "purposes" of men. Secondly, he speaks of man as an "agent." An agent as an "agent" is ***not free***. He is bound by the will, policies, and dictates of the one responsible for him, under whom he serves as an "agent." A "free agent" is an oxymoron - mutually exclusive words; "free" and "agency" are mutually exclusive concepts. [Only in sports are there "free agents;" and who would expect this profession to be very well educated?] The Scriptures do not speak of agents. Rather, it speaks of "servants." And it speaks of two kinds: "servants of

sin," and "servants of God," or "righteousness." *"He that committeth sin is a servant of sin."* Thus, he cannot be a "free agent." No slave is a free agent! He is bound. The whole force of Fullerite doctrine is based upon this false conception, that God made man a "free moral agent." The truth of scripture is that man is not free, but "sold under sin." He is not moral, and this is obvious all around us. Every fiber of his being is immoral, *i.e.*, "totally depraved." In no sense is man a "free agent;" or does he possess a "freedom" will. A will? Yes! Free? No! The will is an interstitial faculty of the corrupt natural man, and in itself, it too, is corrupt. *"Ye WILL NOT come to Me, that ye might have life."* (John 6:40.) The greatest defender of Baptists doctrine in America against the rise of Fullerism was the Old School, or Particular Baptist minister, Elder Gilbert Beebe. [Much of his works are now available, and may be had from The Remnant Publications, P.O. 1004, Hawkins, Texas 75765] The following is quoted from him on this subject from an 1844 Editorial., Volume 1:

"Mr. Sands, of the Religious Herald, of Richmond, Virginia, has served up to his readers part of a sermon said to have been delivered in South Carolina by Wm. B. Johnson, D.D., in which the doctor professes to have proved clearly that man is a free agent, and at the same time that God is sovereign! The logic by which the doctor has attempted to prove both sides of this palpable paradox is this:

"In considering them separately, each may approve itself to every mind; but in attempting to reconcile them, serious difficulties may arise. From our inability to reconcile these two points, we may be tempted to reject the one at the expense of the other, or reject both."

Thus, although the learned doctor virtually admits that the two points are at antipodes with each other, yet he contends that they must be received and believed by those free agents who cannot reconcile them, and the way to do this thing is to believe them one at a time, as it is beyond our capacity to believe both at the same time.

The mode of proving that man is a free agent is as queer as that of disposing of the glaring inconsistency of his theory:

"Not free, what proof could they have given sincere,
Of true allegiance, constant faith and love,
Where only what they needs must do appeared
Not what they would; what praise could they
receive?

What pleasure I from such obedience paid,
When will and reason, (reason also is choice),
Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled,
Made passive both, had served necessity, Not me."

Ergo, the doctor draws the conclusion that the world must be peopled with free agents, or absolute slaves; bound fast in the chain of Fate, of absolute incompetency to deliver himself from its iron mandate. What a fine thing it is to be a doctor! Truly these things are hidden from babes and sucklings, and revealed to doctors!"

Hereafter we will attempt to prove that such a thing as a free agent cannot possibly exist in heaven, earth, or hell. Angels, men, or devils, to be free, could not be accountable to God, nor to any other power, for their conduct; and if free, they are not amenable. Agents, when the term is applied to any created being or thing, signifies an actor for, or in reference to, another; he cannot be free and at the same time an agent." (Editorials of Gilbert Beebe, Jan. 1, 1844, Page 382).

"That man was created under law to his Creator is self-evident, and requires no argument to establish the fact; for if there were no law, there could be no transgression; and if no transgression, no guilt or penalty; but both are manifestly attached to all the human family in their relation to Adam. "*By the offense of one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death has passed on all men, for that all have sinned*" (Romans 5:12). That all men are subject to and under the sentence of death is declared in the Scriptures. "*The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law*" 1 Cor. 15:56). Therefore, as man could not be a sinner, nor a sufferer of legal

penalty, if he were under no law, it follows as a certainty, that man was created under law to God. Whether that law was expressed or only implied, is not the question; but the certainty of its existence, and of its dominion over man. "*Until the law,*" (or Mosaic dispensation,) "*sin was in the world, and death reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of Him that was to come.*"

From the above consideration it is certain that man was not, in his first estate, a "free agent;" but that he stood as a creature of God, subject to His will, pleasure and decree; amenable to God, and bound to abide His sovereign pleasure and order in all things. It is ridiculous to argue that man is free, if he is absolutely bound; and that man was bound by the law, and by the absolute and sovereign decrees of God his Maker, few, if any, will dare to deny.

An agent is an actor; and none can doubt that man is an actor: but if he is or was a free actor, or agent, he could not sin; or if free, he was under no restraint or obligation to God or man. The absurdity of those who contend that moral obligation and free agency are inseparable is abundantly manifest, for both cannot exit together, it is impossible. **That man acted according to his own inclination in the original transgression, and that all men voluntarily sin against God, we do not dispute;** but this admitted cannot change the position that a man that is bound is not free, and a man that is free is not bound.

As to the allegory of our correspondent, we are led to conclude that all allegories fail to fully elucidate the subject of the mystery of iniquity or the mystery of godliness. The claims of divine government were not annulled by man's apostasy from original innocence, or man would have become a free agent; but his circumstances are materially changed, and in his sins he is fallen under the condemnation and wrath of that law under which he was created, and that law, which before only required him to continue in perfect and perpetual obedience, now pours out its curses upon his guilty head.

But the restoration of "the hoe," [referred to in the analogy mentioned] , or implements to work with, cannot

qualify the transgressor for obedience to the law; for the soul that sins must die; the law holds the transgressor where he cannot put forth his hand and eat of the tree of life and live forever. But if man had retained his active purity and innocence, that could only have perpetuated his paradise, but it could not make him spiritual, nor fit him for heaven. The work of redemption does something more than to restore lost implements; it redeems from the law as well as from guilt, and redeems unto God; brings the redeemed under law to his Redeemer, and secures to him all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus his Lord." (Editorials, Volume 2, 1845, pages 587-588.)

Thus, bound under law originally, man was not then a free agent, and for the elect, bound to the law of Christ, he is still not a free agent. In both cases, he is a bond servant. He is either a "servant of sin" or a "servant of righteousness."

Following Fuller's position, Pendleton says, (without scriptural warrant,):

"Such is the extent of the atonement, that salvation is offered to all men; nor dare we question God's sincerity in making the offer."

One would be better persuaded if consistent Biblical support could be given for his philosophical opinion. But watch this next sentence:

"While the atoning merit of the blood of Christ is infinite, its saving efficacy is restricted to its application." (Ibid. page 245) Or, "We may therefore say of the atonement that it is so general (better: nebulous!) that all are saved who "come to God" by Christ, (notice that he limited it here, too!) and so limited that none are saved who do not "come to God" through the Mediator, the *"man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all."*

Interesting twisting! Christ did atone, but didn't; He gave Himself for a ransom for all, yet ransomed less than "all." To wit: He was a miserable failure, according to this scheme.

It is interesting, considering the time-period of these discussions on the extent of the atonement, how little Christians of that period understood the subject. Joseph

Smith, the guru of Mormonism during that period, advocated a “universal atonement.” However, his atonement went far further than Fuller’s, Pendleton’s or Spurgeons. When he said “universal,” he meant *universal!* He taught that the atonement of Christ covered all man-kind, all angelic and demonic creatures, and even all animal creation! It is self-evident, that these views of the atonement were *insufficient for the salvation of those its advocates applied it to!*

This kind of double-talk is necessary for those **who do not know for whom Christ died**, or what He did for them when He died. They create a contradiction between the **extent** and **scope** of Christ’s death. In other words, where Christ said: “*I lay down My life for the sheep,*” they must add without authority: “and for the goats, too!” Where He says, “*I pray not for the world,*” they must dispute Him, and say He intercedes for everyone. To them, God “wants” each and every man to be saved (scope), but that He will not apply it to anyone except those that “let Him” (extent). Again, whatever this strange paradoxical doctrine is, it is not Calvinism, nor even *Christianity*. It stands totally opposing Christianity; hence it can be nothing less than **Antichristian**.

Charles Spurgeon is the high priest of the present-day Neo-calvinist proselyters. But was he a “Calvinist”? Is his so-called “evangelism” true New Testament publication of the true Gospel of redeeming grace? As with all Pelagians, the true test of their orthodoxy is what they do at the conclusion of their sermons. Do they wish to “sit in the temple of God professing themselves to be God,” or leave the Gospel where it is: in God’s hands. So, let us see how Mr. Spurgeon closes his *little book*. Turning to the last pages of All of Grace, we read:

“But, why should you refuse? If you do not desire the choice blessing, which I have brought to you, at least do me the justice to admit that the blame of your final doom will not lie at **my door**.”

Here he shows clearly that he does not believe that Christ has redeemed, reconciled, ransomed, and saved His people – any of them!

He continues “When we two meet before the great white throne you will not be able to charge me with having idly used

the attention which you were pleased to give me while you were reading my little book."

This is an outright denial of electing grace, eternal redemption by Christ, and salvation by grace. It is predicated upon what the readers do with his "little book." He continues:

"Do not refuse Jesus, His love, His blood, His salvation."

So, in spite of the Calvinistic title of his little book, it isn't "all of grace" at all! In fact, it is not "Grace at all!" If you can refuse it, it is not salvation. So what of His love? What kind of love would create a hell, and then damn to hell those He loves? If a man set his house on fire with his teenage son asleep in bed, who would think he loved his son, if he refused to awake him, or drag him forcefully out of the burning building, because he did not want to violate his son's "freedom of choice"? Let the reader be the judge. After Christ's suffering, bleeding, and dying, the Fullerites insist that all that He did was insufficient to save His people, and then write about the "sufficiency of Christ's atonement!"

Continuing with Spurgeon's "little book": "I beseech you, Do not turn away from your Redeemer!"

Now that is nothing short of ignorance! How can one refuse one's Redeemer? If a man went to hell, he certainly was not redeemed! One of the five points of Calvinism is "irresistible grace." No, Charles Haddon Spurgeon was not a Calvinist! He adds:

"O Soul, it may be now or never with you."

This is not even Christianity. Did Christ not do something? Those people who are charged with Hyper-calvinism are indeed thankful that "*Salvation is of the Lord,*" (Jonah 3:9) and that God is Sovereign.

ALLELUIA: FOR THE LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT REIGNETH.

- Revelation 19:6