

# **The Famous Alabama Debate**

**on**

## **The Plan of Salvation**

Between.

VERNON L. BARR, (Missionary Baptist),  
of Dallas, Texas, and

BILL L. ROGERS, ("Church of Christ"),  
of Huntsville, Alabama.

Held in Sheffield, Alabama, commencing on the night of September 23, 1958, and continuing for four consecutive nights.

You may order the Barr-Rogers Debate from Vernon L. Barr, 1917 Shortal Dr., Dallas 17, Texas; Hollis Ledbetter, Box 438, Red Bay, Alabama; or Baptist Book Store, 214 East Broad Street, Texarkana, Texas. you may write to either of the three places, named to receive quoted prices on wholesale lots.

**Printed and Bound by,  
*THE MANNEY COMPANY***

***1041 Isbell Road Fort Worth 14, Texas***

## PROPOSITIONS

1. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT ALIEN SINNERS ARE SAVED AT THE POINT OF FAITH BEFORE AND WITHOUT WATER BAPTISM.  
VERNON L. BARR -- AFFIRMS  
BILL L. ROGERS — DENIES
2. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT WATER BAPTISM, TO THE PENITENT BELIEVER IS FOR (TO OBTAIN) THE REMISSION OF ALIEN SINS.  
BILL L. ROGERS -- AFFIRMS  
VERNON L. BARR -- DENIES

### THE DISPUTANTS AGREE:

1. To be governed by Hedge's Rules of debate.
2. There are to be no demonstrations from the audience.
3. The debate is to last four nights with two hours being given to the debate each night. Each speaker will have two thirty minute speeches each night.
4. Both the affirmative and negative speaker will be allowed to ask not more than five written questions each night of the debate. They are to be single questions, not questions with, two or more parts. The written questions are to be answered in writing. Each speaker will present his questions to his opponent at the beginning of his speech.
5. The debate may be recorded, but if it is reproduced in book form by any person it must be published in full as delivered orally. Each disputant will be allowed to read his own speeches, and make only corrections in grammar, and typographical errors by the typists.

### SIGNED:

Vernon L. Barr  
Bill L. Rogers

State of Alabama  
County of Frinklin

**CERTIFICATE**

I, Hollis Ledbetter, do hereby certify that I am the recording agent who reported the debate between Bill L. Rogers and Vernon L. Barr, held in the Community Center in the City of Sheffield, Ala., County of Colbert, Ala. on the 23rd, 24th, 25th, and 26th days of September, 1958. I further certify that the annexed and foregoing typewritten pages contain a full, true and complete transcript of my recordings of said debate, to the best of my knowledge, and ability. I further certify that both speakers spoke for the same length of time.

Given under my hand, this the 1st day of July, A.D. 1959.

Hollis Ledbetter.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of July 1959.

Mrs. Haskle Phillips, Notary Public

My commission expires August 21, 1962.

## FOREWORD

Eld. Vernon Barr, pastor of Missionary Baptist Church, Dallas, Texas, has again distinguished himself as a defender of the faith.

This book contains a record of one of the finest debates ever held between Baptists and the church known as, The Church of Christ. As the reader reads he will be provoked to scriptural thinking and consequently become a stronger Christian.

This debate was held in Sheffield, Alabama, in the Community Center Building. The crowds were large. The representation of Baptists was greater than the opposition.

It was my genuine pleasure to serve as moderator for Bro. Barr and the Baptists. At the close of the debate I could honestly commend the speakers on their behaviour during each session.

Our appreciation is extended to the Big Bear Creek Association of Missionary Baptists for making this debate and book possible. We have Elder Hollis Ledbetter and his wife to thank for preparing the manuscripts.

Wayne T. Branson

Birmingham, Alabama

## NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

There appeared in the local newspaper, "The Tri-Cities Daily" an article obviously turned in to the paper by the Southern Baptist Convention people, that was apparently aimed at discrediting the Baptist debater, and also to keep their people away from the debate. You will note that the article states that the debate would close or be concluded "tonight." The article referred to was published in the issue of Thursday, September 25, 1958. That was on the third day after there had been two nights of the debate. There was to be a session on Thursday night" and the concluding session was to be on Friday night.

Under the caption, "Baptist Debater Not Supported By Local Group," appeared the following article: "The Pastor's Conference of the Colbert-Lauderdale Baptist Association, of which Rev. Walker Campbell of Cherokee is President, passed a resolution Tuesday in their regular meeting at the Muscle Shoals Hotel to inform the press that the 54 churches of the Colbert-Lauderdale Baptist Association are not sponsoring and have no part in the debate going on at the Sheffield Community Center this week. The debate is between a Texas Baptist Minister and a Church of Christ Minister on the subject, "Water Baptism Plan of Salvation."

I "The moderator of the Association, Rev. J. Wendell Klein, was asked by the pastors to make this announcement. The Pastors stated that they had received a number of inquiries about the debate and felt it would be a matter of public interest to inform the press.

"The 54 Baptist Churches of the Colbert-Lauderdale Association voluntarily cooperate with the Southern Baptist Convention. The Southern Baptist Convention is made up of approximately 9,000,000 Baptists. It is understood that the Texas Baptist preacher participating in the debate is affiliated with another group of Baptists other than the Southern Baptist Convention.

"Churches in the Colbert-Lauderdale Baptist Association include: Anderson, Antioch, Asphalt Rock, Baker Lane Mission, Barton, Bethel, Calvary, Center Star, Central of Florence,

Central Heights, Cherokee First, Colbert Heights, Corum Chapel, Evening Shade, Evergreen Faith, First Florence, Friendship, Grace, Gravelly Springs, Greenhill First, Happy Valley, Harris Chapel, Highland Florence, Highland Park, Johnson Crossroads, Killen, Leighton, Dowis Mission, Lexington First, Liberty, Mount Pleasant, Mountain Springs, Muscle Shoals, New Bethel, New Hope, New Sockwell, Nitrate City, Okolona, Pilgrim's Rest, Pleasant Ridge, Pride Mission, Pruition, Rogersville First, Sheffield First, Southside, Tuscumbia First, Tuscumbia Valley, Underwood, Valdosta, Valley Grove, Waterloo, Weeden Heights, Westside, Woodward Avenue, York Terrace and Whitehead.

"The religious debate will be concluded tonight at the Community Center."

In spite of the fact that the Conventionites tried to close us out a night early by the false report in their article that the debate would close on Thursday night, when it did not close until Friday night, a large audience was present for the concluding night of the debate.

The following article appeared in the Tri-Cities Daily on Friday, September 26, 1958, as turned in to the paper by the representatives of the Big Bear Creek Baptist Association. It was under the caption, "Big Bear Creek Baptist Group Backs Debater". "Pastors of the Big Bear Creek Baptist Association today released a statement in which they said, "We wish it to be known that we are Baptists, with members of the churches of that Association, who are sponsoring the debate being held at the Sheffield Community Center.

They explained that there are 48 churches in the Big Bear Creek Baptist Association. This group of Baptist churches are in no way affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention.

"We quit working with the Convention during the 75 million campaign put on by the Convention a number of years ago, they explained.

They added, that the next annual meeting of the messengers of the Big Bear Creek Association will be its one hundred and twenty third annual meeting.

Arnold Lindsey, moderator of the Association, sponsoring the debate expressed the belief that it would be a matter of public interest to know who is sponsoring the debate, and

also that the Baptist debater, Vernon L. Barr, of Dallas, Texas, is sponsored in the discussion by one of the oldest Baptist Associations in the State of Alabama.

"The American Baptist Association with which the Texas preacher is identified is the second largest Baptist body in the United States. In contrast to the Southern Baptist Convention, which endorsed the court ruling of the Supreme Court in forcing the mixing of the races in our public schools, the American Baptist Association went on record as believing that the forced mixing of the races in the schools is contrary to the teachings of the Word of God, and contrary to our American way of life, and an encroachment upon states rights and state sovereignty," Lindsey explained.

Lindsey concluded by saying that there is still one night of the religious debate between Mr. Barr and Minister Rogers of the Church of Christ, and he invited the general public to attend.

The debate finale will be held at the Sheffield Community Center beginning at 7:30. A large audience attended the Thursday evening debate session.

With reference to the Southern Baptist Convention, Lindsey stated: "Brother Barr has no affiliation with the Southern Baptist Convention. As far as we know the Convention has no preachers who will defend what they believe in public debate."

## **PROPOSITION**

1. The scriptures teach that alien sinners are saved at the point of faith before and without water baptism.

Vernon L. Barr Affirms

Bill L. Rogers Denies

## **BARR'S FIRST SPEECH**

**Tuesday night, Sept. 23rd**

Gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, Mr. Rogers, ladies and gentlemen. It is with a grateful heart to the Great God Who is the Creator of the heavens and the earth and all things therein for His providential watch-care over me since I have been in the world, yea, even before I arrived in the world, and particularly on my journey from Dallas, Texas, to here, and for innumerable blessings bestowed upon me day by day that I come before you with a heart filled with gratitude to Him. I am thankful to the forty-eight (48) churches of the Big Bear Creek Baptist Association that have endorsed me for this discussion. I am especially thankful to Elder James Hood who has made, most of the preliminary arrangements. Also, I am glad that I am meeting a man whom I am quite sure is as capable as any man his people might have to represent them in the things they teach. It is good to be here to debate with him.

We are not strangers as we have engaged in a debate on previous occasion at Corinth, Mississippi. It was a very enjoyable discussion, and I believe a profitable one.

The proposition for discussion this evening reads: "The Scriptures teach that alien sinners are saved at the point of faith before and without water baptism." It becomes my duty as the affirmative speaker to define the proposition for You. This is in order that there be no clouded minds as to the exact issues under controversy. By "the Scriptures," I mean the sixty-six (66) books of the Bible. By "teach," I

mean to either say in so many words what the proposition affirms, or to teach by Scriptures correlated together, or by necessary inference. By "alien sinners," I mean one who is unsaved, who has sinned against God; is alienated from God. By "saved," I mean one made safe by the God of heaven; no longer an alien, but a son of God, an heir of God, and a joint heir with Jesus Christ. By "at the point of faith," I mean when one has trusted in Jesus Christ with all his heart for salvation. By "before and without water baptism," I mean that faith comes before water baptism and hence the alien sinner is saved before and without water baptism. Then, after one is saved, it is time for water baptism.

In following our written agreement I will present to my opponent five questions. After I have read the questions for you, I will ask my moderator to hand a copy to Mr. Rogers so that I can continue to speak.

1. Do you baptize a child of God or a child of the Devil?
2. Does your candidate for baptism have a pure heart or an impure heart?
3. Do you baptize a man with a clean soul or one who has a filthy soul?
4. When your candidate for baptism is on the way to the baptismal waters, is he being led of God or being led of the Devil?
5. Is your candidate for baptism condemned or is he out from under condemnation?

Let me briefly state the issue before I launch into the affirmative of the proposition. The issue in this debate is not, "Is baptism a command?" We both believe that it is a command, but for what is it commanded? Is it a means of obtaining salvation, or is it to declare that one is saved? The issue is not "Is baptism important?" We both agree that baptism is important. But for what is it important? To obtain salvation or to declare to the world that one is already saved, and purposes to walk a new life? The issue is not, nor will it be "Must one obey God in order to obtain salvation?" The issue is, "At what point in obeying the thousands of commands of the Lord is one saved?" Which of the commands of the Lord are given as conditions with which one must comply before he can be saved, justified, or become a child of God.

I noticed in the Tri-Cities daily paper today a display advertisement of the debate. I understand that it was put in the paper by a representative of the church that Mr. Rogers is here to defend tonight. And the advertisement states, better than I know how to do it, the issue between us. It is headed, "Bible Debate, Sheffield Community Center, Sept. 23-26, each evening 7:00 P. M., Bill L. Rogers, Memorial Parkway Church of Christ, Huntsville, Ala., will meet Vernon L. Barr, Baptist, of Dallas, Texas, in a debate on 'Water baptism, Plan of salvation'." That will be the point at issue. I will be here to preach to the people, and to teach the people that Jesus Christ is the Way. In John 14:6 Jesus said, I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me. I am here to preach the blood before the water; Christ before the church, but my friend is here to preach his "Water Baptism, Plan of Salvation." Now, that is the point of issue. Thank you! Whoever put the advertisement in the paper, because it states the difference between us much better than I am able to do it myself.

There are four commands of God Almighty that specify four conditions with which man must comply in order to be saved. These four things are stated in the positive, and warnings are given in the negative. Men who do not comply with these four commands, each of them, will be damned. Such is not said of all the many other commands in the Bible. The four commands are:

1. TO HEAR. Luke 14:35 "He that hath (the one having) ears to hear, let him hear." In Roman 10:17 Paul said, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. So, men are commanded to hear. Negatively: Acts 3:23, "Every soul that shall not hear shall be destroyed." So, we have a positive command for men to hear. And when men do not hear they are going to be destroyed. But where does the Bible say, 'that every soul that shall not be baptized shall be destroyed?' That is what my opponent will be teaching in this debate. Every condition requisite to salvation in the Bible is followed with a warning that he who does not comply with it shall be damned. But where is the warning, 'He that is not baptized shall be destroyed?' My opponent and his people teach it, but God's word does not.

The second commandment is: TO HEED. (The Holy

Spirit's call in conviction.) Hebrews 3:7, 8: "The Holy Ghost saith if ye hear His voice, harden not your heart." Negatively: Rom. 8:9, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Where in the Bible does it say, If any man has not baptism he is none of his? That is Mr. Rogers' doctrine. That is what they preach all over the country. Surely he can find somewhere in the Bible 'where it says, If any man have not baptism he is none of his, if his doctrine is right. Show me a verse that so says and I will join your side of this proposition, Mr. Rogers, and we will go out preaching the same things together.

The third thing that is commanded is: TO REPENT. Acts 17:31, "God hath commanded all men everywhere to repent." Negatively; Luke 13:3,5, Jesus said, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." But WHERE IS IT: Except ye are baptized ye shall all likewise Perish? If my friend could read such, a verse from the Bible then I could understand his being here tonight to try to negate this proposition that has been read in your hearing.

Ladies and gentlemen it is the doctrine, though, of my opponent and his people, and they claim to speak where the Bible speaks, and to be silent where the Bible is silent. So, Mr. Rogers, please speak right up in your next speech and read in the Bible where it says, Except you are baptized, ye shall all likewise perish.

Then the fourth command is: TO BELIEVE (have faith in Christ.) In Acts 16.31, Paul and Silas replied in answer to the question asked by the Philippian Jailor, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And they said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,' and thy house." Please find where any person under any condition was ever commanded of the Lord, Be baptized, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. Negatively, in John 8:24, "If ye believe not (said Jesus) that I am He, ye shall die in your sins. Thank God for the privilege of being here to call to your attention the falsity of the things taught by Mr. Rogers and his people, and to Point you to what the blessed Son of God teaches about salvation. Where is it, If you are not baptized, you will die in your sins? That is what my friend and his people teach.

ARGUMENT One is based on John 3:14,15, "And as Moses

lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." The Scripture read, teaches exactly what Baptists believe, and what my position states, that every believer in Jesus Christ, has eternal life. My opponent will affirm to the contrary. He will thrust in baptism as a condition, but this, John 3:14 and 15 will not allow.

Please note the analogy: 1. As Moses raised the serpent in the Jewish camp, and as it was an effectual remedy for the Jew, so is the Lord Jesus Christ an effectual remedy for the sinner. 2. As the Jews were cured by looking at the serpent, so is the sinner cured by believing in Jesus Christ, and not by being baptized. And now, listen; As no overt act intervened between the looking of the Jews and their healing, so no overt act intervenes between the faith of the sinner and his salvation. Do you not see that they thrust in baptism between the sinner's faith and salvation? To do so is to spoil this analogy. Where is it? That whosoever believeth in Him and is baptized should not perish, but have eternal life? This is my friend's doctrine, but it is not the doctrine of God.

ARGUMENT Two. Baptists and the Bible teach that one is saved at the point of faith in Jesus Christ. My friend and his people teach that one is saved at the point of baptism. That, is the issue between us. Note in Ephesians 2:8-10, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For: we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." This Scripture sustains the Baptist Position that one is saved at the point of faith, but it would have to be changed to sustain the position of my friend and his sacramental "Water baptism, Plan of salvation." It would have to read for him, For by grace are ye saved through faith and baptism, etc. So you see this text is in harmony with my side of the proposition and out of harmony with my opponent's side of the proposition. His position is incompatible with the phrase, "And that not of yourselves." The statement, "That not of yourselves," must refer to all that goes before, "For by grace are ye saved through faith."

Grace, salvation, faith all the affair of salvation are not of yourselves. But this cannot be said of baptism.

When Jesus came to be baptized of John the Baptist, John protested saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" But, "And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" "US", said he. My friend's belief on the proposition is out of harmony with the phrase, "It is the gift of God." The first phrase tells us that the whole affair of salvation is "not of ourselves." The latter tells us it is the "gift of God." But baptism cannot, with any show of intelligence, be thus spoken of. Salvation at the point of baptism is out of harmony with the phrase, "Not of works lest any man should boast." Baptism must be included in the term, "works." It cannot be included in the term, "saved;" it cannot be included in the term, "faith"; it cannot be included in "that which is not of ourselves"; it cannot be included in that which is "the gift of God." The text says, "For we are His workmanship." This shows that a performance of duty, or walking in good works, which is expressive, certainly, of obedience to all the commands of God, is an EFFECT of this salvation by grace through faith. Then it cannot be a CAUSE. My opponent's false plan makes baptism a CAUSE and not an EFFECT of salvation. According to my friend's position the text would have to read, For by grace are ye saved through faith and baptism. He would have to thrust in baptism. That is adding to the Word of God.

ARGUMENT Three: John 3:36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." This text affirms what my proposition affirms, and what Baptists teach. But the position of my friend does not so affirm. His position contradicts this text, unless he thrusts in baptism after "believeth." People should be very careful about adding to the Word of God. On his side of the proposition, he would have to add to this text, and make it read, He that believeth on the Son and is baptized, hath everlasting life; if he does not lose it, it may be, when he gets to heaven. That is about the way his doctrine will have to go to fit his belief.

ARGUMENT Four is based on John 5:24, where Jesus said, "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." This text teaches exactly what my proposition states and what Baptists teach. But the people who think they are the only Christians in the whole wide world teach there is no such thing as freedom, from condemnation and the possession of eternal life to the believer, unless he is baptized. So, again, my friend would have to add to the text by inserting "baptism" after "believeth" or else his position would be forever at war with John 5:24.

ARGUMENT Five is based on John 20:31, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." This text substantiates what my proposition states and what Baptists teach. We believe it exactly as God wrote it. But it antagonizes the preachments of my opponent. I have heard many of them say: "If you want to know how to be saved, read the Acts of the Apostles; as that is the book of conversions." But please remember that the entire book of John was written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His Name. Does it read, And that believing and being baptized ye might have life through His Name? To make it fit his side of the proposition, he would have to thrust in baptism.

ARGUMENT Six is based on Phillipians 3:9: "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." It is by faith. So, Baptists believe this text exactly as Paul wrote it, under divine inspiration. Baptists believe the righteousness of the text is the kind that every believing sinner has. But my friend must take the position that there is no such righteousness. He teaches that the righteousness of God is by faith and baptism, the text to the contrary. "Paul recognized the fact that he was in Christ, and that he was in Christ by faith in Christ. This text so states and so teaches.

ARGUMENT Seven: 1 Cor. 1:21, "When the world by

wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." The position of Baptists asserts the same as the text. But what is the position of the opposition? Their position is this: It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe and are baptized. They would have to thrust in baptism. Thousands of texts would have to be added unto in order to make my friend's position a correct one.

ARGUMENT Eight: Rom. 3:2,5,26, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." These verses set forth both the ground and final condition of our justification or salvation. It is set forth here that Jesus Christ is the Justifier of him which BELIEVETH IN JESUS. Where in the Bible does it say that Jesus is the justifier of him which is baptized? If he could find something like that then I would understand why they run all over the country preaching their "Water baptism, Plan of salvation" as found in the display advertisement. Such is the doctrine of the negative of this proposition. But I am affirming that the ground of our justification is the blood of Jesus Christ. This is our propitiation, our redemption. The condition of remission of sins and justification before God, is faith in His blood. It is not through faith in baptism. That is what their plan comes down to.

ARGUMENT Nine: Luke 8:12, "Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and takes away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe (have faith) and be saved." In this verse faith is the dividing line, as elsewhere in the Bible. To make baptism the dividing line is to do what God does not do in His Word. To make the scripture harmonize with my friend's position, one would have to thrust in baptism after believe, and it would read, Lest they should believe and be baptized and be saved. God's Book in no place predicates salvation on baptism. The gospel according to the people represented by my friend must have baptism in Luke 8:12. But the gospel according to Jesus Christ left it out, hence, the gospel according to my friend's

people is not the gospel according to the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

ARGUMENT Ten: Gal. 5:6, "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but FAITH which worketh by love." The preachment of the opposition is that faith avails nothing without baptism. You can have all the faith in the world, but if you are not baptized you will go to hell. Now that is their position. The one who has believed in Jesus Christ with all his heart, repented of all his sins, confessed Christ before men, and is ready to be baptized, is still a child of the devil until after his baptism according to the gospel in water. Baptists teach as the Bible that the believer's faith is working by love when he confesses Christ before men, and while he is on his way to the baptismal waters, even before he gets there.

ARGUMENT Eleven: Acts 26:16-18, "But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." Jesus Christ in this special commission to Paul sent him to preach the gospel. As a result of the gospel he preached, those who had faith in Christ were to have the following benefits bestowed upon them: 1. Eyes opened, 2. Conversion turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, 3. Forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among; the saved. Jesus Christ teaches that the medium through which all this was to come is faith; "By faith that is in me." As these benefits were to be received by faith, the instrumentalities necessary to faith had to be employed by Paul. Hence, Christ sent Paul to preach the gospel. But Paul said in 1 Cor. 1:17, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect."

Please note the argument on this. My argument is that he (Paul) needs to preach the gospel that does all these things

mentioned a little bit ago. Then he could not without contradicting himself say Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel. Now then, all this is strictly in accord with the position of the affirmative, but it is not in accord with the position of the church that calls itself 'The Church of Christ.' It lacks one indispensable item—baptism. According to my friend's gospel, in the kingdom of Satan and in their sins, they must remain until they are baptized. Did the Christ-sent Apostle Paul understand the matter as does my opponent? If so, how could he thank God that he had baptized so few among the Corinthians? And how could he say that Christ sent him not to baptize? It would be equivalent to his saying that he thanked God that he did not get the Corinthians out of the kingdom of Satan, and that Christ did not send him to get the sins of lost folks remitted. According to Mr. Rogers' doctrine, Paul needed to baptize them. Paul never entertained any such views as those embraced by my opponent and his people.

Now, in what ever time I have left I want to give you some New Testament examples of pardon before baptism.

ARGUMENT Twelve: The palsied man in Luke 5:20, "And when he (Jesus) saw their faith, he said unto him, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee." No baptism. Can you find a scripture that says, When He saw their baptism, He said, Thy sins are forgiven thee? If he can find something like that he will be going some place.

ARGUMENT Thirteen: Another example of salvation before baptism is found in Luke 7:44-50; The woman who came and washed the feet of Jesus with the tears that fell from her eyes, and dried His feet with the hair of her head. Verse 50, "And he (Jesus) said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace. Can he find a verse where Jesus ever said, Thy baptism hath saved thee; go in peace? If he could, he would be getting his doctrine. Ah! ladies and gentlemen, these men come with smooth words, and they are excellent citizens, most of them; I will give them credit for that, but I will tell you they are teaching a doctrine that is a false doctrine. I would to God that you would flee from their preachments, and look up by faith to the crucified, buried, and resurrected Soil of God, and oust in Him with all your heart for salvation.

ARGUMENT Fourteen: A Bible example of salvation before and without baptism is found in Luke 19:5-10. Zacchaeus. was lost; Jesus came to save him, and said salvation came that day. He came down out of the sycamore tree when Jesus called him. Jesus came to save him, and He said after He visited his home, that salvation came that day. But there is no record of baptism.

ARGUMENT Fifteen: Another example of salvation before and without water baptism is found in Luke 23:39-43. Jesus saved the thief on the cross before and without water baptism. As the Son of God hanged yonder, suspended between heaven and earth, on the middle cross, two thieves hanged one on either side of Him. In the beginning they were both railing against Him, but finally one of them turned to the other and said, "We are here justly condemned, but this man hath done nothing amiss." And one of those thieves turned to the blessed Son of God. The Son with His great compassionate heart, and said, "Lord remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom." And the Lord replied to him, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." There is no record of baptism. One moment, he was a thief, condemned to die, lost and on his road to hell. The next moment, he is made white in the blood of the Lamb. Lifted out from under condemnation, saved by God's marvelous grace. There is no question whatever in my mind but that he would have desired baptism, had he been permitted to live here upon this earth. But he was not, as he died there on the cross. But thank God! that as The Son of God died, He stopped dying long enough to save the penitent sinner that looked up to Him, and called on Him, and trusted in Him to the salvation of his soul.

ARGUMENT Sixteen: Gal. 3:26, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Verse 27 reads, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Who is the "you" referred to in verse 27? The children of God in verse 2, of course. In Romans 13:14 Paul said to people who are already saved, already baptized, "But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof." If my friend can find a verse in the lids of God Almighty's Divine Book, that says, We are all the children of God by baptism, I will go over

and shake his hand, and say, "Rogers, thank you; I thank you from the depth of my heart for teaching me the truth;" and we will stop this debate, and I will let him take me out here and baptize me, and then we will all be members of that church that you mistakenly think Jesus Christ started, when He had nothing to do with it Alexander Campbell, and others started the thing in 1827. But he cannot do what he is called on to do. I promise to quit the debate; I promise to shake hands with him and I promise to let him baptize me, if he can pull open God's Book, anywhere, and read me a verse where it says, "Ye are all the children of God by baptism." That is what he teaches; that is exactly what he teaches. Thank God! It is wonderful to be a Baptist, and have the Bible on your side of the proposition. (Time called.) Thank you kindly, ladies and gentlemen.

## **ROGERS FIRST SPEECH**

### **Tuesday Night**

Mr. Barr, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen: I'm grateful to have this opportunity to be here in your midst and discuss with you and for you the proposition that has been affirmed by Mr. Barr for the past 30 minutes. I'm always grateful when I have the opportunity to discuss the word of the Living God, and to investigate the Scriptures with such a splendid audience as this assembled. We're grateful that you are here and we trust and pray that you will be studying your Bible daily, investigating carefully all the things that here are said. And, as has been emphasized by the moderator for Air. Barr, this is a serious occasion. We are here in the presence of Almighty God to hear the things that are commanded us of Him. I therefore commend you to God and to the word of His grace that is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified.

I'm glad to have the opportunity of engaging Mr. Barr again in debate. He is a very fine Baptist debater and, though I do not agree with him in these things that are peculiar to his faith and Baptist doctrine, I will say that I appreciate and respect any man who has the courage of his convictions and that is willing to step out upon the forensic platform and to investigate, after a gentlemanly fashion, the position that he teaches as well as the faith of others. And so I'm glad to be here tonight to have a part in this debate.

First of all, I should like to clear the issues that we are discussing. And I will investigate carefully every argument that Mr. Barr has introduced and we will see whether or not those things teach in reality the proposition that he has affirmed. First of all, Mr. Barr has NOT affirmed that men are saved "BY FAITH." That is NOT his proposition! He does not affirm and he has not signed a proposition that says that men are saved "by faith." This I believe and this I will affirm just as heartily and just as strongly as will Mr. Barr. But he has affirmed that salvation is "at the POINT of faith."

And there is a great difference between being saved "at the POINT of faith" and being saved "by faith." For the expression "BY FAITH" goes beyond and above the idea of the expression "AT FAITH." I should like to emphasize right here that when Mr. Barr signed the proposition that men, or alien sinners, are saved "at the POINT of faith," it was superfluous for him to add "before and without water baptism." For if indeed men are saved "at the POINT of faith" they are not only saved "before and without" baptism, but they are saved "before and without" ANYTHING ELSE THAT COMES AFTER FAITH. In reality Mr. Barr tonight has affirmed justification by FAITH ALONE. That is the thing boiled down in it's final analysis. And he is affirming that particular thing. If he admits or argues that other things are involved then let him name those things and then we will investigate and see if those things are involved in the passages that he read that ascribe salvation to "faith." There are many things that are necessary to salvation and that Mr. Barr, before this debate is over, will admit are necessary to salvation, that are not mentioned in the verses that he has adduced. And so Mr. Barr in reality need not affirm anything about "water baptism," for he doesn't believe that LOVE FOR GOD or CONFESSION OF FAITH in the Lord Jesus Christ or ANYTHING that comes AFTER faith is necessary for salvation if he believes the proposition that he has affirmed. For "at the POINT of faith" means at the very instant a person believes. Why then he is saved "before and without" CALLING ON GOD, "before and without" LOVING GOD, and "before and without" CONFESSING the faith that he has in Christ. The issue then is this: Are we saved "at the point of faith before and without" ANYTHING ELSE as far as that is concerned because he has affirmed it is "at faith," and inasmuch as he injected "baptism," why then we will be glad to discuss that particular thing. I believe that men are saved "by faith" and "through faith." But that does not mean that men are saved "at the point of faith. And Mr. Barr cannot find one single passage in the Book of God that says men are saved "at the point of faith." When he introduced his speech and gave a definition of terms, why he said that he could find it either in these words or by necessary inference. You can't find it in any shape, form, or fashion,

Mr. Barr, in the Book of God Almighty! It is just not in that Book! The idea and the expressions "by faith" and "through faith" do not mean "faith ONLY." And whenever he says "at the point of faith before and without water baptism" he says something that the Bible does not say. He cannot find that in the Book of God.

Let us define the word "faith." The greatest problem that -Mr. Barr has about the idea, is the fact that he thinks that faith as it embraces the Lord Jesus Christ, the faith that saves, is the trust we have in Christ and AT THAT VERY POINT WITHOUT DOING ANYTHING ELSE. Then he believes that a man is saved. And I should like to emphasize that Thayer's Lexicon defines the word from which we obtain the word "faith," that it is "used especially of the faith by 'Which a man embraces Jesus, i.e. a conviction, full of joyful trust, that Jesus is the Messiah' the divinely appointed author of eternal salvation in the kingdom of God, conjoined with obedience to Christ" The faith that saves is a faith, NOT that is "at the POINT of faith" or "faith ONLY," as Mr. Barr is affirming, but rather it goes BEYOND that. And Thayer's Lexicon says that it is a faith that is "CONJOINED WITH OBEDIENCE TO CHRIST."

Right here I believe that the questions will serve to clarify this particular point.

1. Were the rulers referred to in John 12:42 saved "at the point of faith" while they refused to confess their faith in Jesus because "they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God"? The Bible says they "BELIEVED." Now that is "at the point of faith." They had faith and therefore they were "at the point of faith." But the Bible says that they refused to confess because "they loved the praise of men .more than the praise of God." Now I would like to know if Mr. Barr thinks that that group of reprobate Jews that believed in Jesus Christ but "loved the praise of men," so much that they refused to confess his name, were saved at the time that they refused to confess, I believe that the faith that saves goes beyond and above his expression, "at the point of faith." And you will see Mr. Barr give up that particular part of his proposition before this debate closes tonight.

2. When a passage of scripture stipulates salvation and mentions one item of obedience such as "faith," is EVERY

THING ELSE excluded as a condition of salvation except the item mentioned? These verses that he read said nothing about LOVE FOR GOD, nothing about REPENTANCE, nothing, about CONFESSION. They mention FAITH! And faith, as far as he is concerned, means "at the point of faith" and WITHOUT ANYTHING ELSE. Well, now I wonder if he thinks that repentance and love for God and all these things are excluded just because they are not mentioned.

3. Can one be given the right to become what he already is?
4. Is there any type of work that a man must do to be saved'?
5. Is baptism of the law of works or of the law of faith?

I insist that these expressions "by faith" and "through faith" go beyond the arguments that he has made tonight. Thayer has pointed that out clearly. And Paul said and he referred to the verse in Gal. 5:6 — that in Christ Jesus neither does circumcision avail anything nor uncircumcision; but—now watch it—a FAITH THAT WORKS BY LOVE. Mr. Barr says, "at the point of faith." If it is "at the point of faith" it is WITHOUT WORKS AND WITHOUT LOVE. But the verse that he read says that it is by FAITH THAT WORKS BY LOVE. Then it is not "at the point of faith," Mr. Barr! And the very passage that you read contradicts the proposition that you have affirmed. Then if it is "at the point of faith," as we have emphasized, it is in reality BY FAITH ONLY without other acts of obedience. And the Bible says in James 2:17 that "FAITH WITHOUT WORKS IS DEAD." Again verse 20, "faith without works is dead being alone." And verse 26, "As the body without the spirit is dead so faith without works is dead also." If it is "at the point of faith," then it is before man has time to work. Mr. Barr has a man saved upon a dead faith.

I know that there are believers in the Bible that are yet lost. I refer to those in John 12:42 where the Bible says that the rulers believed but would not confess. In I John 4:3 the Bible says that every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus is the Son of God is not of God. He does not belong to God! But Mr. Barr thinks that if a man believes, whether he confesses or not, but "at the point of faith" WITHOUT ANYTHING ELSE, why then he is of God and he belongs to God. Well, John says, it is not so! And the Bible says that the

love of the praise of men is "of the world" (1 John 2:15-16). "But if a man love the world then the love of the Father is not in him" (verse 17). And the Bible says in I Corinthians 16:22, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema" then let him be accursed! These men believed but **THEY WOULD NOT CONFESS, THEY WERE OF THE WORLD, THEY WERE NOT OF GOD,** and the Bible teaches that the **"ANATHEMA" OF GOD AND THE WRATH OF THE HIGH HEAVEN RESTED UPON THEM.** Yet Mr. Barr says it is "at the point of faith. That means then, **WITHOUT ANYTHING ELSE** and then men are saved even while under just condemnation without defense or excuse. Also in John 8:21, 24 Jesus had taught the Jews that **14** except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Well, he had pointed out in verse 21 that if they did die in their sins he said "whither I go you cannot come." In verse 30 because of the speech that Jesus had made, the Bible says that many of them therefore that heard Him believed on Him. In verses 31 and 32 the Bible says that "Jesus therefore said to those Jews that had believed Him, If you continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Jesus said, **"IF YOU CONTINUE"** you will be made free. To whom was he speaking? **TO BELIEVERS** in the Lord Jesus **CHRIST, BUT NOT YET FREE.** But they **WERE** "at the point of faith." And Mr. Barr says "at the point of faith" there men are saved. Well Jesus said they were not yet free. Well they objected to that and said, "We are Abraham's seed and were never under bondage to any man." In verse 44 Jesus said to them, "Ye" these believers "are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." **BELIEVERS!** But Jesus said, "Ye are of your father the devil"! Mr. Barr said they were already children of God Almighty. Jesus said, Now I've told you the truth about it (verse 45) and ye believed me not. That is exactly the position of Mr. Barr tonight. People that believed and have not continued in the word of Christ are yet children of the devil. Mr. Barr believes that Jesus is the **Soil of God** but he does not believe what Jesus said, that people that do not continue are yet in their sins, and yet the children of the devil (John 8:44).

The expressions "by faith" and "through faith" do not

mean faith only! And they mean that NOWHERE in the Bible. To illustrate, in Heb. 11:7, the Bible says that "by faith, Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with Godly fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house, through which he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness that is by faith. There is the expression, "by faith. What does it mean? Why the Bible says that "by faith" he did the thing that God commanded. Heb. 11:8; "By faith Abraham obeyed to go out into a place that he should afterwards receive for an inheritance." "By faith" the Bible says (Heb. 11:29) that Israel passed through the Red Sea. Why these people were saved "by faith" but NOT "at the point of faith," as Mr. Barr has affirmed. In Heb. 11:30 the Bible says that "by faith the walls of Jericho fell down." Mr. Barr thinks that "by faith" means "at the point of faith" and the very instant a person believes then that is accomplished. But look at this verse. The Bible says that "BY FAITH" the walls of Jericho fell down "AFTER" that they were compassed above seven days. When did they All? "AFTER" they obeyed! How did they fall? They fell BY FAITH. BUT NOT "AT THE POINT OF FAITH" AND NOT BY "FAITH ONLY." Mr. Barr, in arguing that we are saved by faith "before and without water baptism," has actually taken the position that the idea of baptism cannot inhere in the word, "believe." Well it can, because, as we have demonstrated from Thayer's Lexicon, the faith that embraces Jesus is the faith that is "CONJOINED WITH OBEDIENCE" unto Him. Therefore, anytime that you find the faith that avails, it is a faith that is "conjoined with obedience" unto Christ. If you find one that is not "conjoined with obedience" unto Christ, it is a DEAD FAITH. It is a WORTHLESS FAITH. And that person that possesses it is yet a child of the devil.

Now then, to demonstrate to you that the word "believe" in the New Covenant does carry with it the idea of a BAPTIZED BELIEVER, I call your attention to Acts 2:44. There the Bible says that they that "BELIEVED were together and had all things common." AN. Barr thinks that the idea "believe" excludes baptism altogether. And, arguing on Ephesians 2:8 he said, that baptism cannot be involved in the idea of "faith." Who said that? Mr. Vernon L. Barr! Does the

Bible say it? No, sir! It is not in the Book! But look here: The Bible says, "they that believed were together and had all things common." Well, what was he referring to? In verse 41 the Bible says, "they that gladly received his word were baptized" and then there were added in that day "about three thousand souls." And verse 44 says, "those that believed" — those referred to in verse 41 as baptized believers— "were together and had all things common." Verse 47 states that "God added to the church daily such as should be saved." Or as the margin of the Revised Version says, "those that were being saved." Verse 41 says that those that were BAPTIZED were added. But verse 47 says that God added the SAVED. Everybody baptized was added. But nobody was added to the church except the baptized. And therefore, Mr. Barr — get your pencil out — nobody was saved in that passage except those that were baptized! And they were referred to simply as believers. Again, in Acts 19, Paul came to Ephesus and inquired there, "Have ye received the Holy Spirit" now watch the question "since ye believed?" — now what is the question— "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed?" They said, WE haven't even heard whether the Holy Spirit be given." He said, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" The very word "believe" that Paul used, carried with it trust "conjoined with obedience" to the commands of Christ. When they said they didn't even know about the Holy Spirit, he inquired about believing. He said, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" Why they said, "John's baptism." And Paul taught them that John's baptism was anticipatory that it looked toward the coming of Christ. And then the Bible says that "they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." Well, Why? Because they couldn't be saved without the faith that embraces that particular act. In Acts 16:30-31 the Philippian Jailor inquired, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Well, Mr. Barr thinks that the idea of "believe" cannot include obedience to the command to be baptized. But it does! Going a little bit further the Bible says that Paul spake unto them the word of the Lord with all that were in his house and he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes and was baptized. And

then he took them up into his house and rejoiced —and watch it—with all his house BELIEVING in God. When did he rejoice with all of his house BELIEVING in God? 'When he had the trust that was "CONJOINED WITH OBEDIENCE" unto Christ. And not until that time is it stated that he believed in the sense that he had a faith that embraced Jesus a faith that brought justification.

Well, he said tonight that we are discussing at what point of obedience. And he referred to the News Ad, which was a misprint, concerning the plan of salvation or water baptism and the expression "or" there was left out, I believe, when the brethren put that in. But he said, "I teach that Jesus is the way. He is the Way of Salvation (Jn. 14:6)." Yes, and Mr. Rogers teaches that Jesus is the Way of Salvation. Jesus said, "I am the way." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John 14:6). Mr. Barr, how do you get INTO Jesus who is "THE WAY"? The Bible says in Romans 6:3-4, "Do you not know (MR. BARR DOESN'T!) "that so many of us as were baptized INTO Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" Yes sir, he said we believe in blood before water. Well, it happens to be that. John 19:34 teaches that the blood was shed in His death. And this thing that Mr. Barr disparages and slurs is the very thing the Bible says inducts us into the death of the Lord Jesus Christ (Romans 6:3-4). Then he said he believed in Christ before the church. Well, the Bible teaches that the church is the body of Christ, and certainly to be in Christ is to be in the church.

I should like to refer to Mr. Barr's questions while we have the time. I'll answer them and send them back.

1. "Do you baptize a child of God or a child of the devil?" I might answer that orally like this, Mr. Barr: RETROSPECTIVELY, I baptize a child of the devil. PROSPECTIVELY, I baptize a child of God. LITERALLY, I baptize a son of Adam in the process of regeneration! Now then, you might put that down and deal with it. But the answer here on paper is: I baptize a child of the devil who has rebelled AGAINST the devil and is in the process of becoming a new Creature in Christ.

2. Does your candidate for baptism have a pure heart or an impure heart?" If by an "impure heart" you mean a

man that is still a sinner, then I baptize a man with an "impure heart" if you mean by that whether or not a man is still a sinner.

3. "Do you baptize a man with a clean soul or a filthy soul?" If by "filthy soul" you mean a person that is still a sinner, a person that is still condemned, I baptize a person with a "filthy soul" in that particular sense..

4. "When your candidate for baptism is on the way to the baptismal waters is he being led of God or of the devil?" If by "led of God" you mean obeying God or obeying the Spirit of God, then he is obeying God. But he has not FOLLOWED God UP TO THE POINT that he becomes a child of God. When he is "BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST" THEN he becomes a child of God by faith.

5. "Is your candidate for baptism condemned or is he out from under condemnation?" He is condemned and lost, Mr. Barr! If he were not, then I could not say that baptism is necessary for salvation.

I come now to a review of the arguments that he has advanced. We're debating this same proposition or this same issue for four nights and we will have time to deal with all the things that are introduced. But he made his argument on the positive and negative statements concerning the conditions or terms of salvation. He said that we must hear, and that if a man does not hear then he is lost. And that a man must heed the Spirit, I believe he said, and if a man is not led by the Spirit of Christ then he is none of His. He further said that a man must repent, and that except you repent, ye shall all likewise perish. And he came to believe and said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. John 8:24: "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins. But he said, Now where is the passage that teaches that if a person is not baptized he is damned? Well, the Bible says in Luke 7:29-30, "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." The Bible says in Heb. 12:25 concerning Israel, "For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven." Mr. Barr, if a person is not baptized he has rejected the counsel of God!

And the Bible says that a man that rejects the counsel of God shall not escape!

Let us look now at Acts 3:22. Mr. Barr said there are only four things. Well, my Bible says in Acts 3:22 concerning Jesus, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in ALL THINGS whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." Mr. Barr said there are only FOUR things you have to do, you don't have to hear Jesus in ALL THINGS. But Peter said that you must hear Him in "ALL THINGS." And I'll take Peter! Now you can take Vernon L. Barr if you want to, but Peter said that you must hear Jesus in "ALL THINGS" that he has commanded.

But further: In John 3:3-5 we have the story of Nicodemus coming to our Lord. "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus was rather perplexed and amazed at that. He inquired how he could enter into his mother's womb and be born the second time. Then Jesus explained it: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now there is your "EXCEPT"! Except a man repent, he'll perish. Except he believes, he is damned. And JESUS said, "EXCEPT a man be BORN OF WATER and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." So you just put it down, and we will have four nights of real debate on John 3:5!

Now then, he says that Rogers CLAIMS to speak where the Bible speaks. Mr. Barr, put a tack right here: Do you not claim to do that? Do you not CLAIM to speak where the Bible speaks and to be silent where the Bible is silent? I have often wondered why Baptist preachers go off on such tangents. It must be because they do not claim to speak where the Bible speaks, nor to be silent where it is silent! That will explain a great deal about Baptist doctrine!

We now come to the point he has made. He said, Where does it say that the one that believes and is baptized shall be saved? He reads this one in Acts 16:31 and says, Well now, where is the passage that says believe and be baptized and

you shall be saved? MARK 16:16 SAYS IT, MR. BARR! Mark 16:16 is in the BOOK just like Acts 16:311 Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Barr, through his entire speech, said, Find the verse that says believe and be baptized. HERE you have, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Well now, THERE IT IS! Put it down and let us debate the issue. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mk. 16:16).

He came to John 3:14-15, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." If he will investigate the Revised Version, it says, "that whosoever believeth may IN HIM have eternal life." That is, may have the life IN CHRIST. How do you get into Christ? Romans 6:3-4 says that a man is "BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST." Verse 36 of that same chapter (John 3) says, "he that obeyeth not the son shall not see life" (in the Revised Version).

Then he referred to Moses lifting up the serpent and thought these people were saved "at the point of faith" without doing anything else. But the Bible says that they erected that thing in the midst of the camp and it came to pass that when the Israelites looked that they were healed. So it wasn't "at the point of faith," as Mr. Barr affirmed was the case in the Old Testament.

He came to Ephesians 2:8-10, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast." And thus he tried to eliminate baptism from the Plan of Salvation by this verse. But if he will investigate he will find that the Ephesians had been baptized twice. And the Bible says in Acts 19:5 that the second time they were baptized they were baptized "INTO the name of the Lord Jesus." The Bible teaches that men are saved by grace. But the salvation is IN CHRIST as the Bible states in 2 Timothy 2:10. I challenge Mr. Barr, every inch of him, to bring me the verse that tells how you get INTO the Lord Jesus Christ! He tried to eliminate all works there. But the Bible says in John 6:29, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." BELIEF then is a WORK! And if Ephesians

2:10 eliminates ALL WORK, then even FAITH itself is eliminated as a condition of salvation. He asks, where does it say in this verse, By faith and baptism? Well, where does it say in that verse, By faith and REPENTANCE? or by faith and LOVE? or by faith and CONFESSION? Does he eliminate these because they are not mentioned there? No Or! Hell get them in.

Then he said that it is "not of yourselves." And he said that Jesus said, "Thus it becometh US to fulfill all righteousness." And therefore he concludes that baptism is not essential to salvation because it is of man. Well, so also is faith, Mr. Barr. Put it down. Romans 10:10: "With the heart man," —M-A-N, MAN — "believeth unto righteousness." MAN does the BELIEVING. Mr. Barr said that it is not of anything that WE do; It is not of US. And therefore he believes that baptism is eliminated. So then he has eliminated FAITH by his argument.

Then he said, It is the gift of God and that eliminates baptism. But if that is true then he would eliminate ALL acts of obedience. But we find that such is not true. For, "gift of God" does not mean that a thing is unconditional. In Joshua chapter 6 God said to Joshua, "See, I have given into thine hand Jericho" (Josh. 6:2). God had "GIVEN" them the city but they had a lot to do before they obtained it!

He said that baptism is a work. So is FAITH, Mr. Barr! And so is REPENTANCE! And then he said that baptism is the "effect of salvation." That is pure BAPTIST MOONSHINE! And there is not a verse in God's Book that says it. And nobody knows it better than Mr. Vernon L. Barr.

He quoted Jn. 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Yes, and the last part of that verse in the Revised Version says, "But he that OBEYETH NOT the Son shall not see We, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

John 5:24: Why he said, This is exactly what my proposition teaches. But look at it! Jesus said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word,"—That is Christ speaking — and believeth ON HIM THAT SENT ME, hath everlasting life." Not a single solitary word said about FAITH IN CHRIST. The faith there, is faith in GOD! So he has eliminated faith in CHRIST! Now do you see? He doesn't even believe that you have to believe in Christ. He

says that this is the entire scheme of redemption and plan of salvation. He says, This is exactly what my proposition teaches. Well, faith in Christ is not in John 5:24, Mr. Barr! Put it down and let us discuss it after a while.

He said that we come into possession of eternal life at faith. The passage doesn't say that. Not at all! The Bible says that "LIFE IS IN CHRIST" (1, John 5:11) and that we are "BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST" wherein 0 the life (Rom. 6: 34).

He came to John 20:30-31, "That believing ye might have life through his name." But if he will investigate in the Revised Version it says, "And that believing ye may have life IN HIS NAME." And the Bible says twice (Acts 19:5 and 8:16) that we are baptized INTO THE NAME OF CHRIST.

He came to Romans 4:9 and talked about the righteousness of God which is by faith. But not "at the point of faith," nor by "faith only." The Bible says in Heb. 11 :7 that after Noah obeyed he obtained "the righteousness which is by faith.

On 1 Cor. 1:21 he said that the gospel saves. That is true — that God saves the believer by the thing that is preached — but it is when he OBEYS THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

He talked about Romans 3:25-27. But verse 24 says, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is IN CHRIST JESUS." Mr. Barr, Romans 6:3-4 says, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized INTO Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" We are "BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST" and that is the place you are justified by faith.

He said he had remission of sins by faith in the blood and not by faith in baptism. Yes, but does he get salvation by faith in REPENTANCE? Mr. Barr, just because a thing is a condition of salvation does not mean that we believe in it. You have to be baptized in order to be a member of a Baptist church. Did you trust the creek for church membership, Mr. Barr? Did you trust the creek for church membership? I thank you ladies and gentlemen.

## **BARR'S SECOND SPEECH**

**Tuesday night, Sept. 23rd**

Gentlemen moderators, my worthy opponent, Mr. Rogers, ladies and gentlemen. I will give you just a little more time to settle down. (There was a short intermission after the first two speeches.) I can speak all right, and make you hear. I think they are hearing me in spite of the fact that some are moving around a little, and you do need some relaxation. But I am afraid you might disturb others who are very interested in hearing.

It gives me a good deal of joy to come back to continue the affirmation of the proposition read in your hearing in the beginning of the discussion tonight. And I am glad I am meeting Mr. Rogers, who according to his moderator's statement —and I sincerely believe it to be so — is as able a representative as his people have anywhere, and that makes it wonderful. Mr. Rogers, I think, is a fine young man. That was my impression when I met him before, and I have no reason to change. But he only answered eight of the sixteen arguments I made. He did a lot of talking and found a lot of objections, but I noticed very carefully, that he answered eight of the sixteen affirmative arguments. Only fifty per cent through. Well, he has another speech. It is all right, and I am not going to say he will not reply to the rest in his last speech tonight.

Now to his questions:

1. Were the rulers referred to in John 12:42 saved at the point of faith, while they refused to confess their faith in Jesus: because they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God? Answer: Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea were of this class, but they later confessed Jesus. Are you saying that one cannot have believed in Jesus Christ for salvation of the soul, and be afraid to confess Christ? And in the flesh to become enamored of the praise of men momentarily? To so say is to say something in which the Bible will not bear you out.

2. When a passage of scripture stipulates salvation, and

mentions one item of obedience such as faith, is everything excluded as a condition of salvation, except the item mentioned? Answer: No. The verses I gave specifically stated. four positive commands that one must obey. I showed you the negative of each of the four. And here my friend comes as always, as they do not know anything else to do, and says that Mr. Barr actually teaches faith only. After I made a speech, and gave four specific things one must do, but showed you, that salvation comes at the point of faith in one's obedience. There are a thousand or more commands of Jesus we are to obey. Baptists and the Bible teach that when we get to that point where we believe in Jesus Christ with all our heart, God saves, but he takes the position that when you get to the point of baptism, that baptism saves you. The difference between him and me, and between Baptists and his people is: we teach that God saves, and they teach that baptism saves.

3. Can one be given the right to become what he already is? Answer: No. And of course I know what he has in mind; John 1:11,12, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." But verse 13 says, "Which were born-already born not of blood, nor of the will of flesh, etc., but of God.

4. Is there any type of work a man must do to be saved? Answer: The only work is to repent and believe in Jesus Christ, if you call this work? Now I am aware of the picture he has in mind. I am not a newcomer to this debating business, and I know their little tricks. "And Jesus said, This is the work, that ye believe on Jesus." Some folks -came along and wanted to do the working. Just this one work He said, and of course, the people He had taught repentance to were involved in it. One cannot believe from the heart in Jesus until he has repented.

5. Is baptism of the law of works or of the law of faith? Answer: Baptism is neither. No place in the Bible does it say that it is one or the other. But baptism is a picture of the gospel, and is a command of Jesus to a saved person to obey because of his love for Jesus, shed abroad in his heart,

when he was saved by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, you note his answers to my questions carefully. And listen, my friend, I will be reminding you of these things when this debate is over.

1. Do you baptize a child of God or a child of the Devil? He answered, "A child of the Devil, who has rebelled against the Devil, and who is in the process of becoming a new creature." But I have in my files, newspaper clippings, telling of people that made all the steps he (Rogers) claims one must make, and some of them intended and expected to be baptized, but died before they reached the baptismal waters. So, according to him (Rogers) such people were in the process of becoming new creatures, but never did. There is no need for a man to say that one must necessarily be baptized, who has followed all the other steps; because this life that we live makes it uncertain that any of us could get to the baptismal waters, even if it were just a little way. So, when it all blows over, he baptizes a child of the Devil. He charges me, in the face of the fact that I gave four specific commands, both the positive and the negative, that one must obey to be saved; of preaching that salvation is by faith only. And, yet, he comes to tell you that the one he baptizes is a child of the Devil. So, beloved, he teaches baptism only. He says that was a mis-print in that paper (Tri-Cities Daily), but it was profitable as sure as you live, because it has their plan of salvation in it from beginning to end.

2. Does your candidate for baptism have a pure heart, or an impure heart? He says, "If by an impure heart, you mean he is still a sinner, an impure heart." So he is a child of the Devil, and he has an impure heart. Now, you bear that in mind, and I will make you think of all these things a lot of times before we are through here.

3. Do you baptize a man with a clean soul or one who has a filthy soul? He says, "If by a filthy soul you mean he is still a sinner, a filthy soul." Remember, his candidate for baptism is a child of the Devil in the process of becoming a child of God,, but he has an impure heart, and he has a filthy Soul.

4. When your candidate for baptism is on the way to the baptismal waters, is he being led by God or by the Devil?

He says, "If by 'led of God' you mean, obeying, then of God." But he is a child of the Devil. You cannot serve two Masters, said Jesus in Matthew 6:24. Either you hate the one and love the other or you will despise the one and hold to the other. So, here is a man that is a child of the Devil, but he is obeying God. He has an impure heart; he has a filthy soul, but he is obeying God. But of course he (Mr. Rogers) could not afford to say that it was God leading his candidate to the baptismal waters, because he knows the Book says in Romans 8:14, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." He could not afford to say that, so he tried to dodge the thing. But he did not help himself a bit in the world.

5. Is your candidate for baptism condemned, or is he out from under condemnation? He says, "Condemned! Condemned!" Now, let us look at his candidate for baptism. He is a child of the Devil, he has an impure heart, he has a filthy soul, he is condemned, he is just obeying God. The preacher (Mr. Rogers) would not come right out and say he was being led of God, he is just obeying God. So, the preacher and the water makes a child of God out of that child of the Devil, with an impure heart, with a filthy soul, and under condemnation. Great God! Ladies and gentlemen, if that is not water salvation, then I have not brains enough to meet it when I overtake it in the road. Now, there is the thing they teach, and they know it, and I know it, and everybody else knows it. He would have done better, trying to answer my arguments. He just read hurriedly over the last four of the eight he purported to answer. I actually do not see any necessity of going over my arguments again. So, help me God, I do not, because I am well contented for them to stand just like they are. He said that Barr has affirmed as a proposition that one is saved at the point of faith before and without water baptism, and that it was superfluous for me to add before and without water baptism. For your information, Mr. Rogers, I did not add it. Either you did or your man who drew up the propositions, because I copied the propositions exactly as sent to me with your name signed to them. So, you ought not to make statements like that unless you know what you are doing. I just signed it like he drew it up, because I can affirm it and show it to him in the Bible.

Did he get up here and read to you, that except you are baptized ye shall all likewise perish? Did he get up here and read to you where Jesus said, Be baptized and thou shall be saved? Did he get up here and read to you that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe and are baptized? Did he get up here and read to you, He that believeth on the Son, and is baptized is not condemned? But I read to you those many passages in the Bible, ladies and gentlemen, showing you that when you come to the point of faith in Jesus, in obedience, that is when God saves you. He said that Mr. Barr encourages disobedience, and actually slurs obedience. I tell you, Mr. Rogers, I did not do it, I will not do it in any other speech — you hear me — and you have never heard me do it, and you will never hear me do it. I told you in the beginning that it is not a question of whether baptism is important. We both know that it is important. But for what is it important? To obtain the remission of sins, or to declare the remission of sins? He said that I preached faith only. I deny it. I just simply deny it, because it is not so. I named four positive commands, and their negatives, and I read many verses. He said, "Why cannot Mr. Barr read a verse that says you are saved at the point of faith?" Well, if I could read that, there would be no need of affirming this proposition. Of course I am not going to read a verse that says, Jesus said at the point of faith; that is when one would be saved. But I have read many, many scriptures like John 3:18, "He that believeth on him is not condemned." If one is not condemned, will Mr. Rogers believe it? He says one is condemned until he is baptized. Can he read one verse that says, He that is baptized is not condemned? Can he read one, my friends, on his side of the proposition? Of course he cannot do it, and he knows that he cannot do it. He said, "A faith that saves is a faith that obeys." Well, of course that is so; we all say that, we all believe that. A faith that saves is a faith that obeys. But at what point in his obedience is he saved? There are thousands of commands of Jesus, and the only one that will do any good according to the gospel in water is to obey Jesus to be baptized. You can believe in Him with all your heart, you can repent of all your sins, you can confess Him publicly before men, you can even be immersed in the Name of the

Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but if you do not have faith enough to believe that baptism gets rid of your past sins you are hell bound, unsaved, according to the doctrine of my friend. It is not faith in Christ, it is faith in the efficacy of water baptism. That is his doctrine. It is not a question of obedience, and I said that in the beginning to head off some of his quibbles, quibbles they all make. I know their quibbles. He comes to the rulers in John 12:42, and I have already answered that as one of his questions. Then he comes to repentance, and asks if faith excludes all these other things. No, I went over all those other things, and showed you the positive commands, and their negatives. Ladies and gentlemen, I have even promised to leave this hand, and shake his hand, and let him baptize me, and come into the church of which he is a member, if he can read in the Bible where it says, Except ye are baptized you will all likewise perish; Except you are baptized you will be damned. He knows he did not read it. He knows he cannot read it, and he will not read it. He will not have read it when these four nights are over, yea, when forty four hundred years are over, he will not be able to read it.

Then he comes to John 8:24-31, 32. He calls attention to some people in this chapter. He tries to make those in John 8:44, of whom Jesus says that the Devil is their father the same as those referred to in the other verses in the chapter. There are at least three different classes of persons in John chapter 8. If he wants to fight on it, then I challenge him to fight. In one of these verses, it is 'believe' (his) believe into Him. They were saved. Another group just believed about Him, believed what He said, but did not trust Him to save them. The group in verse 44 did not believe in, or did not believe about Him. They were children of the Devil. So, if you would handle the Word of God that way, it would make infidels out of people. If he will read the chapter, and study it, ladies and gentlemen and you go home and do it you will find three different classes being dealt with in John chapter 8.

He next comes to Hebrews 11:7, and says Noah was saved by faith, but said he, "Look at all the things he did." He did not develop his argument and since he does not, I will do it, and blow it sky high. He presumes that Noah during

all those many years he was building the ark was still unsaved, that all his working was in the "by faith!" But in Genesis 6:8 Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord. His work was not the works of an unsaved man. His faith was working by love in his building of the ark; working because he was saved. He was a preacher of righteousness, Peter said, for many years.

He talks about the walls of Jericho falling down. I want to explode that, and if he does not develop the argument I will explode it anyway. I understand this debate is going into a book and I want to explode it once and for ever. So, they take the position that by faith the walls of Jericho fell down. Yes, and they walked around thirteen times, and filially after thirteen times the walls fell down. Hence, say they, you must be saved by being baptized. Great shades of Aristotle! What sort of reasoning is that? If, because they walked around the walls of Jericho thirteen times, and the walls fell down, therefore ye must be baptized in order to be saved is correct, then I can prove that I am a one-eyed colored aviator, flying in the Mr now. And I am not in the Mr, and I am not flying in the Mr, and I am not a one-eyed colored aviator. But one could prove anything by that sort of reasoning.

He comes now to Acts 2, and he talks about verse 44; their being all together, they believed and had all things in common. He talks about verse 41, "they that gladly received his word were baptized." He talks about verse 47, the saved added to the church. He says that nobody was saved but the baptized. That is simply his assertion for it. Note who was baptized. It was, "they that gladly received his word." Yet, the fellow that he baptizes has an impure heart, filthy soul, condemned, on his road to hell, and a child of the Devil. But, God bless you, that is just not so. And the Book said he added the saved; saved already, and then he added them.

Then he comes to Acts 19, where there are some folks who had not so much as even heard whether there be any Holy Ghost or not. This is according to the Revised Version, which version most of their folks use. They were just a bunch of ducked sinners. They had never been saved by the grace of God; they were just like anybody else who goes down into the water thinking it will save him. He will be a ducked

sinner still on his road to hell, like he was before he got into the water, and he will need to look to Jesus Christ, and trust in Him for the salvation of his soul. He says you cannot be saved without a faith that embraces the act of baptism. Why does he not give some scripture for it? He puts it all in the water. Listen, there is not a line in God's Book that says that the faith that saves embraces the act of baptism. There are many lines in God's Book that teaches us that a man who has believed to the saving of his soul, has faith to dust Christ, will be striving to do all the things commanded, and not just to be baptized.

Next he comes to Acts 16 where Paul and Silas were in jail at Philippi. The jailor said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" They replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." My opponent calls attention to the fact that they were baptized. Of course they were; I have told you that baptism is important, but you read nothing in this scripture that says they were baptized to get rid of their sins. He finds where he went on his way rejoicing, and he supposes that the man rejoiced because baptism got rid of his sins. It does not say he started rejoicing after he was baptized. It does not say that, and he cannot prove it. He just assumes it. You fellows have hollered it all over the country, until a few people think it is so.

Cornelius and his household received the Holy Ghost, and spake in tongues, and magnified God before they were baptized.

He comes to Gal. 3:26, 27, and he argues the way to get into Christ is to be baptized into Him. The Wycliffe Translation, the first English translation, translated in 1338, does not translate Gal. 3:27 as "into." I have a copy over there in my brief case, and you call look at it if you want to. Verse 26 says, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Verse 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized in (in) Christ. It does not translate it "Into." The Douay Version, the Bible the Catholics use, also translates it "in," and they are placing their hope for heaven on the translation of the little preposition "his" in Galatians 3:27 and Romans 6:3. Now I have a lot of scholars in the State of Alabama, whom I purposely wrote to, who tell me that the identical word that is translated "believe his, Christ" is the

one translated, "baptized *his* Christ," in Galatians 3:27 and Romans 6:3. I have a number of them here. I have one from Taladega, Alabama (I don't know if I can pronounce it or not). The letter is from the college there, and I have one from Huntsville, Alabama. I wrote to colleges in Alabama, knowing I would be in this debate in Alabama.

He says, Mr. Barr disparages and slurs. Mr. Rogers, you are a nice young fellow, and you have in the main, kept this discussion on a high plain, and let us keep it that way. I don't slur, nor do I disparage salvation. I disparage your doctrine of baptismal regeneration. That is what it amounts to. I disparage it and I fight it with all that is in me, because it will damn the souls of people in hell. Your doctrine, that you take a child of the Devil, that has an impure heart, and a filthy soul, and is condemned, and make a child of God out of him by baptism.

He reads a scripture about people rejecting the counsel of God because they were not baptized of John. He (Mr. Rogers) does the same thing. He rejects the baptism of John, too. And, so he thinks he finds some help for his cause. He thinks the only counsel of God that you can reject and be lost, is being baptized. That is what his argument amounted to. Barr does not say, that you must not hear Jesus in all the things He commands. They have a habit of saying that Baptists say you do not have to hear Jesus in all things He commands. I did not say any such thing, and I will not say it in the next speech. He is just anticipating my saying it; he hopes I will say it.

He comes to John 3:5, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." And he challenges me to fight on it. I accept your challenge, sir. I will fight on that verse all four nights, if you want to, and I challenge you to it. I am rough on watches, and that is all right; I will get another one. (Barr hits pulpit stand with his fist, and his wrist watch flies off his arm, hitting the floor and breaks.) So, I accept his challenge, and let me show you how he will blow his bubble quick. Wayne, (speaking to his moderator) if you will, get that thing (watch). It may be I did not break it. It cost a hundred dollars, but I didn't pay it, as some folks gave it to me, and I hope it is not broken. But I would tear up a hundred dollar watch to fight this doctrine, and to preach Jesus, any day in the week, or night either,

so far as that is concerned. Friends, Jesus spoke the words in John 3:5, and it does not say Except a man be born of baptism and the Spirit. But it says "water," and of course my friend makes it out to be water baptism. Jesus spake these words to Nicodemus, during his personal ministry. Now you watch him, when he finally gets around to my last eight arguments; the thief on the cross; the woman in Luke 7, and Zacchaeus. He will say, Oh! that was during the personal ministry of Jesus. That is if he talks as he did before, and like others among them. Jesus could forgive them and save them. But he has his plan here, even before Jesus saved the thief. Jesus spake these words during his personal ministry, and yet they claim the first gospel sermon was preached on Pentecost. They preach it everywhere, and now he goes back here to the personal ministry of Jesus. Why, brother, listen, you are so inconsistent — you do not mean to be— it is downright pitiful. Yes, God bless your heart, I accept your challenge on John 3:5. When you are in the affirmative, I hope you will stay to it. I will stay with you on it for two nights, and then if I had to, (I would hate to do it, for I have other engagements) I would wire that I would stay two more days if you want a little more on John 3:5. We will see whether he is bluffing or whether he wants to fight on that scripture.

I showed his inconsistency about speaking where the Bible speaks and remaining silent where the Bible is silent. He wonders if we Baptists do the same. No, if we claimed to speak where the Bible speaks, and remain silent where the Bible is silent, I would not make any comment. I would just read the scripture, and so would he. His position is equivalent to the Roman Catholic dogma of infallibility. Why, brother, he is just like the Catholic Pope. If he catches cold, he has his collar turned backwards. He thinks he can't make any mistakes. Barr does not always speak where the Bible speaks. I comment upon the Bible, where the Bible speaks, and I try always to speak in conformity with what the Bible teaches.

Next he comes to Mark 16:16. We will get a lot of Mark 16:16. I hope he will make a good fight on it. He thinks he has found where Jesus said, "You will go to Hell, if you are not baptized." Here is what Mark 16:16 says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but, he that. believeth

not shall be damned." The condition of salvation is "believe," though this is not a conditional sentence at all. It is a declarative sentence. Jesus simply stated, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He is talking about a future salvation of body and soul and spirit in heaven. "He that believeth not shall be damned." When? Right now? No, when he dies he will be damned, you understand, body, soul and spirit in the resurrection of the unsaved dead. So it is a declarative sentence, and not a command at all. It is not seeking to give a condition of salvation. Here is the way these fellows read it. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and *he that believeth and is not baptized* shall be damned. That is the way they read it, and I challenge him to say he does not believe it that way. Baptists believe it just like the Son of God wrote it. He believes, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, it may be, if they do not trip, and fall, and go to bell, and if he does all this and does all that. But Baptists believe it as it is, God bless you, and he does not believe it. I will show you when we get on his proposition how much he does not believe it.

He said the Ephesian Christians had been baptized twice. No, they had not. Just a few of them had been baptized twice, not the whole Ephesian Church. When you said that, were you speaking where the Bible speaks, and remaining silent where it is silent? When you got up here and said all the Ephesian Christians had been baptized twice you slipped a cog. You should wake up, young man, as you are human just like I am. Being a little younger, it may be you have not learned it as well as I have, yet.

He wants me to show how we get into Christ. I did show him in Philippians 3:9 Paul said be found IN HIM, and he goes on to say "BY FAITH THAT IS IN ME." In the Lord. That is the way we get into Christ. By faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

He said in Joshua 6 the city of Jericho was given to the Israelites. But they didn't get it until they marched around thirteen times, and then the walls fell down, therefore, you have to be baptized to be saved. That is his argument. Great heavens alive! I could-, prove that a snail could run faster than a jack-rabbit by that kind of reasoning. That is foolish.

Next he says, faith in Christ is not in John 5:24. Well,

ladies and gentlemen, read it, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life." "Believeth on him that sent me." Jesus said, I and my Father are one. You could not believe on one without believing on the other. But my friend has not studied the Bible enough to know that.

Then he comes to John 20:31, and left out the phrase "that believing, ye might have life through his name." That is what he did. He would like to have found a verse that says, being baptized ye might have life through his name; but of course it just is not in there.

They do not like Baptist Churches very much, I don't think, and I do not want to be ugly, but the Devil does not like them either. The Devil has tried every way under God's shining stars to stamp them out, but Jesus has promised that the gates of hell will not prevail against them, and they won't. They will be here doing business for the Son of God when Jesus shouts with His voice from the clouds, and calls for His own, and they meet Him in midair.

Mr. Rogers said, "So you trust the creek for church membership." No, I do not trust the creek for church membership at all. I just do what Jesus teaches me to do, and the Lord adds to the church. I will not trust the creek at all. Now then, ladies and gentlemen, I sort of apologize for paying attention to the quibbles my friend has made. Before God, if I have ever heard quibbles, they are quibbles; I said I was content to let the arguments stand as they are, and I certainly am. I am glad to let them go to the public to read, after I am dead and gone. I will give him some more since he got to fifty per cent of the others. I am waiting for the last five minutes, as I want to give him a chance to catch up. I do not want him to stay so far behind. I wish he would answer my arguments. If this is put in a book, it will show that he did not answer, and that he just read my arguments hurriedly, not even making all answer to them, especially the last three or four that he read.

ARGUMENT Seventeen is based on John 3:18. The believer is not condemned. "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." To fit the negative side of this proposition, John 3:18 would

have to read, He that believeth on Him and is baptized is not condemned: because he hath not believed and been baptized in the name of the only begotten Son of God. This shows up the way he answered one of my questions. Baptists believe the text just like it is, but my friend's people must add to the text to make it fit their belief. All should remember that God pronounces a curse on those who add to or take from His Word. They have to add to the 'Word of God 5 make it fit their plan.

ARGUMENT Eighteen is based on I John 5:1 (R.S.V.), "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is a child of God, and every one who loves the parent loves the child." I know, or I feel sure Mr. Rogers has studied The Revised Standard Version, as it is often used by his people. Since one believes in Jesus Christ before he is baptized, then he is a child of God before and without water baptism. I wish my opponent would try and find a verse in God's Bible that says, Every one who is baptized is a child of God. That is his doctrine, ladies and gentlemen, as sure as you and I are here.

I have read most of what Alexander Campbell and his contemporaries put out, everything I could get, preparing myself to fight this pernicious doctrine that is deceiving so many people, and dragging so many of them to hell. I find that if you study what they have taught you can answer all they put out, because it is all carved just like Campbell started it back yonder. You young Baptist preachers get those works and study them, and get your scriptures down, and you can whip any of them across the face of the earth on the false doctrine they teach, because they all run that same circle. They never get out of it.

Mr. Rogers said that when you believe, you are begotten of God. Let me show you something. You are still a child of the Devil, though begotten of God; then you are born of water baptism, and you become a child of God. Of course that is the position he takes. In the natural realm as in the spiritual realm the begetter of a child is the father of that child. Even before it is born, and after it is born. But the doctrine of these people makes God the begetter of the child, but he is still the Devil's child. God begat him, but he is the Devil's child until he is baptized. That is their doctrine, out and out. So, it is pitiful, ladies and gentlemen. I wish to God, you

would desert it because you are following after something that will damn your soul in hell.

ARGUMENT Nineteen: Acts 15:8, 9, "And God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us. And put no difference between us and them purifying their hearts by faith." BY FAITH. Can you find one that says, Purifying their hearts by baptism? Note the way he answered another of my questions. He said he had an impure heart until he was baptized. But I find here, that their hearts were purified by faith. Oh! Why doesn't he get the Bible for his position, and we could have an interesting debate. I am not angry at him, but I am sorry for him. He is the best they have, but he just does not have any Bible on his side of the proposition. Now, it would help the cause of my opponent very much if he could find a verse in God's Bible that says, Purifying their hearts BY BAPTISM. He has them with an impure heart until they are baptized. In the prepositional use one is never said to be saved by or through baptism. I find where you are saved by grace through faith. Let him find a verse that says, You are saved by or through baptism. It just isn't there. It is not in the Bible.

ARGUMENT Twenty. John 3:36, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. So, we get to the place where we should not perish before baptism; hence, saved before and without water baptism. Where do you find in the Bible that it says, whosoever is not baptized shall perish?"

ARGUMENT Twenty-one. Romans 5:1, The believer is justified. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." So, then, to reach the point of justification is to reach the point of faith. And we reach faith before baptism; therefore we are justified (saved) before and without water baptism. The side of the opposition would do well to look for a Scripture that teaches that one is justified by baptism, and has peace with God through baptism. That is exactly what they teach.

I want to tell him now, what one of the questions will be that I will ask him tomorrow night. Does your candidate for baptism have peace with God? You can have it now, and you are going to get him in a shape. You have already started,

and you cannot afford to turn back. I want to paint a chart, if there is someone to paint one for me, and we are going to let the people see it on the last two nights. To see the shape he has his candidate for baptism in. (Time called.) Thank. you, ladies and gentlemen. Give my friend a careful hearing please.

## **ROGERS SECOND SPEECH**

### **Tuesday Night**

Mr. Barr, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen: I am now glad to appear before you for the last speech of this session of the debate. I should like to begin exactly where I left off and review all of the points that I lacked in dealing with the first speech that Mr. Barr introduced. Then we shall have time to answer all the arguments that have been made by Mr. Barr tonight.

I pointed out in the first speech that I made that we are debating the same issue for four nights. And yet Mr. Barr is afraid that he is not going to have time enough to deal with the issue. If you had 10 yews, Mr. Barr, you could not prove your proposition! And so you might as well start fretting about the time, because it cannot be proven. We will deal with all the arguments, and Mr. Barr will have plenty of time to deal with everything that has been introduced or that will be introduced.

He came to Luke 8:13 and said that the devil steals the seed from the heart lest the people should believe and be saved. He said, Why did not the Bible say that the devil stole the seed from the heart lest they should believe, be baptized, and be saved? Well, Jesus did say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And that is the very point that -Air. Barr is requesting! And when the devil steals the seed from the heart and keeps a man from doing what Jesus said to do, then he has done the thing Jesus referred to in Luke 8 Q.

He came to Gal. 5:6 which we referred to. Paul said, "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." Mr. Barr says that it is "at the point of faith" and therefore **WITHOUT WORKS AND WITHOUT LOVE!** Now Mr. Barr, if You didn't believe the proposition you should not have signed it regardless of who typed it out. I don't know whether I did or not. But if I did, I think you knew what you were signing. And if you did not believe what you signed, you should

(51)

have kept your name off of it! If you don't believe that it is "at the point of faith" and you want to open the door and drag in love, and drag in confession, and drag in repentance, then through that SAME DOOR, Mr. Barr, I will bring in the baptism that Jesus commanded. For the Bible says as much about baptism in John 3:16 as it does about love, as much as it does about repentance, and as much as it does about confession. And so when he opens the door to bring in his other things then I will bring in the command of the Son of God to "be baptized for the remission of sins."

He said that a person, according to Rogers, is still a child of the devil even when he has a faith that is working by love. Well, Mr. Barr preaches to a man who he says repents. And thus he has a child of the devil repenting. And repenting carries with it "Godly sorrow." And Mr. Barr has a child of the devil that is unclean, impure, and under the wrath of God he has that man repenting and believing in the Lord Jesus Christ. Yes, and how does it come about? By hearing! according to Mr. Barr, a Baptist preacher. For faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God, and Mr. Barr affirms that he preaches the word of God. But what kind of a man is it that Mr. Barr gets to repent and believe? Why it is a man that is corrupt, that is impure, that is unclean, that is filthy! And he gets that man to repent and believe the same man that I get to be baptized. The only thing is: I take him one more step, the step the Lord took him, and Mr. Barr stops instead of taking him where the Lord took him.

He said that Paul came to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, and that they might be sanctified by faith in Christ. And he said that everything necessary for salvation would certainly be involved in that passage. Well, the passage doesn't say a thing on earth concerning REPENTANCE! There are other passages that teach it, but Mr. Barr has to go out of this passage to find it There are other passages where Paul taught that baptism is necessary for salvation also!

But he said that -we are sanctified by faith in Christ. Yes, but WHEN are we sanctified by faith in Christ. Paul said concerning the church in Eph. 5:26: "Christ loved the church,

And gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." THAT is WHEN you are sanctified by faith! When you are washed of water by the word like the Bible commands.

But he says that Paul said that, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 1:17). Then he concluded that baptism is not part of the gospel. But certainly Paul preached baptism. In Acts 19:5-6 Paul taught them that they were to believe in the Lord and to be baptized in his name. -And they were baptized in his name at that same time. Not only that, but Mr. Barr simply perverts 1 Cor. 1:17. He is actually and really affirming that Paul went on his mission without the authority to baptize. According to Mr. Barr, Paul had no authority to baptize at all. Does Paul say in that connection, "I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gains, lest some body should get the idea that it was necessary for salvation"? Is that what it says? No sir! He said, "I am thankful that I baptized but a few, lest any of you should say that you were baptized in my name." Paul did not want them to say that they were baptized in his name. And besides that we understand that Paul did baptize some. He said, "I baptized Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas. And besides that I know not whether I baptized any other." Now did he baptize without any authority? The fact is, that the very point in the passage is this: Others were sent to do the baptizing, Paul could do the preaching. It doesn't deal with whether or not baptism was "for remission" or not for remission. But here: If Paul's statement that he was not sent to baptize means that baptism is non-essential, then if I find where some -were sent to baptize, that WILL make it necessary! Won't it Mr. Barr? That is just what it proves, Mr. Barr, if your argument is worth the pop of your finger. If Paul being sent not to baptize makes it non-essential, then if I find where some WERE SENT to baptize that will make it necessary! Well, everybody else was sent to baptize and therefore, according to Barr's logic (or ILL-logic, if I may coin a term) it was necessary! Wasn't it, Mr. Barr?

He came to the palsied man in Luke 5. Yes, and the Bible says, "Jesus saw THEIR faith." It doesn't say a single word about that man believing himself. And even then it wasn't

"at the point of faith." These men came and even tore off the roof and let the man down. So it was after their faith had acted and after their faith had worked.

He came to Luke 7:44 and said that this was "at the point of faith" because Jesus said, "Thy faith hath saved thee." Yes, and the Bible says, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; FOR SHE LOVED MUCH." So it wasn't "at the point of faith." And moreover he wanted to know where does the Bible say that baptism hath saved thee. Mr. Barr, have you not read I Peter 3:21? Peter said, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us." Mr. Barr said, Where is it? That's where it is! 1 Peter 3:21! It is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh or the mere removing of a physical stain, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. But now who said that this woman was not baptized? Vernon L. Barr! Does the Bible say it? No sir! Mr. Barr is manufacturing scripture again! He said, It's bad to add to the word of God. Well, every time you say it is without baptism, Mr. Barr, you have added to the word of God! And that is a dangerous thing to do. Mr. Williams, who was a Baptist, stated in his translation in his foot note that this woman was a scarlet woman a harlot. But the Bible says that the harlots justified God being baptized of John (Luke 7:29).

He said that Zacchaeus in Luke 19 was justified by faith. True, but WHAT KIND OF FAITH? It was a faith that works or obeys or acts. The Bible says, "Forasmuch as also he was the son of Abraham. He was already a child of Abraham. He was already a child of God, Mr. Barr!

Then he came to the thief on the cross. And he fixed himself a place to fall because he discussed the idea of when the New Testament became effective. The Bible says, "For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (Heb. 9:17). The Great Commission had not been given at the time the thief was on the cross. But again, let me point out that Mr. Barr said the thief was not baptized. Who said it? Mr. Barr! Does the Bible say it? NO! It doesn't say that the thief was not baptized but Vernon Barr does! But a moment ago Mr. Barr said, It is a dangerous thing to add to the word of God. Well, Mr. BARR, QUIT ADDING TO IT THEN! Quit

adding to it and saying, Here was a man saved by faith and without being baptized. And incidentally, I can come a whole lot nearer proving that he was baptized than you can prove that he wasn't.

He said that Gal. 3:26 says, For ye are all the sons of God by faith. For as many of you, (that is, you children of God) that were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Let us look at the tense of the verb Mr. Barr. You ARE the children of God FOR. . . .And the word "FOR" there is from the Greek word "gar." The word means to INTRODUCE A REASON. The reason that you ARE, right now, the children of God by faith is because YOU WERE BAPTIZED! Mr. Barr is a Baptist because he WAS baptized. But he wasn't a Baptist until he was baptized. And so Paul says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For (and here is the reason) as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3:26-27). Thus they were children of God IN Christ, and not out of Christ. And he said that Rom. 13:14 says, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." There is a secondary sense in which a person puts on Christ. But the primary sense is referred to in Gal. 3:27 when we put him on in baptism.

He said that Mr. Rogers church started in 1827. Mr. Barr, if you wanted to debate the General Church proposition why didn't you sign it. I met you four nights over at Corinth, Mississippi on General Church propositions and the same propositions were sent, but you refused them. You turned them down, and substituted some others. I wonder why he did that. Now if you want to debate the General Church proposition, I'll be glad to do it. And let me tell you this .Mr. Barr: You can find just as much about a church started in 1827 as you can the one YOU are a member of. If you will read a verse that says ONE WORD about the Baptist Church, in the same verse I'll read the one that mentions the church started in 1827, or any other church that you -want to mention, Mr. Barr. For it is just not in God's Book.

He said that Mr. Rogers was a fine young man and that he had nothing against him. No, and from what he said, he is evidently a fine OLD MAN and I have nothing against him! Not anything at all do I have against him.

He said that Rogers answered only 8 out of 16 arguments.

Well, I pointed out that I would have another Speech and would answer them then.

He said that Rogers had accused him of teaching faith only. Well, if you did not believe it, Mr. Barr, you should not have signed it. You said, "At the point of faith." Now if you do not want to believe that and you want to take it back, you just get up and say so and we will leave it alone. But as long as you affirm that it is "at the point of faith" then you are affirming by "faith only," in reality. For there are other things that come after faith that you have mentioned, but I want to emphasize that as far as conditions are concerned, you have made faith your only one.

He said that Rogers baptized a child of the devil and that he had learned of some that died before they got to the water. And he just wondered now what would happen to the man who was on his way to be baptized and died before he got to the water. Mr. Barr, I suppose the same thing will happen to him that will happen to a man that smothers to death at the mourners bench before he gets prayed through! What will happen to him, Mr. Barr? What will happen to the man that repents and believes and yet hasn't called on God and dies before he does that, Mr. Barr? What will happen to him? The same thing will happen to the man that is on his way to be baptized as will happen to the other man.

He said that Rogers believed and was teaching BAPTISM ONLY. And he insisted that such was true. I want to read a little statement here. I have a little book by a man named Albert Garner and he calls us sectarians. He said that we had accused them of teaching salvation by faith only. And he repudiated that and objected to it vehemently. But he said these same sectarians teach that one is saved at the point of baptism. Baptists do not lie on them. They do not lie on them and tell that they believe that one is saved by baptism only. Dr. Garner (as he is referred to) says that to charge the people who are called "Campbellites" with any such thing as that is to LIE on them. I wonder if Mr. Barr will apologize or will he get on Albert Garner and say, "Now Albert, did you not know better than that? You had better call your little book back and let us get out of trouble if we possibly can!", Now that is what Mr. Garner, his own brother, said

(in *A Few Aspirins for Campbellism*, — F.R). I didn't say it. That is what Mr. Garner said.

He said that Rogers said that a man was led of God when he obeys God. Well, I have no hesitancy in saying that a man was led of God when he is baptized, led by the Spirit of God. But he said if that is true, then he is already saved before his baptism, because everyone that is led by the Spirit is a child of God (Rom. 8:14). All right, let us go just a little bit further, What Mr. Barr needs is a verse that says a man that REFUSES to be led by the Spirit of God is a son of God. What about a man that has not been led by the Spirit? Then he is not a son. A man that hasn't been baptized is not led by the Spirit of God. Mr. Barr, What spirit led you to repentance? The Spirit of God? or the spirit of the devil? If the Spirit of God led him to repentance and if you are already a child of God when you are led of the Spirit, then Mr. Barr was a child of God BEFORE HE REPENTED! Who led you to believe, Mr. Barr? Were you being led by the Spirit when you believed? If you were, then you were already a child of God. Then FAITH would not even be necessary to salvation!

He said that Rogers said. that a man that was evil, impure, unclean, and condemned was taken by the preacher and the preacher makes him. pure. And he said that that was "water salvation." Well, Mr. Barr takes a man that is condemned, impure, unclean, and he comes along as a preacher, because you can't be saved without hearing you-know, and he preaches and he induces that man to repent and believe. And that man who is impure, unclean, and under condemnation of God is saved by a BAPTIST PREACHER! and the preaching that he does! and the thing that he leads him to do! That is Mr. Barr's argument.

He said that he wasn't going to add "without water baptism." But that was in the proposition, Mr. Barr. You are an adult, above 21, and if you did not believe it you didn't have to sign it in the least.

Well, he said that Rogers did not find "except a man be baptized he would perish." What did Mr. Barr say about Luke 7:29-30? The Bible says of certain ones that they "rejected the council of God against themselves, NOT BEING BAPTIZED of him." To reject the commandment of God to be baptized is to reject God. It is to reject the council of God.

The Bible says in Heb. 12:25, "If they (the Israelites) escaped not when they rejected him (that is, Moses) that warned on earth, how much more shall NOT we escape if we reject him that warns from heaven." Mr. Barr, the man that rejects the council of God has no hope of salvation! And the Bible says in Heb. 12:25 that such is true. Now there is a verse that says it. But Mr. Barr used his "forgettery" there. He talked about somebody ANSWERING things! What did you hear about that! Hub? What did you hear? Not one single solitary word!

Well, he came to John 3:5 and he said that Rogers said he slurred baptism. Yes, I say he SLURRED it, because he talked about baptism as just being WATER. Baptism is MORE than just water, Mr. Barr. And to refer to a command of the Son of God that has the authority of high heaven behind Him, an act that is performed in the name of the Sacred Three, as simply being water is to slur the commandment of God, if such can be done!

He said again that it was "at the point of faith." And he said if he could read that in the Bible then there would not be any need to enter into debate. Well, I can read James 2:24 that says that it is "NOT by faith only." And yet that is in reality what Mr. Barr is affirming. And though I can read it, he thinks there is some point in debating.

He said that John 3:18 claimed that the believer is "not condemned." And he said, "What about the verse that says that the man who is not baptized will be condemned?" Well, I gave him John 3:5 and he merely slapped at it with his hand and passed on. We will observe his effort in just a moment. But he admitted that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys. Then it is not "at the point of faith," Mr. Barr. Faith must obey. You must have faith. That is number one, that is the "point of faith." And secondly your faith must obey, Mr. Barr says, in order to be saved. So he has already yielded the first part of his proposition and if we can get him to yield the last part of it we will take him and baptize him in Jesus' name for the remission of sins, before the debate comes to a close. He has already given up the first part of his proposition right here. Well, he said that he would let me baptize him if we could read that. Well, we have given him Luke 7: 29:30 and John 3:5.

Then we come to John 8:30-31. And he said that he was ready to fight. Well, I am ready to fight too, Mr. Barr. So it looks like we are going to have a wonderful time, because I have just challenged the point that he made. He says that the people in verse 44 are entirely a different class from those referred to in verses 30-31. If you will go home and take your Bible you will find that Jesus preached the sermon. And the Bible says that they that heard, believed on him. And in verse 31 the Bible says, "Jesus THEREFORE" (in the Revised Version and in the original language) "said to those Jews that believed him" (these are the very ones that are mentioned in the verse before, verse 30), "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed. And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The discussion continues with the SAME GROUP of people. Jesus says to them, "you are of your father the devil, and the just of your father it is your will to do. (Verse 44). And it will be there when the world is on fire! And so just come right ahead, Mr. Barr, and let us deal with it. Yes sir, they were believers, but they were the children of the devil.

He came to Heb. 11:30 and said that I supposed that a person had to be baptized in order to be saved since they went around the walls 13 times! Well, it does prove that you are not saved "at the point of faith," Mr. Barr. That is what I introduced it for. I did not introduce it to prove that people had to be baptized to be saved. I introduced it as a negative argument to show that your proposition is false from the core out. And that is exactly what I did. Because "by faith" does not mean "at the point of faith." Mr. Barr did not deal with the argument. He said, "That does not touch baptism." NO, but it does deal with the argument "at the point of faith." It deals with that, and it shows that Mr. Barr's proposition is not true. Because by faith means AFTER our faith has obeyed and not before

Then he said Acts 2:44 referred to those that believed. Verse 41 says that those that gladly received the word were baptized. And verse 47 says these were added to the church. And he said that Mr. Rogers just gave his "ipse dixit" that these were the ones that were saved. Well, I have Mr. Barr's book here, his debate with O'Dowd, and on page 66-67 Mr. Barr says twice in that book that those that are saved are added to the

church, and that people are added to the church after they are saved. Well, we see that only those that were baptized were added to the church. And so according to Mr. Barr, they were not saved until they were baptized. And thus the word "believe" carries with it the idea of a BAPTIZED BELIEVER. And he did not deal with it at all. But he said, They "gladly received the word" before water baptism and therefore you are saved when you receive the word before you are baptized. Well Acts 17:11-12 says of the Bereans that "they were more noble than those in Thessalonica in that they RECEIVED THE WORD with all readiness of mind and examined the scriptures daily to determine whether or not those things were so." What did they do? They RECEIVED THE WORD! They were saved then, according to Mr. Barr. But the next verse says "many of them therefore BELIEVED." They received the word and THEN believed. And according to his argument he has eliminated faith as a condition of salvation. They received the word and then they later believed.

He said that Rogers believes it is all in the water. Well now Mr. Barr, that is not true. Rogers believes that men must believe, repent, confess their faith in Christ, and be baptized in order to be saved. And it is NOT all in the water.

And he came to Acts 16:30-34. But he never did deal with the argument. He never did touch the point that I emphasized that Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house. And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set food before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God." The phrase "having believed in God" includes the obedience to the command to be baptized, Mr. Barr. What did he say about the point that I emphasized from Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, that the word "believe" as it refers to the faith that embraces Jesus is a trust "conjoined with obedience unto Him"? He was as silent as the tomb. You have not heard a word about it. And he's the man that wants everything answered because he is just afraid somebody might not hear it tomorrow night! Mr. Barr, YOU are the man that is not answering the points that are made!

He said that the first English translation does not say 4, into" in Gal. 3:27, but rather "in." That might be an archaic force or use of the term "in," but in the Revised Version and in the King James Version the Bible says that people are baptized "INTO" Jesus Christ. And do you know why Mr. Barr wants to change it? Because it teaches what I teach! Mr. Barr, why do you want to change it? Why don't you like it just like it .is? Why do you want to change what the Bible says? I want it to stay just like it is. Well why? Because the Bible teaches that we are baptized "into" Christ. That is what I teach, but Mr. Barr wants to change it. Why does he want to change it? Hub Why do you reckon he wants to change that into something else? Because he KNOWS if it teaches what I say and if it reads like the Bible gives it, then Mr. Barr's doctrine has gone "world without end"! Thank you, Mr. Barr, for that confession.

But he said that you believe "his" Christ just like you are baptized "his" Christ. Well, then if you are baptized "his" Christ just like you believe "his" Christ, then baptism sustains the same relationship to salvation that belief does, Mr. Barr! And it looks to me like a blind man would be able to see that.

He said that we are preaching "Baptismal Regeneration." And what Rogers is preaching will damn your soul in hell. Who said that? Vernon L. Barr! And yet Rogers teaches that you cannot be saved without faith in Christ. Everyone of us believes in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of men. Yet he said if you believe what I believe you are going to hell. You are going to hell! You are on the road to hell, if you believe what Rogers believes. Then if a man believes in Jesus he 5 saved. Then if he believes what Rogers believes he apostatizes and he falls from grace because he believes what Rogers believes! So there goes his argument on the impossibility of apostasy. Moreover since he thinks that if you believe what I believe you are on the road to hell, then that means that you have to believe Baptist doctrine in order to be saved. You cannot go to heaven without believing Baptist doctrine! And that is the point that he is making here tonight.

He said that he was ready to fight on John 3:5. Well again, I am ready to fight and we are going to have a wonderful time. He said that it doesn't say that "except a man be born of baptism he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven." No, and it

doesn't say "except a man be born of faith he cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven" either. The Bible does say that "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Mr. Barr just does not believe what Jesus said. And he said, Well that was during the personal ministry. Well, many laws are given concerning a thing before that thing comes into existence. In Dent. chapter 17 the law concerning Israel's king was given in detail four or five hundred years before they had a king. And so Jesus could have given the law for entrance into His kingdom a short time before that kingdom was established.

But he says that he doesn't even claim to speak where the Bible speaks and to be silent where the Bible is silent. That is a noble confession. I knew that Baptist preachers did not do that. They do not speak where the Bible speak& They are not silent where the Bible is silent. They teach things not in the Bible. And they fail to teach some things that are in there! And so we know why Mr. Barr has left out baptism and why he teaches a great many other things that he teaches. It is because he doesn't even claim to speak where the Bible speaks and to be silent where the BONA is silent. He said that would mean the idea of Papal Infallibility. Well, 1. Peter 4:11 says, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." Your argument is with Peter, Mr. Barr, and not with Rogers.

He said that Mark 16:16 is a declarative statement and that it means a FUTURE SALVATION. Well, it also has faith. It says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." So Mr. Barr tonight said it means a future salvation and therefor it means that you CANNOT BE SAVED IN HEAVEN unless you are baptized like Jesus said! Thank you Mr. Barr. it doesn't matter to me whether you make it necessary to salvation HERE or salvation in the FUTURE. It is still necessary to salvation!

And he said that Jesus did not give the negative, "He that is not baptized shall be damned." Well, we might say this, "He that cometh to the debate and listens attentively shall receive a blessing." Mr. Barr would say, "The man that doesn't come to the debate and doesn't listen will miss a blessing." But a man cannot listen unless he is here. And thus Jesus knew that a man could not be baptized until he believed.

And so that is the reason Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

He said that the Ephesians had not been baptized. The Bible says in Acts 19:1-4 that there were twelve of those men that had been baptized, to say the least.

And at this particular point he said that Rogers was a young man and had not learned as much as Mr. Barr had learned. He is older and so it is possible I have not learned as much as Mr. Barr. It may be that there are many things that Rogers does not know. And I will admit that I am a young man, but it **DOESN'T TAKE AN OLD MAN TO MEET BAPTIST DOCTRINE** and expose Baptist error! And so we are just glad to deal with the issue even as a young man, and even though we haven't learned hardly as much as Mr. Barr from Dallas, Texas.

And he came to the gift in Joshua chapter 6 where God said, "I have given you the city." He said he guessed that meant you had to be baptized. I didn't use it to show that people had to be baptized. I used it to show that a gift may be conditional. which Mr. Barr had denied. Did he deal with that point? "No sir. **HE OBSERVED THE PASSOVER** and completely refused to answer it. But then he claims to be the fellow that answers arguments.

He says that Rogers doesn't know that you cannot believe in God without believing in Christ. And he quoted John 10:31 where Jesus said, "I and my Father are one." Therefore when Jesus said, "He that heareth my words and believeth on Him that sent me," Mr. Barr says that you also believe in Jesus and that of necessity. Mr. Barr, every Jew on God's earth believes in God. Now I want you to tell how all Jews are saved. He said, You cannot believe in one without believing in the other. Therefore, even though the Jew says that Jesus Christ is **NOT** the Son of God, even though he does **NOT** believe in Him, he does believe in God (and Mr. Barr says that you cannot believe in one without believing in the other), he gets the Jew saved while he is an infidel and doesn't even believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God! Now come back and try to patch that one up, Mr. Barr.

He said that Rogers doesn't like the Baptist Church and the devil doesn't either. No sir, and the devil doesn't like what Rogers teaches about the necessity of baptism and Vernon L.

Barr doesn't like it. Mr. Barr doesn't like what Rogers teaches about the necessity of baptism and the devil doesn't like it either.

He said that he would just apologize for noticing these quibbles. And of course these were the weakest things that you ever heard. I heard a man say one time that if you said that, it was evidence that you had already gone down in the debate. Remember that Mr. Barr? He said when a man says that, he knows that he is already whipped.

Well, he said he hoped that Rogers would catch up. Well I feel that we will. We have already answered all of the things that have been introduced in reality.

But he came to John 3:18 where Jesus said that the believer is not condemned. He said, Where does it say that the one that is baptized is not condemned? Well, Jesus said, "He shall be saved," which is equivalent to coming out from under condemnation. Moreover, "no condemnation" is IN Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:1). But verses 3 and 4 of Rom. 6 says that we are baptized INTO Christ. But he said that John 3:18 doesn't mention baptism. No, and it doesn't mention love, and it doesn't mention confession. He said you had better not add to the word of God. Well, have you added LOVE? Have you added REPENTANCE? Have you added CONFESSION, Mr. Barr? You had better be careful, for if you can add them without adding to the word of God, then I can add baptism.

He said, "Study Campbell and you can whip these boys all over the place." If you had not told them Mr. Barr, they would have never caught on to it. So you boys go ahead and read Campbell and read all the things that he said. We got our doctrine from the Bible. I never read a book that Alexander Campbell wrote in my life. I never read a one of them. I got mine from the Bible. I did not get it from Alexander Campbell.

But he said that I said that you are begotten of God and still a child of the devil. Yes sir, that is right. Because to be begotten of God means that you are given "the right to BECOME a child of God." "He came unto his own and his own received him not, but to them that received him to them gave he the right to BECOME the Sons of God, even to them that believed on his name. Who were born" (or as the margin of the Revised Version says, "who were begotten") John 1:11-12.

They were "begotten" and given "the right to BECOME" a child. Mr. Barr says that they are already a child. If you are not a child of God, then you are a child of the devil.

But he said that their hearts were purified by faith. And he asked, Where does it say, "Purified by baptism"? 1 Peter 102 says, Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth."

And he said that it never said that we are saved BY or THROUGH baptism. The Bible says that "in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, where in few, that is eight souls, were saved BY," B-Y, Mr. Barr, "BY WATER. The LIKE FIGURE whereunto baptism doth ALSO now save us." Noah was saved "BY WATER" and the Bible says that we are saved just like that, "BY WATER" or through water. And that verifies that. Eph. 5:26, "Cleanse and sanctify BY THE WASHING OF WATER by the word." Titus 4:5, "By the washing of regeneration."

I thank you very kindly for your attention tonight.

## **BARR'S FIRST SPEECH**

**Wednesday night, September 24th**

Gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, Mr. Rogers, ladies and gentlemen.

It is indeed a great joy to be privileged to come again and to discuss with you what the Bible teaches about the proposition that has been read in your hearing; the same proposition that was discussed last evening. I am always glad when I am privileged to meet a man in public discussion who teaches that a proper candidate for baptism is "a child of the Devil, has an impure heart, a filthy soul, and that he is condemned until baptized." Of course, the opposite side of the proposition to be discussed tonight is that one becomes a child of God when he is baptized. His heart becomes pure, his soul becomes clean, and he comes out from under condemnation, when baptized. My friend, in taking that position, of course, arrays himself against Almighty God. This discussion has come to be a debate. not between Rogers and Bari-, but between. Rogers and God. God teaches the direct opposite of Rogers' position, as I have shown you in this debate, and will continue to show you.

I went down to the newspaper office in Sheffield early this morning. I asked to see the copy of the display advertisement referred to last evening, and they referred me to the office at Florence, as the paper was printed there. Remember, that last evening I read the advertisement, and said that it states better than I could the difference between us. I suppose that one of Mr. Rogers' brethren said to him, "That is a misprint." At least he came back and said it was a misprint. But I looked at the original copy. I told the folk who I was, and told them why I wanted to see it. Although it was arranged differently, this statement, "Water Baptism, Plan of Salvation", is on the original copy handed by Mr. Rogers' brother to the newspaper, as in this paper here. (Barr holds up copy of Tri-Cities Daily). You ought to correct that Mr. Rogers, and not leave the impression that the newspaper people made a mistake. Your brother who turned that adver-

tisement in knows that you preach and teach, "Water Baptism, Plan of Salvation." He innocently put it in the, paper, and now it is hard to defend in public debate. So, you come and say it is a misprint.

I will reply to the things he said in his last speech on last evening that are pertinent to the proposition.

I made an argument on John 3:16, where Jesus said, "For God so loved the world Oat he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." He wants to get baptism in. I said that in order to make the text At his doctrine he would have to thrust in baptism. He said that John 3:16 said as much about baptism as it does about love. Does not Mr. Rogers ever read the Bible? John 3:16 says, "For God so LOVED the world that he gave his only begotten Soil, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Nothing about baptism in the text, and yet he says there is as much about baptism as about love in the text. I say that you should be charitable toward a man who cannot see better than that, to fail to see love, and to think baptism is there as much as love.

He quoted Ephesians 5:26, and took the position that Paul was teaching, "that the washing of water by the "Word" wherein the Ephesian Christians were sanctified was water baptism. That he will have to prove. If he will develop an argument on it, seek to prove that they were sanctified by water baptism; then I will ask him another question. Are men sanctified in any sense before being baptized? And by the way, I want to read the questions, and present them to him, because we agreed that we would do that in the beginning of our speeches, and I was about to overlook them.

1. Is your candidate for baptism at peace with God? I told him last night I would ask him that question. I do not mind telling him ahead of time, as I would have been agreeable to sending him the questions from Dallas, and let him look them over before the debate was to start.

2. Does your candidate for baptism love God?

3. Did baptism save you?

4. Does it take perfect obedience to all the Lord's commands in order for one to be saved? He seemed to take that position last night, and there are over a thousand commands.

5. Is the soul of the penitent believer saved by works? (If my Moderator will please present these questions to him, I will continue to speak.)

I made an argument on the palsied man in Luke 5, where his four nameless friends brought him to Jesus, and Jesus forgave his sins. No record of his baptism. Mr. Rogers said, "They tore off the roof." Well, of course they tore off the roof, and let him down before Jesus. But the Book said, "When He saw their FAITH, He said to him, thy sins are forgiven thee." God did not say anything when they tore off the roof. You could prove anything by that method of handling the Word of God.

He so desperately seeks to find a passage of scripture that says, You are saved by or through baptism, which he will never be able to do, that he found one that says by water. He splits the middle out of a verse, and says, "Saved by water." He claims that Peter in 1 Peter 3:21 said that baptism saves us. Peter did not do any such thing. He cuts the middle out of a sentence, and ladies and gentlemen, that is no way to handle the Word of God. It says, "the like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." And so he just cuts the middle out of it. You could prove there is no God by the Bible, handling the Bible in that way. Because in the Psalms you will find where it says that the fool hath said in, his heart, There is no God. You could cut off the part, the fool hath said in his heart" and say that here the Bible says there is no God. That is the way he handles I Peter 3:21.

He comes to the thief on the cross. He is in trouble over John 3:5 because he is going to fight on it he said. I am glad he is, and I am waiting for the fray, when he comes to his affirmative. He said he could prove as easily, more easily, that the thief on the cross was baptized, than I could prove that he was not baptized. He asked me why I did not read where he was not baptized. Well, listen, ladies and gentlemen, if he was baptized, surely, somewhere in the Book we would find something about it, and somewhere Jesus would have said to him, Thy baptism hath saved thee. He (Jesus) said to the woman in Luke 7, "Thy faith hath saved thee." This Mr. Rogers is the man who claims to speak where the Bible speaks,

and remain silent where the Bible is silent. And that is equivalent to saying he is infallible. He cannot make mistakes. He would have to read the Bible, and never make any comment on it, to believe his rule. If you speak where the Bible speaks. for God's sake, why did you not read where the Bible speaks and says the thief was baptized? Why doesn't he do that, and not waste all that time saying he could as easily prove it? If you remain silent where the Bible is silent; and the Bible does, not say the thief was baptized, then why does he (Rogers) not keep quiet. He will if he is honest about believing his rule.

He said he never read anything that Alexander Campbell wrote. Well, if not, he has sure been listening to a lot of his older preachers who have read after Campbell. I am quite sure, Mr. Rogers, that you know the first man who, ever lived that made the statement, "We speak where the Bible speaks, and remain silent where the Bible is silent," was Thomas Campbell, the father of Alexander Campbell. It is in his written declaration of faith, and nearly all you folks know about it And now you know it, if you did not know it before. It is my business to try to straighten you out. I hope to be able to help you.

He wants to know what happens to the fellow that smothers to death at the mourner's bench? And he asked for the reason that I said, "There is no guarantee that any man who has repented to God of his sins, and trusted in Jesus, can get to enough water to be baptized, because this life we live is so uncertain." To get your minds off that, he comes back and, says, "What happens to the mail that smothers to death at the mourner's bench?" I will tell you that the man that smothers to death at the mourner's bench, who has not repented to God of his sins, and trusted in Jesus Christ to save his soul, will go to hell, just like the man who goes to the baptismal waters trusting in baptism to save him, will go straight to, hell.

I asked him in one of my questions if his candidate for baptism was being led of God or being led of the Devil. He finally came out in his second speech, and said he was led of God. Then he read the passage of scripture Romans 8:14, that proves, one is saved before baptism if he is led of God, because Paul said, As many of you as are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of Got So, if led by the Spirit of God, on the way to the baptismal water, then they are sons of God. Sons of

God, while on their way to the water, while they are down in it, and after they come up out of it.

My opponent thinks, or somehow he seems to think, that the only way faith can be made alive, is to work it. Good works of every sort covered in the Bible, are the result of faith in Jesus. You cannot ride a dead horse and make him work. By trying to ride a dead horse, you cannot make him alive. If he can take a dead horse and ride him to the creek, I will get on him, and ride him all the way to heaven. He has nothing until he gets in the water, you understand. He puts nearly everything in baptism, the best I am able to comprehend him, and according to his newspaper advertisement. Baptism is never used in a conditional clause, wherein God promises salvation to the one who is baptized. I would like for him to get it.

He is quite disturbed because I did not pay attention to what Mr. Thayer, the Greek lexicographer, had to say about faith being conjoined with obedience. I am in perfect agreement with Mr. Thayer that saying faith is conjoined with obedience. When men are saved, when they have believed in Christ with all their hearts, then because they are saved, their obedience is conjoined with faith. Saying faith produces obedience to God. And what he believes is obeying in baptism, and then you do not have anything. According to him (Rogers) you just have forgiveness for past sins, and you have to paddle your own canoe all the rest of the way into heaven. He wants to know why I want to change the Bible. I had read to him the Douay translation where in Galatians 3:27 and Romans 6:3 the preposition "his" is translated "in" instead of "into". I also read the Wycliffe Translation, and it was in existence long before any of the translations he has on his table, or that I have either. So, I am not wanting to change the Bible. I am simply showing you, that the two verses that he bases his eternal destiny on, is not translated in the two translations, as he translates it. And the Wycliffe Translation is the very earliest English translation. Well, of course I do not want to change the Bible, that was said, you know, to seek to make you believe that Baptists want to change the Bible. Of course it is not so.

He admits that the believer is begotten of God, and he has taken the position, that though the believer is begotten of God,

-the Devil is his papa until he is baptized. Who ever heard of one begotten, in the natural realm, not being the son of the begetter. The begetter of the child is the father of the child, before it is born and after it is born. But he has God begetting one, and yet the Devil is its papa until he, or his kind takes him down to the water, and the preacher and the water makes a child of God out of him, according to their doctrine.

Those are the things he said pertinent to the proposition. I must get in any new arguments in this speech as my next speech will be my last upon this particular proposition. Of course we will still be on the plan of salvation.

ARGUMENT TWENTY TWO: Based on Acts 10:43-48. Peter came to the household of Cornelius, preached the gospel to him, the Holy Spirit fell upon them, and they spake in tongues and magnified God. Peter said, "Can any man forbid water that these may be baptized which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" And so, he took them and baptized them. Remember that they had received the Holy Spirit, they had magnified God, even spake in tongues, and then were baptized. Jesus said in John 14:17, speaking of the Spirit, "Him the world cannot receive." Cornelius received the Spirit before baptism, they spake with tongues, and magnified God, hence were saved before baptism.

ARGUMENT TWENTY THREE is based upon Romans 1: 16. Before I read the scripture, let me say that my friend, Rogers, is a promising young man. He is considerably behind on trying to reply to my affirmative arguments, but he promises to catch up, and probably he will. I hope he will. But, Romans 1:16, Paul said, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Notice it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that BELIEVETH. This text with thousands of others like it agrees with the proposition I affirm, and with what Baptists believe. But the position that my friend and his people take, is that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth and is baptized. He would have to thrust baptism in the verse, thus adding to the Word of God, in order to make the text harmonious with their belief.

ARGUMENT TWENTY FOUR: I Peter 1:9, "Receiving the end of your faith even the salvation of your soul." It

is good to have so very many scriptures to read that put salvation at the point of faith in Jesus Christ. The verse would have to be mis-handled in order to make it fit the doctrine of my friend's people, and others. Where do you find in the Bible, Receiving the end of your baptism, even the salvation of your soul? One is not saved according to my friend's argument until he is baptized. He is a child of the Devil, and he has an impure heart, a filthy soul, and is under condemnation until baptized.

ARGUMENT TWENTY FIVE: Romans 10:4, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." So, one believes before baptism, hence he is made righteous before and without water baptism. Again, the people who had their beginning with Alexander Campbell and others would have to add to the text, thus bringing a curse on themselves, in order to make the text harmonize with their doctrine. In the prepositional use one is never said: (1) To be saved by or through baptism, (2) to have a pure heart by or through baptism, (3) to have justification by or through baptism, (4) to be at peace with God by or through baptism, (5) to become a child of God by or through baptism, (6) to receive everlasting life by or through baptism. Yet, in the course of this debate I have given you chapter and verse that says the believer has all these things.

God never made the remission of sins depend upon an act which a man cannot do for himself, and which must be performed by another.

ARGUMENT TWENTY SIX: John 6:35,40, "And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger: and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. And this is the will of him that sent me that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day. Let my opponent read from the Bible where it says, He that is baptized shall never hunger, and he that is baptized shall never thirst or let him read where it says everyone that seeth the Son, and is baptized may have everlasting life and I will raise him up at the last day. According to my friend and his people it will be only the baptized who are raised up at the last day. But Baptists stay with the Bible on the plan of salvation. We teach that salvation is by grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

Mr. Rogers is aggressive in teaching that salvation comes by an act of faith or that salvation comes by an act resulting from faith. That act of faith is being baptized according to them. If that be true then baptism is the crowning act without which no man can be born of God, saved, justified, adopted, or sanctified. You cannot believe Bible doctrine if you believe his side of this proposition. There is a flat contradiction between the two.

ARGUMENT TWENTY SEVEN. Luke 18:14, Jesus said, "I tell you this man went down to his house justified rather than the other." You may remember that this is the record of the Pharisee and the Publican. "Rather than the other" means this man was justified (saved) while the other was not. This man was pardoned, not without faith, but before and without water baptism. His prayer proves he has faith. But he was not baptized. I beg of you ladies and gentlemen, to turn to the Bible and accept the truth that Jesus Christ saves sinners by grace through faith in Him.

ARGUMENT TWENTY EIGHT. Acts 10:43, "To Him, (that is Jesus, of course) give all the prophets witness that through his name, -whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." This passage certainly proves that remission of sins comes at the point of faith. It is not only taught here by the Apostle Peter that WHOSOEVER BELIEVES IN JESUS CHRIST SHALL RECEIVE REMISSION OF SINS,, but it is the UNITED TESTIMONY of all the prophets. Now, suppose the teaching of Peter had been, that faith in Jesus Christ, without baptism, was insufficient to obtain remission of sins, could he have claimed all the prophets as witnesses? No. Never since the world began has a single prophet testified that baptism obtained remission of sins for anybody. So, all the prophets testify that the one who believes in Jesus Christ receives remission of sins. Let my opponent read where one prophet, just one, ever witnessed that one must be baptized in order to receive remission of sins. The Bible teaches in these many Scriptures that I have given you that men are saved at the point of faith, but there is not one verse in the Bible that teaches that men are saved at the point of baptism. There is not one verse in God's Bible that says we are to baptize children of the Devil to make children of God out of them.

ARGUMENT TWENTY NINE, is based on Galatians 3:8,

"And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." Baptists believe this text. But what about my friend and his people? They must say, the Scriptures foresaw no such thing. God will justify the heathen through faith and baptism. That is their doctrine. The Scriptures could be multiplied hundreds of times over that teach the sinner is justified, saved, has remission of sins at the point of faith in Christ.

ARGUMENT THIRTY is based on the fact of what Romans 11:6 teaches us. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is -it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." There are but two ways in which a man may be saved. They are God's way, and man's way. He must either be saved by works, through legal obedience, as taught by false religionists, or by grace THROUGH FAITH in Jesus Christ.

Is it not plain that we are either saved by works or by grace, and not by both co-working? "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all," Romans 4:16. Paul assigns two reasons why the plan of salvation is arranged as we find it. He says: "It is of faith, that it might be by grace." He had before affirmed that, we are saved by grace, and now he adds, that, in order to be saved by grace, we must be saved, by or through faith. Now, if baptism is a condition of our salvation we are not saved by grace, for baptism is a work. Can my friend find a verse in the Bible that says, It is of baptism, that it might be by grace? That is his doctrine, but certainly not Bible doctrine.

ARGUMENT THIRTY ONE. Romans 4:4,5, "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." It is not His baptism is counted for righteousness. But his FAITH. Yet, my friend's argument would be, No, he cannot have the righteousness of God counted to him until he is baptized. The second reason that Paul assigns for faith being the point at which men are saved, that is when they trust in Jesus,

is "to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all."

Let us try this system of salvation by grace through faith, in contrast with the works system, and see which is the better adapted to secure pardon to all the seed under any and all circumstances. Suppose that faith, repentance and baptism are the conditions. I do not care where a man is, he can repent toward God, and trust in the Lord Jesus Christ for the salvation of his soul. He can be a thousand miles away from water, and read in the New Testament, how God loved him, how Jesus died for him, was buried and raised from the dead. But Mr. Rogers' plan of salvation is not adapted to many people. The man on Iwo Jima in a fox hole dying, who had had Christ preached to him, would have to go to hell, no matter how much he loved God, how much he had repented, how much he had trusted Jesus. He would have to go to hell if there was no person there, and enough water to baptize him, according to my friend's doctrine.

The Book teaches us that the blood cleanses from all sins, I John 1:7 (R.S.V.). (Warn me at five minutes please). Does A L L mean all? Or does it mean only part? If the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sins, what is left for baptism to cleanse us from? John said the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sins. The opposition says, "Baptism cleanseth us." The issue is between God and Mr. Rogers. The Baptist position is that faith in the heart leads to obedience in life. The question between us is which saves, faith in the heart in Jesus Christ, or obedience to law in the life. At what point is a person saved, when he believes in Jesus Christ or when he is baptized? Is salvation a matter of the heart or of the life? Is it spiritual or physical? My friend's doctrine would make salvation become a physical, external, material, mechanical affair. It depends on a third person. It is not a matter between a soul and God, but it becomes a matter between the soul, and God, and **SOMEBODY ELSE**. We are saved by faith. If we are saved by faith, we are not saved by works. If we are saved by faith, we are not saved by faith and works. The blood of Jesus Christ is the procuring cause of salvation and faith the instrumental cause. Grace planned the way through the blood. Faith accepts the way. Grace is God's

side of the plan of salvation, and faith is man's side. The fruits do not make the tree—they show the tree. The works do not make the Christian—they show the Christian. My friend has the works making the Christian. I say it would be equivalent to getting a dead horse and trying to work that dead horse to make him come alive. That is what his doctrine would do for you.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to give you some quotations from Greek professors, and professors of linguistics to whom I have written letters concerning the Greek preposition "his" as used with believe. Believe "his" Christ, and baptized "his" Christ. Here is a quotation from a letter from Dr. Ray Summers, Professor of New Testament Greek, at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, dated September, 1958: "This is in response to your letter of September 5th, relative to the use of the Greek "his" after the verb, to believe. When this preposition is used after the verb, to believe, it actually means to put one's trust into Christ. Though it does not make a real smooth translation it would be very accurate to translate it, to believe into Christ. Surely the total picture of the way of salvation in the New Testament is that salvation is by faith in Christ. Baptism is important, but it is important only as a way in which one shows to the world that by faith in Christ he has died to an old life of sin. He is buried to that old life and raised to live a new life in Christ."

There are five scriptures to his one, yea, ten scriptures to his one, that say we believe in Christ. The word translated "in" after the verb "to believe", is identically the same word used in the original language, the Greek preposition "his", that is used in Galatians 3:27; "For as many of you as have been baptized into (his) Christ have put on Christ." So I have ten scriptures to his one.

Here is a quotation from Dr. E. E. Rogers, Professor of New Testament Greek at Oakwood College, Huntsville, Alabama: "The root meaning of the preposition his, is within and in. It was derived from the preposition 'Ev' and gradually took over its function, so much so that in modern Greek 'Ev' does not occur. Rev. S. G. Green thinks of "his" as just another form of Ev, as he of ek. He further states that his in Romans 6:3,4, is to be taken in its symbolic use as marking

the entrance into a state or sphere. So we enter (his Christon), into Christ actually by faith, symbolically by baptism, Christians being (en Christo). . . in Christ. "However, let me state again that this personal inward union with Christ is entered into actually by faith. Baptism is merely the symbol of this union for his marks the entrance into a state or sphere. The Greek phrase "en Christon," means not simply attached to Christ as a follower, but in Christ, in the most intimate abiding fellowship. Paul's whole philosophy of being in Christ is based upon the belief that such a personal union is achieved by faith and consummated in love. In using his the Greek thinks of putting one's faith "into" someone else."

So, I could go on, and I am going to read a few more, but I will not have time to read them all. Men who study the original language in which the Bible was written will tell you, that men actually believe into Christ, and they are symbolically baptized into Christ. Mr. Rogers goes to the picture of the gospel instead of the real gospel for salvation. Should my friend practice in life what his theology calls for, and he had a milk cow, he would not go to the cow and milk her, but he would go to a picture of the cow, and try to milk the picture to get milk. He would send the picture of the young lady, I presume he is married, to the preacher, and say, "I want to marry the picture of this woman." Baptists, marry the real Christ by faith in Him. We go to Jesus and Mr. Rogers goes to baptism. He has told you over and over that baptism saves you.

Here is a quotation from a letter from Dr. Leo A. Causey, head, department of Greek, Missionary Baptist Seminary, Little Rock, Arkansas, September 11, 1958: ". . . the Greek preposition his which is translated into in Galatians 3:27 and Romans 6:3 could well be translated into in the other scriptures you listed." I listed many scriptures where "his" is used in connection with believe. Believe into (his) Christ. But let me quote some more from Dr. Causey: "If it is correct in one place it must necessarily be correct in all other places of like degree. Examples: John 6:29 . . . this is the work of God that ye believe "his" (into) him whom he hath sent. John 3:23 ". . . many believed 'his' (into) His Name."

Here is another quotation from a letter written by Dr. Frank Staggs, Professor of New Testament Greek, New Orleans,

Louisiana. (Time called) Thank you kindly ladies and gentlemen.

# ROGERS FIRST SPEECH

## Wednesday Night

Mr. Barr, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen: I am grateful that I again have the opportunity of coming here tonight to engage with Mr. Barr in this honorable public discussion of the Sacred Scriptures. The debate is getting rather interesting. The further we go the more interesting it gets. And I think that we will have some very interesting things before our session shall close tonight.

I should like to emphasize again as I did on last evening that this is indeed a most solemn occasion and we have assembled here in the presence of Almighty God for the purpose of studying His word and investigating the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, I believe it would behoove all of us to carefully, sincerely, and prayerfully listen to everything that is said, and then to take time to investigate the scriptures to determine whether or not the things that you hear presented here are in reality the word of Almighty God.

The first thing that I wish to do is to read the questions that I have for Mr. Barr. I have already handed him a copy so that I need not walk over to his table.

1. Since you said last night that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys, at what POINT of obedience or in what ACT of obedience does faith save? At first Mr. Barr affirmed that it is "at the point of faith" and then later he affirmed that faith does not save until it obeys, because the faith that saves is the faith that obeys. And so tonight we would like to know how much farther he is going to go. And at just what point is he going to say that the alien sinner receives remission of his sins.

2. Who are people serving when they repent of sins? God or the devil Last night he said that a person could not serve two masters, and that when a person is baptized he is serving and therefore he thought a person is a child of God when he is baptized. Well, I would like to know who he was serving when he repented and when he believed? God or the devil?

: 3. Do you teach that people today are to receive the Holy

Spirit just like Cornelius before they are baptized? He introduced Cornelius tonight and I would like to hear him come out with a forthright answer to that particular question.

4. Would Noah have been saved when the world was destroyed by water if he had not obeyed in building the ark?

5. Was Paul sent out without authority to baptize? We would like for him to deal with that particular point and answer the questions that we may deal with them in the latter part of our speech tonight.

I should like to deal with the answers that he gave to my questions upon last evening.

1. I asked him, Were the rulers referred to in John 12:42 saved "at the point of faith" while they refused to confess their faith in Jesus because "they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God? Mr. Barr did not answer the question. He asserted that Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea were among this class of believers and later these men repented and confessed. Even if that had been so, I want to know if they were saved "at the point of faith" before they did confess and before they did repent of their wickedness against God. Mr. Barr has not answered it. And even if we say that these men later repented and obtained forgiveness, they still were, not saved "at the point of faith." Mr. Barr knew better than to say that they were saved "at the point of faith." Even though the Bible says that they believed "his" Jesus, this man will not say that they were saved. The Bible says that they believed, but they would not confess. Moreover, he just asserted that Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea were involved in this number. The Bible says in Luke 23:50 that Joseph of Arimathaea was a "good and a righteous man." The Bible says of these men in John 12: "But they refused to confess Jesus because they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Is that a "good and a righteous man"? Joseph of Arimathaea was. And he says, Joseph was one of them in John 12. Mr. Barr, that is not so! And if I had to drag the names of the sainted dead in the dust of the earth in order to defend that doctrine, then I would by all means give it up. In John 19:38 the Bible says, that the reason that Joseph was a disciple secretly was because of the fear of the Jews. The reason these people refused to confess Jesus was not because they were "good and righteous" men that were afraid, but because "they

loved the praise of men more than the praise of God. Now Mr. Barr will you tell me if they were saved "at the point of faith" before and without confessing the Lord of glory. I challenge you, every inch of you from top to bottom, to answer me tonight. You haven't answered the question yet.

2. When a passage of scripture stipulates salvation and mentions one item of obedience such as faith, is everything else excluded as a condition of salvation except the item mentioned? He said, No. Thus he believes that other things are included. And so I pointed out that the verses that Mr. Barr referred to do not mention these other conditions. He opens it up and says, Oh, but faith in these passages is comprehensive enough to include love, repentance, confession, prayer, and even calling upon God. But he can't find it big enough to include the command of the Son of God to be baptized into the Name of the Sacred Three. I say that if these passages exclude baptism, they exclude everything as conditions of salvation for a man to perform that are not mentioned in these verses. Mr. Barr knows that. And thus he has yielded his whole proposition. He says that these verses are not exclusive. Then they must be inclusive, Mr. Barr! And I can prove that they include baptism in exactly the same way that you prove that they include repentance, love, confession and other things!

3. Can one be given the right to become what he already is? He said, No, a person cannot be given the right to become what he already is. But the Bible says in John 1:11-12, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Now watch it. The Bible says that those that "believed" were given the "right to become sons of God. Mr. Barr says that you can not be given the right to become what you already are (Major Premise). But believers are given the right to become the children of God (Minor Premise). Therefore according to Vernon L. Barr a believer is not yet a child of God! Who said it? Mr. Vernon L. Barr! And he answered correctly. John 1:11-12 says that the believer is given the right to become a child of God." He therefore is not one until he exercises the right and the privilege that God has given him.

4. I asked, Is there any type of work that a man must do to be saved? He said, The only work is repent and believe. And

then he refers to John 6:29: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. I charged that Mr. Barr in reality believes in salvation by faith only. He just didn't have the moral fortitude to step out on the forensic platform and affirm that forthrightly without any hedging or dodging. But when he got down to John 6:29 he said this is the work of God that ye believe. He said this is the ONE WORK that is involved. Who said it? Mr. Vernon L. Barr. But if it is just one, then it is just faith. And if that is not faith only I would like to know what it is! And so Mr. Barr, in answering that question, in attempting to dodge the point, in reality, got himself into it. And let us notice here that faith is a work. And for that reason he has to affirm that men are justified and saved by works. But he doesn't believe that baptism is necessary to salvation because he says it is a work. But faith is too. And so he will eliminate faith. And, the Bible says that God saw the "works" of the men of Nineveh, that they turned from their evil way. But what Jonah calls a "work," Jesus calls "repentance" in Matt. 12:41. And so if all works are excluded, Mr. Barr will have to exclude repentance and faith as conditions of salvation.

5. I then asked, Is baptism of the law of works or of the law of faith? He said, Neither. It is neither of the law of works or of the law of faith. But he had just gotten through arguing from Eph. 2:9 that very point. He said, It is not of works and baptism is in the works in Eph. 2:9. But when you had a question that you knew you could not answer you said that baptism is in neither of the law of works or of the law of faith. But you just said that it is of the works in Eph. 2:9. Moreover he said that it is a command of God. And so he has a command of God that isn't of the law of works nor is it of the law of faith. Mr. Barr, tell us then what on the earth it is, since you say it is not of the law of works nor is it of the law of faith. I wonder where he will classify baptism. Moreover since he said it is not of the law of works then those passages which state that salvation is not of works do not include baptism, because you said that baptism is not included in the law of works. And so you just read all the passages that you want to read that say that we are not saved by works. You have already said that baptism is not included in the law of works. And so you can read every one of them and it still doesn't touch

baptism, top, edge, side, or bottom, according to Vernon L. Barr's own admission.

Well we come to his questions tonight.

1. He asked, Is your candidate for baptism at peace with God? No sir. He is not at peace with God.

2. Does your candidate for baptism love God? He loves God in the sense that the word love is used in I John 5:3: This is the love of God, that you keep his commandments. And His commandments are not grievous. The man that loves in that sense, in the sense that he obeys and does what God commands, that man that loves in that sense is born of God (I John 4:7). He has been baptized in obedience to the command of love.

3. Did baptism save you? Yes, in the very same sense that faith saved me. It was a condition of pardon, given by the Son of God and it saved me just exactly like I was saved by faith.

4. Does it take perfect obedience to all the Lord's commands in order for one to be saved Faith must be perfected to the point that God demands. Whether we have to have perfect obedience or not is not involved in this debate. If I prove that you have to do this one command that God has given, then that is sufficient and your proposition falls to the earth.

5. Is the soul of the penitent believer saved by works? Yes, the kind mentioned in John 6:29 where it states that faith is a work. The kind mentioned in Jonah 3:10 where the Bible says that repentance is a work. And anything that falls in that category or the works of God, the commands that God has given within the gospel.

Alright, now then I want to pass rather rapidly to a further observation. Mr. Barr affirmed last night that men were saved at the point of faith. Then later he admitted that faith must obey and that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys. Now remember that he read last night and again tonight a very fine number of scriptures which predicate salvation upon faith. But now he has admitted that faith when it justifies is the faith that obeys. It is the faith that does what God commands. Therefore, any time that you find the faith that justifies, according to Mr. Barr, it isn't at the point of faith, it isn't by faith alone, it isn't a faith without obedience, but it is a faith that obeys. It is a faith that does what God demands. Any time that you come upon a passage of scripture that mentions

faith that justifies, then it is a faith that "works by love." God never blessed any man in any dispensation "at the point of faith" before and without that faith expressing itself in some overt act.

We come now to John 3:5. There the Bible says, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." I affirm confidently that in the gospel of Christ, water as an essential element is connected with nothing other than water baptism. But water is mentioned as an essential element in John 3:5. Therefore, John 3:5 refers to water baptism. Now let Mr. Barr come and deal with the argument. Let him come up and do the great fighting that he talked about last night. It happens to be, as he suggested, that we have been in these things before. And we have discussed John 3:5 with other Baptist Preachers. And I haven't found one yet that was able to dodge it or to get around it. And I don't believe that Mr. Barr can get around what the Bible has to say.

I emphasize again that the saved believer is the baptized believer. The Bible teaches that the believer in John 20:30-31 is to have life "through" or "in the name of Jesus." Let us remember that life is in the name. The Bible says in Acts 10: 43, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sin&' Where does the believer receive remission of sins? It is "through" or "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." Not out of that name, but "in" that name. Acts 4:12, "There is none other name under heaven that is given among men wherein ye must be saved." And may I further emphasize that the Bible says in Acts 8:46; Acts 19:5 that we are baptized INTO the name of the Lord Jesus. Therefore, the believer that has life, the believer that has remission of sins, the believer that is saved is the believer that by faith has been baptized into Christ. He can't be saved out of the name and the Bible says that we are baptized into the name.

Moreover, the Bible says, "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him" (Luke 7:29-30). To reject baptism is to reject the council of God. Paul said in Heb. 12:25, "Much more shall not we escape

if we refuse him that warneth from heaven." Paul said that you will not escape if you reject the Son of God that warns from heaven.

Mr. Barr said that he was glad to meet a man that would say that the proper candidate for baptism is a child of the devil, that he has an impure heart, a filthy soul, and is under condemnation in the sight of Almighty God. Well Mr. Barr, anybody that understands the Bible and believes what the Bible says will realize that a man is a sinner and is lost until he is baptized like Jesus says. And so all of these terms that you are using simply describe a lost man. And a man is lost until he does what God commands.

He said this debate is between Rogers and God. I'll let you decide whether it is between Rogers and God. God isn't the one that's been doing the sweating and the shouting and working up the steam. Not at all. That has been Mr. Vernon L. Barr. And he is the man that is doing the suffering. Rogers is not debating with God, he is debating with Vernon L. Barr.

Well he said that the statement in the newspaper had been re-arranged. Certainly the note was taken down there in note form and it was published in that particular way. But it seems that Mr. Barr would like to make some stock of a misprint since he doesn't have any Bible for his position. If he can run to the newspaper to get any help then more power to him. I knew he would leave the Bible and go somewhere before the debate was over. He had to get out of the Bible to get anywhere in this debate. For he hasn't read a verse yet that touches top, side, edge, or bottom of the proposition that he has affirmed.

I come now to John 3:16. He said that we had to *thrust* baptism in. Well Mr. Barr, *you snatched* baptism out of Mark 16:16 and every other place where the Bible mentions baptism and salvation or blessing in Christ in those places where baptism stands between the sinner and that blessing. And Mr. Barr comes along and snatches it out. And do you know how he reads it? "He that believeth is saved and then may be baptized if he wants to. He lays his hands upon the word of Almighty God and snatches the command of God out where Jesus put it in. Rogers hasn't "thrust" anything in. The Son of God Almighty "thrust" baptism in Mark 16:16.

But he said that Rogers said that there was as much baptism

in John 3:16 as love. I said as a condition of our salvation, a condition that we comply with. Mr. Barr, you are not God. Nobody else here is God. This passage says "God so loved the world." But it doesn't touch YOUR love for God. I'm talking about the love that you have. I Cor. 16:22 says, "If a man loves not the Lord Jesus Christ then let him be anathema." Is there anything in that verse, Mr. Barr, about our loving Christ? I challenge you to put it down and deal with it when you come to the platform.

We now look at Eph. 5:26. He said that he denied that that was water baptism. Well, the Bible says that Jesus sanctified and cleansed the church "by the washing of water by the word." Will Mr. Barr tell me how else the church is cleansed "by the washing of water"? What else is water connected with in the Christian religion except being baptized in Jesus' name? I challenge you to get up and tell us. Is there anything else in the gospel scheme of redemption or plan of salvation that water is connected with except water baptism?

He said that there was no record of the baptism of the palsied man in Mark 2. No, and there is no record of HIS faith. The Bible says that there were four men that brought the palsied man and Jesus saw "their" faith, not his faith, Mr. Barr. But Jesus saw their faith. Then Jesus said to the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.

He said there wasn't a verse in the Bible that said men are saved "by" or "through" baptism. He said that Rogers split a verse. Rogers did no such thing. If you will play the tape back you will find that Rogers quoted and even gave you Mr. Goodspeed's translation of the expression "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." I did give that. The Bible says that "When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by (B-Y) water" (I Peter 3:20). And then the Bible says in the Revised Version, "Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism" (verse 21). They were saved, the Bible says, "by water." And it says baptism saves us like that did. Well there 4 your "by," Mr. Barr. There is your instrumental that you have been referring to.

And again he came to the thief on the cross. And he said that I ought to speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where

the Bible is silent. I know why Mr. Barr says that the thief was not baptize? Because Mr. "Barr does not even CLAIM to speak where the Bible speaks and to be silent where the Bible is silent. He can put in anything he pleases because he doesn't even purport to speak where the Bible speaks and to be silent where it is silent. But Rogers said that he could come a whole lot more proving that he (the thief) was baptized than Barr could prove that he was not. The Bible does say in Matt. 3:5-6, "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." And that "all" is a pretty strong word, as Mr. Barr himself said just a moment ago.

Well, he said that I had never read anything by Campbell. No, I didn't say that I had never read anything. I said I had never read one of Mr. Campbell's books, Mr. Barr. I have read sketches here and there in one or two of his writings, but I have never read one of his books. I got my doctrine from the Bible. I don't need Alexander Campbell to know what the Bible has to say.

But he said that I got the idea of speaking where the Bible speaks from Thomas Campbell. If I knew anything I would know that that is in his "Declaration and Address." He simply stated that he was going to do what the Bible commanded in 1 Peter 4:11. There the Bible says, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. And so Brother Campbell said, I am going to do that. And I also am going to do that, Mr. Barr. But Mr. Barr says, "I don't. I don't even claim to do that. I don't even claim to speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent." Thank you for that noble confession. I knew it, but I never thought a Baptist preacher would come to the lick log and admit it.

I asked him, What would happen to the man that smothers to death at the mourner's bench. He said that if he hadn't repented he would go to hell. Well, you say a man repents before belief. So what if he has repented, but hasn't believed? He has repented but hasn't believed and smothers to death. What will happen to him? Or suppose he has repented and believed and yet hasn't called upon God. He hasn't "gotten through" (as the expression sometimes goes). What will hap-

pen to the man that repents and believes and dies before calling upon God?

Then he said if you are led of God then you are the son of God. I pointed out that that means you obey God. And certainly the man that obeys God becomes a child of God. But Mr. Barr doesn't realize that we are led by the Spirit of God to repent. We are led by the Spirit even to believe. But he would say you are already a child of God when led by the Spirit to repent and believe.

But he said that we could not make faith alive by our works. Well, that A just Mr. Barr for you. The Bible says, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also" (James 2:14). And so he said that you couldn't make a dead horse alive by trying to ride him. No, but riding a dead horse does not sustain the same relationship to the horse that works sustain to faith. The Bible says that works sustain the same relationship to faith that the spirit does to the body. The spirit in the body, the body is alive. Take the spirit out of the body and the body is dead. Faith and works, and your faith is alive. Take the works away from faith and your faith is dead. And so your parallel is not parallel at all.

But he said that if you will ride a dead faith to the creek, I will ride it on to heaven. Well, if you will ride a dead faith to the mourner's bench, you could ride it on to heaven and so just join up with the Primitives and say that you don't have to do anything in order to be saved.

He said that he agreed with Thayer's definition. Well, If you do, then you don't believe that a man is saved "at the point of faith.

He said that in some translations "his" in Gal. 3:27 is translated "in" instead of "into." And I pointed out that he is trying to change the Bible. But Mr. Barr ought to know that the word in is sometimes used in the sense of into. Sometimes we say we are going "in" the house when in reality we mean "into" the house. And if he will investigate the preposition "his" after such a verb as is found in Gal. 3:27 he will find that it ought to be translated "into." And we'll deal with his scholars after awhile.

But he said the silliest thing that he ever heard of was being begotten of God and still a child of the Devil (and the Devil still your papa was the way he expressed it). Well, Mr. Barr,

begetting always precedes the birth. You say that men axe born at faith. If that is so then he is begotten sometime before faith. And if you become a child of God the moment you are begotten and you are not born until later at faith, then you become a child of God when begotten before and without faith. And so he has given up faith as a condition of salvation! Well, I knew that he would before this thing came to a close.

He said that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit. But Mr. Barr doesn't believe that people receive the Holy Spirit today like Cornelius did. And moreover Baptists do not believe that the reception of the Holy Spirit proves that a man is saved. In their theology they affirm that God has promised to give unto all those that are ordained unto eternal life his Holy Spirit to make them willing and able to believe. Their theology is that God gives you the Spirit and then after that you believe. Then if you get the Spirit and that is evidence of salvation and God gives you the Spirit to make you willing and able to believe, then you are a child of God before and without belief according to their theology. Moreover the Bible says that the Holy Spirit fell upon Cornelius as Peter began to speak. And at that time Cornelius did not even have faith (Ads 15 a).

He said that the gospel saves (Romans 1:16). And that it saves the believer. Yes, but what kind of a believer? An obedient believer? Or a disobedient believer? The Bible says an obedient believer (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

He came again to 1 Peter 1:7-9 which says "receiving the end of your faith." Well, I thought you said it was "at the point of faith"! That is when it begins. And this passage says that A is at the end of your faith when you receive the salvation of your soul. Mr. Barr is so rattled he doesn't know whether he is coming or going. One time he says it is at the point of faith, when trust commences, and this passage says at the end of faith.

He said that Jesus was. the end of the law. Well, I am not talking about the law of Moses and verse 5 to Moses in that very connection. But he said that Jesus was the end of the law to the believer. Yes, but not to the individual who, only believes.

He said the Bible never says that we are saved "by" or through baptism. We gave him 1 Peter 3:20 and Eph. 5:26.

And Titus 3:5 says, Not by works of righteousness which we did ourselves, but by his mercy did he save us by (B-Y) the washing of the laver of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. The "washing of regeneration" has reference to Acts 22:16 where Ananias told Saul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

He said that no act performed by another is a condition of salvation. But you said last night that it was, Mr. Barr. You said that a man couldn't be saved without hearing. The Bible says, "How shall they hear without a preacher?" (Rom. 10: 14) Hearing is absolutely essential to salvation. Barr said so. But the Bible says that we cannot possibly hear without a preacher. And so there is hearing as a condition of salvation, and Mr. Barr has put a preacher between a sinner and his Saviour. He brought in his third party. You see that there is (1) the sinner, (2) God, and (3) the preacher that does the preaching.

He said that in John 6:36 it is the man that believes that shall never thirst. Yes, but it doesn't say "at the point of faith." Nor does it say, By faith only.

Then he came to Luke 18:14 which speaks of the Publican, there that was justified. But there was nothing said about "the point of faith" before and without further acts of obedience. This man was already a child of God. He was in the temple. And Ezekiel 44:9 teaches that no stranger could enter therein. Moreover these very people, the Publicans, were the ones that justified God by being baptized (Luke 7:30).

He said that Jesus saves sinners. Yes, but when does Jesus .save sinners? The Bible says, and Jesus is the author of it, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mk. 16:16).

I have already referred to Acts 10:43, but we will get to it again. He said "at the point of faith." It doesn't say it! It says "through his name." He asked, What did the prophets say about baptism? They said this: that our justification would be IN the seed of Abraham. The seed of Abraham is Christ (Gal. 3:16). And we are baptized INTO that seed. And so the prophets foretold that.

He quoted Romans 11 :6 and said it is not of works. Mr. Barr, that doesn't touch baptism because you said that baptism is not of the law of works. So Romans 11:6 doesn't refer to baptism. Mr. Barr has already said that.

Romans 4:16. Why that refers to the works of the law (verses 13-14). Verse 12 points out that the faith that saves is the faith that "walks in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham.

He said that baptism is a work. Yes, in the same sense that faith is. But remember that baptism is not of the law of works and therefore is not excluded.

He quoted Romans 4:4-5 which states that we are justified by faith and that therefore we cannot glory. But the Bible says that the works referred to there are the works of the law (Romans 3:27). And these works do not refer to gospel obedience at all.

He said that you could repent and believe away from the water, without a preacher at all, a thousand miles away from it. He said, What about that boy that had the gospel preached to him and he is in the fox-hole and he is about to die and he can't be baptized? Well, what about that good Jew there that needs to hear about Jesus (which Mr. Barr said is damned unless he repents and believes!) And he said last night that he has got to hear. He has got to have a preacher and yet there is not a preacher there to preach to him. What will happen to that good honest sincere Jew that is there in the fox-hole that hasn't repented and believed? He surely cannot repent and believe a thousand miles from a preacher according to Romans 10 and according to Vernon L. Barr.

He asked, Is salvation of the heart? Yes, we obey from the heart the form of doctrine delivered unto us (Rom. 6:17). He said the blood cleanses from all sins and how much would that leave for the water? The same number you have left for faith, Mr. Barr! Blood cleanses from all sins he said. And he claimed that it didn't leave any for baptism. Well, does it leave any for faith? He is mistaking the remedy for the application of the remedy. Faith and baptism is the way you apply it Mr. Barr. And the blood itself is the remedy.

He then came to the matter of fruits. He said the fruit is evidence of salvation. Well, Gal. 5:22-23 says that one of the fruits of the Spirit is faith. Mr. Barr said that if you have fruits you are already saved. The Bible said that faith is a fruit. So you are already saved when you believe, according to Mr. Barr.

We come now to the scholars that he read (and they are de-

nominal preachers just exactly like Mr. Barr). Some of them are Seventh-Day Adventists and I suppose the rest of them are Baptists. But I have here a number of quotations that we will get to later on, and he can refer to them during the latter part of the debate, concerning the very fact that whenever the word "believe" is used in connection with "his Christ" that it is not properly translated "into." And so he said if Rogers wanted milk he would go to the picture. No, Rogers would go where the milk is. He would go where it is. I'll go where the blood is, Mr. Barr. It is in his death (John 19:34). And do you not know that we are baptized into his death (Rom. 6:3-4). If I want milk I go where the milk is, and if I want blood I go where the blood is! Where was the blood of Jesus shed, Mr. Barr? Where did Jesus shed his blood? It was in his death. So I'm going where the blood is and the Bible says that the way I get there is by being baptized into that death. So if you want milk, go where that is and if you want blood go where the blood is and in the way that the Bible says.

And I thank you very kindly, Ladies and Gentlemen.

## **BARR'S SECOND SPEECH**

**Wednesday night, September 24th**

Gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, ladies and gentlemen. I am before you now for my last speech on my affirmative proposition.

Not only did my friend fail to get to all the arguments I advanced tonight, but he completely ignored the arguments he did not get to last night. Should he reply in his last speech, of course, I could answer, the last two nights of the debate. But I do not purpose to do it, for the reason that if he does not do better than he has done thus far, I will be perfectly contented to let them stand just like they are.

Now, because it is fresh on your mind, I am going to notice the last thing he said, then I will take up the questions. He said he went where the blood was shed, for the remission of sins, and he teaches, as do all his people, that the only way you can reach the blood is in baptism. Baptism is spoken of as a burial. My friend seems not to know that Jesus Christ shed His blood on the cross and not in the grave. He goes down into the grave to reach the blood, but Jesus shed His blood on the cross, and Mr. Rogers seems not to understand it. This man is baptized to get with Christ, not buried with Him. He never gets with Christ, or reaches the blood until he gets into the baptismal waters according to his theory. It is easy to answer the quibbles he puts out. This argument was fresh on my mind, and I suppose it was on yours, and I wanted to notice it in the very beginning of my speech.

Now, my answers to his questions:

1. Since you said last night that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys, at what point of obedience, and what act of obedience does faith save? Answer: When we obey, to repent to God, and trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, that is the faith that saves us. Acts 20:21 says, "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

2. Who are people serving when they repent of sin; God or the Devil? Answer: When one repents it always culmi-

nates in saving faith in Christ. One cannot genuinely repent without believing in Christ. So, he is serving God.

3. Do you preach today that people are to receive the Holy Spirit just like Cornelius, before they are baptized? Answer: In the sense that people today receive the Holy Spirit, and he (Cornelius) received the Holy Spirit. The world cannot receive the Holy Spirit, and when men receive Him it is evidence they are saved. It is not the same in the outward manifestation. Men today do not speak in tongues as did he and others. The outward manifestations simply proved to the Jews who were with Peter, that salvation was for the Gentiles also.

4. Would Noah have been saved when the world was destroyed by water, if he had not obeyed in building the ark? Answer: No. But that is entirely a suppositional case. The fact of the business is he built the ark. Noah was saved spiritually long before he built the ark. He built the ark because he was saved spiritually, and not in order to be saved. The trouble with this man is, he works and works and works, and he does not know whether he is saved or not. He has to wait until he dies to find out if he makes it. I would hate to embrace such a doctrine.

5. Was Paul without authority to baptize? Answer: No. But baptism is not a part of the special commission given to him by Jesus, as I read it to you in Acts 26. Jesus let Paul know that through the gospel he was to preach to them, he was to open their eyes, take them out of the power of the Devil, and all these other things mentioned. Then, I showed you that Paul said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ be made of none effect." I have pointed out to you that baptism was not included in this special commission that Jesus gave to him. But of course Paul had authority to baptize, and he did baptize some people. But if one is a child of the Devil, has an impure heart, an unclean soul, and no peace. with God before he is baptized, surely Jesus would have put baptism in that special commission.

Now his answers to my questions:

1. Is your candidate for baptism at peace with God? He answered, "No." Now, ladies and gentlemen, I will take my time, and I want you to think, as this is going on record. it may be that people will read it after we are dead and gone.

In this debate Mr. Rogers has taken the position that all his people take. His moderator has told you that he has the unqualified endorsement of the churches he represents. And I say to you very sincerely and very frankly that he does as good as any of them can do. He is an able representative of his people, but it is the doctrine, His doctrine, that will not hold up under the light of investigation. Mr. Rogers says, "No", his candidate for baptism is not at peace with God, but take him down and baptize him, and presto! he is a child of God, pure heart, clean soul, not condemned, peace with God. Great shades of Aristotle! that puts more power in water than the Roman Catholic church puts in it, as sure as you live, and that is the truth.

Does your candidate for baptism love God? He answers, "In the sense that love is used in I John 5:3: "For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments." We don't keep His commandments in order to get to love Him, but we keep His commandments because we do love Him. Jesus said, "If ye love me you will keep my commandments." That is where Rogers gets mixed up. Look at I John 4:7, ". . . and every, one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." Now if you love Him before you are baptized, and one does if he has repented, and believed in Jesus; "he is born of God and knows God." But look at the shape Mr. Rogers has his man in! He is a child of the Devil. He has an impure heart, he has a filthy soul, he is condemned, he is not at peace with God, but he loves God "in some sense!" Boy! Isn't that going somewhere? Whenever I begin to propagate or preach a doctrine like that, so help me ladies and gentlemen, I will get off the platform, and say, "Boys, I will have to give her tip, she is too weak, and I cannot stand up for that kind of doctrine." It is too weak for a man to present, as sure as you live.

3. Did baptism save you? He answered, "Yes, in the very same sense that faith saves me." Let us see if that is so. He says you can have faith in Jesus, you can trust the Lord, and yet you have a filthy soul, an impure heart, and are a child of the Devil, still condemned, no peace with God, some sort of a love for God, but "Faith saves him in the same sense baptism saves him." But baptism gets him out from under all this according to the doctrine he has preached here. So, you see the legs of the lame are not equal. Don't you see where his

answers to the questions get him? A man who seeks to defend a false doctrine cannot answer questions without getting into difficulty exactly like this man.

4. Does it take perfect obedience to all the Lord's commands in order for a man to be saved? He answers, that "Faith must be perfected to the point God demands." Well, why didn't he tell us at what point that is? I took it from what he taught last night that one must keep all the commands, over a thousand of them, in order to be saved. Of course we know that is not so, and that we are very imperfect people. In Matthew 5:42 Jesus said, "Give to them that asketh of thee." If a man should ask you for fifty dollars, and you failed to give it to him you would go to hell for not keeping that command. Romans 16:16 says, "Salute the brethren with a holy kiss." Will you go to hell if you do not kiss all who come in? Jesus said if they slap you on one cheek turn the other to them. So, if somebody slaps the daylights out of you, and you do not turn the other cheek, and let him hit you, you will go to hell?, if you have to keep all the commandments? Do you see where his doctrine gets him?

5. Is the soul of the penitent believer saved by works? He answers, "Yes, the same as in John 6:29." Some type of works he says. He says, "not by works of the law." Now listen, some folks came to Jesus, and said, "what shall we do that we might work the works of God." Well, He said unto them, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." He simply used their language to show them that salvation is not of works in the common acceptation of the terms. Belief in Christ is not works in the sense that baptism is a work, and he knows it, and God knows it, and these people who read their Bibles know it also. So, when he says "by some type of works," I will reply in the words of the verse he read as a proof text: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit," Titus 3:5. So, I have used his proof text "not by works of righteousness which we have done." Let it (baptism) be a work of righteousness, and it is, but we are not saved that way says Paul. Mr. Rogers states that the laver (in Titus 3:5) of regeneration is baptism. If so, then, ladies and gentlemen, where does the blood enter in? If the laver

of regeneration is baptism, and that is the position he took in his interpretation of the scripture, there would be no need for the blood of Jesus Christ. Yet, it is the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, that cleanseth us from all sin.

He claims I did not answer his questions, but of course we may expect such in a debate, for the reason that many men will come up, and they would like to impress you that they have done a little better than they actually have. I did answer his questions.

I signed my name to the proposition, and it states that one is saved when he trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ with all his heart. He asks again about those that believed in Jesus, and wanted to know if they were saved, the rulers who did not confess Him. I say anybody who believes in Jesus Christ with all his heart, is saved, sir.

Why does he not prove that baptism is included in the many Scriptures I quoted? He has said that of all these many verses that Barr has quoted showing that we are saved by grace through faith, are children of God by faith, justified by faith, and all these things, He says he can prove that all of them include baptism. Ladies and Gentlemen, I say that is adding to the Word of God; hundreds and thousands of scriptures would have to be added to. I charge him with adding to the Word of God, of thrusting baptism in. If he can do that he can add the throwing of your babies to the crocodiles, crawling on your stomach ten miles do not eat hog meat, or catfish, do not do this or do that to be saved. You can include anything you want to, if men are permitted to thus handle the Word of God. You would not have a Bible of God, but you would have a Bible of men.

He comes again to John 1:11-13 where Jesus said, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not, but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God. Several versions say, "authority to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name." They never read verse 13, "Which were born (now, get this) not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." They become children of God when they receive that authority. That is what verse 13 teaches us, but they never want to notice the 13th verse.

He gets tip again and says I charge Mr. Barr with teach-

ing faith only." Well, I deny his charge, and I assure you ladies and gentlemen, that it does not disturb me a bit in the world, no matter what he charges me with. He is likely to charge me with anything. I am here to show you what the Bible teaches.

I have given you many scriptures showing that we are saved by grace through faith in Jesus Christ, that we become children of God by faith in Jesus Christ, and that we are justified by faith. We are at peace with God at the point of faith. He says, "faith is a work". "What must we do to work the works of God?" This is what some asked Jesus. He (Jesus) said, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." So, Jesus used their terminology to show them that the only works they could do was to "believe on Christ". One must repent, of course, before he can possibly believe on Jesus. Repentance culminates in faith.

A good many times Mr. Rogers has said that Barr, "hasn't touched top, side, edge, or bottom. I have called throughout this debate for one scripture where Jesus ever said, Thy baptism hath saved thee. Go in peace

I read Luke 7:50 where Jews said to that poor woman, that great sinner, who came weeping, and washed the feet of the Soil of God with the tears that fell from her eyes, and dried His feet with the hair of her head; the Son of God said to her, "Thy faith hath saved thee. Go in peace." Ah! listen friends, I say he has not touched top, side, edge, bottom, or round about, of finding the scripture that even half-way resembles his doctrine. So, I pay him back out of his own spoon. If that is the kind of business he wants to do, I know how to do it too.

He says that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys, that is working by love. Well, I say so too, but the only time it is working by love, so far as "his water plan of salvation" is concerned is when he is being baptized.

I did not run to the newspaper to try to find help. I wondered if your brother (the one who took the article to the newspaper) was absolutely honest. I did not think you knew what went in the paper, or that you gave it in. I even had the newspaper mail here to phone, and he said the advertisement was printed by hand. He also said it Was just like it was when it was turned in to the paper. I swear before God, ladies and

gentlemen, that he misrepresented last night when he said it was a misprint. I certainly do not want him going to hell by getting up here and misrepresenting. He ought to get up and apologize for saying it was a misprint, because it was not a misprint. I copied down the copy. There was some rearrangement, and a word or two left out, but that expression, "Water baptism, Plan of Salvation" is exactly like it was in the copy. You can go over and look at the copy yourself. Now, when I get caught in a predicament like that, I will not get up here, and bluster and bluff my way through it. I will just say, My Brother was mistaken, it was not a misprint. Now, listen friend don't shake your head (one of the men at the table with Mr. Rogers was shaking his head negatively). I went over (to the newspaper office) and copied it down, even asked for the copy to have it here, but the man was a little afraid to let me have the original copy. I asked the young man I talked with at the paper office what his religious affiliation was, if any, and he comes from the same church you represent. Yes sir, I do not mean the same local congregation, because I do not know about that. So he would have no reason to misinform me about the thing. I just believe in keeping you fellows honest I do not want you to die and go to hell for lying. They claim they will, you understand, and so, I am trying to help them stay out of hell.

He comes to John 3:5 again, and he says Barr promises to fight. And I still promise to fight, but you have never made an argument on the verse. You simply quoted, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." You believe, and I know it, because as you stated, I have debated you before, that the Kingdom of God refers to the church. Yet, you do not even believe there was a church in existence then. You do not believe it came. into existence until the day of Pentecost. You preach that the first gospel sermon was preached on the first Pentecost, after the resurrection of Jesus. Yet, you find Jesus here telling a man how to get into a church that (lid not even exist, and you have Him preaching your plan of salvation, that you say Was not preached until the day of Pentecost. I am just playing with him now, but I will whip his britches plumb off of him if he makes an argument on it, when he gets to his affirmative. I mean his theological pants; you understand, of course.

He says salvation is in the Name of Christ, and he quotes a scripture, "baptized into the Name." Yes, symbolically. John 2:23, "Many believed (his) into his Name." We actually believe into His Name, and we are baptized into His Name, symbolically.

Did you have Jesus when you were on your way to the baptismal waters? That will be question number one for you to morrow night. Did you have Jesus when you were on your way to the baptismal waters?, or did you go there without Him? Boy! we will have a lot of fun before this thing is over. And he said it (the newspaper advertisement) was a misprint!

He says, "Oh, Barr says it is a contest between God and Rogers." That is exactly what it is. I quoted many scriptures where God says men are justified by faith, become children of God by faith, and he gets -tip and says, "No". He is a child of the Devil, he has a filthy soul, an impure heart, he is not at peace with God, he is under condemnation, and presto! baptism fixes him up every way in the world, as far as his past sins are concerned.

He says, "Barr is the fellow who sweats and shouts and works up a steam." God bless you, I have something to shout about, yes sir! Baptists have something to shout about. We know the Lord said, "Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth and be ye saved. We can tell that old sinner, no matter where he is, "Look to Jesus and be saved." Even if he is not within ten thousand miles of one of their preachers, or a hole of water. I am a little heavier than he is, and I perspire very easily. I am also zealous in trying to get some of them to quit following after this false doctrine. I hate to see them go to hell. I want to see them come to Christ for salvation. I am in hearty accord with him that this is a serious business, and I beg you to turn away from the doctrine this man teaches, and turn to the doctrine of God, as I have given it to you from the Book of God.

He said he could find baptism in John 3:16 the same way I could find love. I showed you that it was not so.

He accuses me of snatching baptism out of Mark 16:16. Now, Mr. Rogers, why do you do those things? Honestly, I have not done any such thing, and I will not do it in this debate. I did not do it when I met you before, and if I ever meet you again,

I will not do it in the future. I take Mark 16:16 exactly as it reads. It is a declaratory sentence. It is not a conditional sentence, but Jesus declared, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." I believe it, and I believe the man that believeth in Christ, and then is baptized *shall be saved*. I believe the man who believeth and is baptized, goes to church every Sunday, pays his money, takes care of the widows and orphans, and all these other things, *shall be saved*. I find hundreds of scriptures where one is saved, and receives remission of sins when he believes in Jesus Christ with all his heart. The latter part of the verse (Mark 16:16) tells you that it is the unbeliever that will be condemned. But my friend will make it read this way, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth, and is not baptized shall be damned. Damnation is never connected with baptism, because baptism has nothing to do with damnation. He does not believe Mark 16:16 and he knows he does not believe it. He believes, "He that believeth and is baptized may be saved. That is if he outruns the Devil to the end, and a thousand and one other things. He does not believe A, and yet he claims I snatched baptism out of it. I did no such thing, but if he wants to make such charges, it does not disturb me, because I have heard them before.

Now, he comes to Ephesians 5:26, and he talks about the church being cleansed by the washing of water by the word. Before this debate is over, he will deny it, because of one of the questions I will ask him. He will deny that water literally washes away sins. In his dire extremity to try and find his plan of salvation, he makes this water baptism. In the interpretation he gives it, Water baptism would be that which will wash the church, and cleanse A, and sanctify it. Does he believe that? Let him get back up and tell you if he believes that water baptism cleanses and sanctifies the church. Now, I wonder if he will do it. If so, he will be the first one I have ever debated so foolish as to get up and take such a position.

The palsied man in Mark. He says "when Jesus saw *their* faith." But last night he said, "They tore up the roof," and intimated that Jesus forgave the man's sins because they tore up the roof. No, "when He saw *their* faith." He thinks that Jesus saved that palsied man without faith. No, THEY had faith, and so did the palsied man. The Book says in Hebrews

chapter 11, "Without faith it is impossible to please God. For he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." He would have the Lord saving a man here who did not have faith in Jesus, but of course he had faith in Him. So, you see where false doctrine will get you.

I called for a scripture in the Bible where it says we are saved through or by baptism. I read many where we are said to be saved by or through faith. He goes over and finds a verse that talks of Noah being saved by water. All of us know ladies and gentlemen, that the ark saved Noah from the flood. God saved Noah spiritually, and he was a preacher of righteousness before the water ever came. Do you not see that? The sense in which he was saved by water was that he was saved from that wicked generation. But you understand that he was saved spiritually, before the flood. So, in his extremity he finds "saved by water," but there are no scriptures that say we are saved by or through baptism, and he knows it, and all who read the Bible know it.

He says Mr. Barr does not claim to speak where the Bible speaks and remain silent where the Bible is silent. No, sir; Mr. Barr claims to do his best with the help of God to rightly divide the Word of truth. But I would be foolish, and so are you to claim to speak only when the Bible speaks, and remain silent when the Bible is silent. That is equivalent to saying, I am infallible, I could not possibly make a mistake. You know that is so. If you speak where the Bible speaks, and remain silent where the Bible is silent, for God's sake read to us where the thief on the cross was baptized. So, if the Bible is silent on it; why are you not silent on it? He has broken his rule already. But he reads from the Bible, where Judea and all the people around about were baptized of John, so he just puts the thief in that bunch. How do you know the thief was not in the bunch that came to John, and he (John) said, "Ye generation of vipers, why do you flee from the wrath of God to come." John refused to baptize them, and told them to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. -My goodness! friends, he is pressed to try and find some sort of argument to sustain his side of the proposition.

He says, "Baptist preachers come up to the lick log," and "That was a noble confession," and all that sort of business.

I will tell you one thing friends, Baptist preachers can read in the Bible where we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, where we are justified by faith. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," (Romans 5:1) and many others. He cannot find any that connect baptism with salvation; whereby you meet that condition to be baptized, and are said to be saved because of baptism.

I have already told him that repentance culminates in saving faith. You cannot genuinely repent without believing in the Lord Jesus Christ.

A faith that will not work is not saving faith; but works do not produce faith. Works are the result of faith. Of course a faith that is dead cannot work, and it is not saving faith. Saving faith will work, but it works because it is alive, and not in order to make it alive. I say again that if he can ride a dead horse to the creek, (and his man has nothing until they have gotten him in the water) then I say I can get on him and ride him into heaven. He says, "If Barr can ride a dead faith to the mourner's bench, he can ride it on to heaven." Well, of course, but I am not going to ride a dead faith to the mourner's bench, or any where else. The man who does not believe with all his heart at the mourner's bench, or any place else under God's shining stars, is going to die and go to hell as sure as I am standing here speaking to you folk tonight, because he has misplaced his trust. He must fully trust in Jesus if he is to be saved.

He touches very lightly on the fact that I showed that he took the position that one is begotten of God when he believes, and that he is still a child of the Devil. He did not deny that he thus teaches. I said, "In the natural and in the spiritual realm the begetter of the child is the father of the child before it is born and after it is born. But he (Rogers) actually has God begetting a child, and the Devil still the child's father until it is born of water (baptism). I know he knows that the original word translated "begotten" and "born" is identically the same word in the Bible. In the natural birth, one is begotten and then born, but the word translated begotten and born in the New Testament is the identical same word in the original language. He knows that and he will not deny it.

He says that Baptist theology is, God gives you the Spirit

and then you believe. Friends, if he would be allowed to make out my case and his too, he would do a good job debating, but he will not be allowed to do it. I say to you that is not Baptist theology, certainly not Baptist theology of the kind of Baptists I run around with; who teach that you receive the Spirit, and then you believe. Not so, absolutely not so, and he knows it is not so, I think. If he does not, then I have been giving him more credit than I ought to have given him, so far as his knowledge is concerned.

He says an obedient faith saves, and I say that a faith that saves will be obedient. But he makes obedience the one act of being baptized and you know he does. I am not mistaken, because he has that man before he is baptized a child of the Devil, with an impure heart, a filthy soul, condemned, not at peace with God etc. So, of course, he makes the one act of obedience, baptism, and then he does not have anything. Only forgiveness of past sins, and he has to outrun the Devil to the end or he will die and go to hell.

When he comes to the verse of scripture, "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your soul," he thinks faith is like a stick, with two ends to it. Is not that pitiful? No, receiving the end of your trust in Jesus even the salvation of your soul. Faith is not like a stick with two ends to it at all

He says, "Barr puts the preacher between God and the sinner." Barr does no such thing. "Barr said you must hear." That is true. But I do not mean you must hear audibly. If so, a deaf person would have to die and go to hell, would he not? But one can take a New Testament and read how God loved him, and how Jesus died for him, and was buried and raised from the dead. Then, one can repent to God, and trust in Christ, if he is not in ten thousand miles of a preacher, and the Lord will save. I do not put anybody between God and the sinner

He asks about the sincere Jew who does not repent and believe when there is no preacher. He will die and go to hell, if he does not repent and believe in Christ. Just like the man who goes to the water expecting to find salvation will die and go to hell if he does not repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

He said that many of the folks I quoted are sectarians, and etc. Why, you are the biggest sectarian that God ever had

upon top side of earth, you and your bunch. A sectarian it, is one who puts himself off to one side, and everybody else is in conflict with him. Everybody else is wrong. That is what a sectarian is, and the group he represents is the most sectarian sect on top side of God Almighty's earth, anywhere under the shining stars.

So, the blood is the remedy, and not water, and faith is the instrument through which the sinner receives Jesus Christ.

He says that one of those scholars I quoted from was a Seventh-day Adventist. Do you not know that they believe in baptismal regeneration? That makes my argument even stronger. The man simply spoke as a Greek scholar, and he had to speak correctly when he spoke as a Greek scholar.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have replied to everything he had to say that had anything to do with the proposition.

In the few closing minutes I have I want to call your attention to the fact that I have given you thirty one affirmative arguments in this debate. My friend has touched but a very few of them. God knows that, and the records will show it, because it is going down on record. I am not complaining, as he can carry on his side of it anyway he wants to.

I have given you many scriptures which prove that men are saved at the point of faith. I gave an argument on John 3: 14,15, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." I told you that is exactly what Baptists teach, and it is so. But he will have to thrust in baptism, ladies and gentlemen.

I plead with you tonight, if you have never looked by faith to the Son of God, recognizing that you are lost, without God and without hope, and if you have not trusted in Him alone to save you, I beg you to do it ere you sleep tonight. Like the poor woman who was such a great sinner, who came to the blessed Son of Got when Jesus was a guest in the house of Simon the Pharisee, who had failed to give Jesus the courtesy of a bowl of water to wash His feet, which was a common courtesy of the day, the poor woman weeping over her sins, no doubt, came to the feet of Jesus, and as the tears splashed on His feet, Jesus said to her: "Thy faith hath saved thee." (Time called).

Thank you. And I hope you will trust in the Lord and let

Him save you. Thank you ladies and gentlemen. Please don't anybody leave. Give Mr. Rogers a good hearing, courtesy demands that we do it.

## **ROGERS SECOND SPEECH**

### **Wednesday Night**

Mr. Barr, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen. I now come before you to reply to the speech that Mr. Barr has just made in your hearing.

The first thing that I wish to do is to look at the answers that Mr. Barr has given to the questions that we propounded.

1. Since you said last night that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys, at what point of obedience or in what act of obedience does faith save? He said, When you repent to God and when you trust Acts 20:21 says that Paul preached repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. But now, Mr. Barr, you said last night that the faith that saves is the faith that obeys. You further said that you agreed with Thayer's definition of the word that is translated "believe." But Thayer says that A is "trust conjoined with obedience unto Christ" Therefore, Mr. Barr, it is NOT at the point of trust. You don't agree with Thayer. Thayer says that it is "trust conjoined with obedience." Tonight you say that it is at the point of trust and therefore without anything else. So Mr. Barr has finally run the circle. He started out contending for salvation at the point of faith which eliminated everything else as a condition except faith. Then he tried to take in everything else except baptism. He is now back just like the puppy chasing his tail. He has finally wound up at the hole that he went in at the beginning of the debate. He doesn't agree with Thayer. If it is at the point of trust then it is not trust plus obedience like Thayer says. I believe that I will take Mr. Thayer as a scholar in preference to Mr. Vernon L. Barr.

2. I inquired, Who are people serving when they repent of sins, God or the Devil? He did not say whether you are serving God or the Devil. He just said that repentance will always culminate in saving faith. The Bible says in John 12:42 that the rulers believed but would not confess. Since he said that repentance comes before belief, then he believes that the ruler's faith was a saving faith, in spite of the fact that John said in

I John 4:3, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." John says that the man that does not confess does not belong to God. But Mr. Barr says that he does. You can believe John or you can believe Vernon L. Barr. According to John these men in John 12 were not of God. According to Barr, they were of God and had a saving faith. I quoted again and again 1 Cor. 16:22 where Paul says, If a man love not the Lord Jesus then let him be anathema (accursed). The Bible teaches that if a man loves the world, which involves the vain glory of life, then the love of the Father is not in him. Then the man that doesn't love God and doesn't love Christ is condemned. Mr. Barr says that he is saved even though he will not confess and though he loves the praise of men more than the praise of God.

3. I asked, Do you teach that people today receive the Holy Spirit just like Cornelius? He said, Well, in the sense that people receive the Holy Spirit today. Then he said, No, not in outward form. Then you do not get it like Cornelius got it? Why then do you bring up Cornelius as an illustration? He brings up Cornelius and wants you to think that people today are saved just like he was and that you are not baptized until you get the Holy Spirit just like Cornelius did. Yet he knows that Cornelius was baptized in the Holy Spirit and spake in tongues. He knows if he really takes that position then he will have to join up with the Pentecostals and so he doesn't believe it after all. He just dodges around the question without coming to it.

4. I asked him, Would Noah have been saved when the world was destroyed by water if he had not obeyed in building the Ark? He said, No. Well, that is the very point of illustration that Peter is using. Noah was saved from the condemnation that the world suffered because the water lifted up the ark and separated the Ark from those condemned. The Bible teaches that in like manner, in the same way, baptism saves us today. In just exactly that way. He admits that Noah would not have been saved if he had not obeyed the command of God to build the Ark. You will not be saved today unless you obey the command to be baptized. He said that Noah was saved spiritually before the water came. Whether he was or not, that is not the point. Peter is discussing his salvation from the destruction by the flood.

5. Was Paul sent without authority to baptize? He said, I& Last night he tried to argue that when Paul said that Christ sent me not to baptize that that excluded baptism from the commission that Paul received. But if that was so, then Paul would have had no authority to baptize. Yet tonight he says that he did have authority to baptize. Therefore, Mr. Barr, 1 Cor. 1:17 does not mean that baptism was not involved in Paul's commission. You will also note that Mr. Barr changes his words there. He says that Paul said that Christ sent me not to "baptize" (which is a verb). He changes "baptize" to "baptism" (which is a noun). The mere act of baptizing is no part of preaching the gospel. But that is not the same as saying that baptism is not part of the gospel. Paul did preach baptism and preached A very strongly. So much so that he taught that it inducts people into the Lord Jesus Christ.

He came to the point about getting to the blood. He said that Mr. Rogers said that he goes to the place where the blood is, He gave the illustration about getting milk. He said that he supposed that Rogers would have gone to a picture of a cow in order to get a glass of MILK rather than going to the cow herself. I responded by saying that Rogers would go to the place where the milk is. I would go where the milk is. And since I want the blood of Jesus then I will go where the blood is. He said, Don't you know that the blood was shed on the cross and not in the tomb? Well, where do you think he died, Mr. Barr? Did you think he didn't die until he got to the grave? My Bible teaches that he died on the cross. And the same Bible says, Or are ye ignorant (ASV) that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? (Rom. 6:3). Paul asks, Are you ignorant of this point? Mr. Barr is! Mr. Barr said that he died on the cross. Where did he shed his blood? On the cross, in his death. How do you get into his death, Mr. Barr? What does the Bible say? I want the Book of God on that particular thing. What does the Book say about it? The Bible says, "Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?" So we can see that Rogers goes where the blood is. He goes to the cross. He goes to the death. And the Bible says that the very thing that Mr. Barr calls a picture is the culminating act of obedience (if he likes it expressed that way) that inducts a man into the death of the Lord Jesus

Christ. When by faith he is baptized into the death of the Lord Jesus Christ where his blood was shed he is then saved by the blood.

But Mr. Barr says that we are buried "with Him" and not in order to get with Him. He thought that since the Bible says that we are buried "with Christ," that that meant you were already saved. Well, the Bible says in Romans 6:6, "Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, (now here is the reason) that the body of sin might be done away. Mr. Barr thinks if a thing is done "with Christ" you are already saved before it takes place. But Paul said you are crucified "with Christ" that or in order that the body of sin might be done away. So we can see that to be "With Christ" in that sense does not mean that you are already saved.

He talked about having peace with God. I believe that we have peace with God IN Christ and I will deal with that more thoroughly tomorrow evening. I would have to introduce material that has not thus far been introduced which might not be profitable.

He says that Rogers does as well as anybody can do. Whether I am doing as well or not, I am doing well enough to explode Baptist doctrine. Last night Mr. Barr had his watch torn up and bless your soul that wasn't the only thing he got torn up. He had something torn up besides his watch, and that was the doctrine that he propagates. So whether Mr. Rogers is as good as the best or as bad as the worst, he can answer Baptist doctrine. That is all that is essential in this debate.

He said that Rogers takes a man that is a child of the Devil, that is impure, that is unclean, that is filthy, and he is dipped in the creek and "presto" the preacher and the water make a saint out of him. Well, Mr. Barr says that he takes a child of the Devil, that is impure, that is unclean, that is filthy and Of, that is corrupt, wholly opposed to all that is good and right, and entirely inclined to evil and that Mr. Barr preaches to him and then that man hears what Mr. Barr preaches. Thus Mr. Barr leads that man to repent and to believe through that preaching. So Mr. Barr "presto" through his work as a Baptist preacher takes an unregenerated corrupt child of the Devil and makes a child of God out of him. Now Mr. Barr, what you are getting out of that is beyond me, because you do exactly the same thing that I do except that you teach people to re-

pent and believe and then you refuse to tell them to be baptized for the purpose that the Bible gives. That is the difference. I just take another step and tell a lost person to do all that Jesus said to do in order that he might obtain forgiveness. But Mr. Barr refuses to do that.

He said that we keep his commandments because that we love Him. He referred to 1 John 4:7, "Everyone that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." But, I pointed out that the Bible says, "This is the love of God that we keep His commandments (1 John 5:3). What is the love of God? That we keep His commandments. Mr. Barr does not think that is the love of God. He thinks that keeping His commandments comes after the love. But the love that justifies is the love that is expressed IN DEED AND IN TRUTH. It is not a dead love like the faith that you propagate. But rather a faith and a love that will obey.

He came to the point about a man loving God yet still being unclean. Mr. Barr, when a man repents and rebels against the Devil before he believes, does he love God or does he love the Devil? Does he love God or does he love the Devil after he repents and before he believes? If he loves the Devil then you have one of the Devil's children that still loves the Devil, rebelling against the Devil and believing in God. Or you have a man loving God and according to your argument he would be born again before he even has time to believe.

So tomorrow night, as you suggest, we will have some more questions and we will see how this thing gets along. He says that no man can answer questions without getting into trouble if he is teaching error. And these people have seen that demonstrated tonight in Vernon L. Barr. They knew that, Mr. Barr, without you telling them. They had already seen it demonstrated when you tried to answer the questions.

He came to the matter of perfect obedience. He said that Rogers evidently thought that we had to keep a thousand commandments in order to be saved. Last night I said that Mr. Barr made the statement that there are only four commandments that are indispensable. When I got up I read Acts 3: 22-23 where Peter said we are to hear all that Jesus says or else be destroyed. And I said that Mr. Barr says that you don't have to hear all of them. He got up and said that Barr didn't say it in the last speech and he won't say it in the next speech.

He said that he would not say that you don't have to keep all the commandments of God. Mr. Barr, what are you saying tonight? You said that you wouldn't say it in this speech nor in the next speech. Then you come along and argue that you don't have to keep all the commandments of God. That is what you said tonight. He said he wouldn't say it in his next speech but he did say it you see.

He came to John 6:29 and said that Jesus used "their" words. Did he use their words to teach the truth, Mr. Barr? Or did he use their words to teach error? Jesus said concerning faith, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent. And so if all works are excluded then out goes faith. Mr. Barr can join up with his brethren that teach unconditional salvation.

He came to Titus 3:5, "Not by works of righteousness which we did ourselves." Certainly we do not "do" baptism in the sense that we invent it or make it for ourselves. It is not something that man gets up. I don't get up baptism, Mr. Barr. The Son of God is the one that commanded it. It is not something that we get up or something that we invent ourselves. It is not something that we make it, but it is by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. Ladies and gentlemen, when you go home get your Bible and run the reference on that particular verse. You will find that it will direct you to such passages as we have quoted tonight, Eph. 5:26 and Acts 22:16 where Paul was told, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord."

He said that if we are saved by baptism then there is no need for the blood. Well then, if you are saved by faith there would be no need for the blood. Why friends, just because that baptism is necessary to salvation does not mean that the blood is not in reality the active agent of our salvation. It is the very basis of our salvation, but there are conditions to it. Mr. Barr has not met the arguments here.

He said that he had answered the question concerning the rulers in John 12:42-43. He never did say whether these men were saved at the time they believe and before and without confession of their faith in Jesus Christ. He finally came up and said they were saved if they trusted in God with all their hearts. The Bible says that they "believed his Christ," Mr.

Barr. They believed "his" Christ. They believed in Christ. Now were they saved or were they not saved? I still challenge you, every bit of you, to say yes or no. He won't say yes or no until this debate comes to a close. He won't tell us that they were saved before and without doing anything else. I pointed out that they were not of God (1 John 4:2-3), that they did not love God (1 John 2:15-17), and that the anathema of high heaven rested upon them (1 Cor. 16:22).

He asked, Why did not Rogers prove that baptism was included in these expressions that refer to believe. I proved it and Mr. Barr ignored the proof. Paul came to the Ephesians, and said, "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since you believed?" The word is "believed." Then they said, No. Paul said, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" (Acts 19:2-3). The word "believe" there carries with it the idea of their obedience and being baptized like God commanded.

John 1:11-13, "He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Barr says that I dodge on the last part of the quotation that says, "Who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. I pointed out last night, Mr. Barr, that the margin of the Revised version says, "which were begotten" of God. And to be begotten of God doesn't mean that you have life or that you are saved or that you are a child of God. John 1:11-12 says that you are given "the right to become a child of God." Mr. Barr says if you are begotten, you already are a child of God. The Bible says that the ones that were begotten were given the "right to become sons of God." Mr. Barr said that you can't be given the right to become what you already are, and he is exactly right. These were believers, they were begotten of God, but not the sons of God. They yet had to exercise the authority that God gave them, the right that God suggested to them, in order that they might become the sons of God.

He said that Rogers did not disturb him in saying that he taught faith only. It might as well not disturb you, Mr. Barr, because we can demonstrate it world without end. But in his next to last speech he said that a man is saved by faith and

not by faith and works. Well, if it is not by faith and works then it is by faith without works. And the Bible says, Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, BEING ALONE (James 2:17). The Bible says that faith without works is dead and that it is alone. Mr. Barr says that a man is saved by faith and not by faith and works. It is therefore faith without works. The Bible says that such faith is faith alone and that it is dead! I knew Mr. Barr believed it and Mr. Barr has affirmed it. But he is just like the frog that jumps here, yonder, and everywhere.

But he said, that Rogers said that he hadn't touched it top, edge, side, or bottom, and said that I had not given him any verse that says we are saved by baptism. I gave him I Peter 3:20-21; Eph. 5:26; and Titus 3:5. And what does he do? With a majestic sweep of the hand and with a sneer he says, "Hub! That doesn't refer to water baptism." And his ipse dixit is enough to solve the problem! Mr. Barr, that doesn't go in this debate. When we have debates, it takes just a little bit more than your word. You'll learn that before this thing comes to a close.

Gal. 5:6, For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. He says that he agrees with that and then he turns around and said that the faith that saves will obey. The faith that saves will work. So he teaches that it avails first and then works later. Paul teaches that the faith that avails is the faith that first works, and that by love. Mr. Barr said that a faith first saves and then later it works. The Bible says that a faith first works and then it obeys. Now friends, you can take either Mr. Barr or the Bible. I'm going to accept what the Bible has to say. You had better give up this human doctrine and the commandments of men and accept what the Bible says, instead of Baptist doctrine and the human laws that this man has propagated.

He came to the newspaper ad. He said that Mr. Rogers had misrepresented it. I said that it was a misprint. He said that Ile. went back and found the original copy and that it was not a misprint. Mr. Barr, did you think that newspaper people were the only people that could make a misprint? If my brother wrote that, it was a misprint by him. So it is still a misprint whether my brother made the misprint, or whether the newspaper made it. So it doesn't matter who made it.

Somebody made a misprint and Vernon L. Barr knows that Rogers and his brethren do not believe that all there is to the Plan of Salvation is water baptism. His brother said, and I read it last night, that any man that so affirms has lied about what we teach. I didn't say it, but his own brother, Dr. Albert Garner of Jacksonville, Texas, said that! He said that any man that affirms that Rogers' brethren teach that just baptism is all there is to the Plan of Salvation has lied on the people that he referred to as "Campbellites." He referred to us as "Campbellites," I'll say in his ignorance.

He said that he was trying to keep me honest and to keep my soul out of Hell. Well, Mr. Barr, I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. And according to your doctrine a man could get drunk, rob, steal, lie, curse, or beat his wife and still go home to heaven. If you believe in Jesus, then you are saved and not anything can happen to damn your soul according to Mr. Barr. So I believe in Jesus. And if you believe your own doctrine you shouldn't be worried about Rogers because I believe in Jesus as the Son of God. Now if you don't believe your doctrine on the impossibility of apostasy then you might have some room to get excited about somebody misrepresenting. But he knows that Rogers has not misrepresented, unless. he will affirm that the only people that can make a misprint happen to be newspaper people. And I never saw any man that was allowed to run loose that would make any such affirmation as that!

He said that Rogers never made an argument on John 3:5. Well, I guess this audience is glad that you told them! I pointed out, put this down — Mr. Barr, that water as an essential element is mentioned in connection with nothing in the New Covenant except water baptism. But water is mentioned in John 3:5. Therefore, John 3:5 refers to water baptism. That is even in syllogistic form, Mr. Barr! Yet you said that Rogers had made no argument on it. He blustered around about going to whip the pants off of somebody on some point. Now if you are capable of doing it, Mr. Barr, you just come right out to the whipping log, if you want to change the expression, and I will be glad to serve as the whipping boy. If you have the courage to make your quibbles and your dodges on John 3:5 then you just go right ahead and we will explode them and blow them as high as "Sputnik" as sure as you live tonight.

He talked a lot about being sorry that he had to answer what I had said. He said that it was the weakest stuff he had ever heard. I have a little book here called the Barr-Smith Debate. The man named Barr was Mr. Vernon L. Barr. It is a debate between two Baptists on "Conventionalism." Mr. Barr says here on page 92 concerning Cullis Smith, "He says I'm the easiest man he ever met; when one talks like that, he is feeling the hurt bad and don't you doubt it. Mr. Barr, don't you doubt it! When you start talking about whipping the pants off somebody and about his theological britches being burned and about somebody being easy to meet, you remember that Mr. Barr says that the man that says that is hurting bad and don't you doubt it! Bless your soul, he testified and told the truth. I never saw a man suffer any worse in my life. Thank you, Mr. Barr, for that confession.

He said that he looked to Jesus for salvation. Rogers does too! I look to Jesus that said, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark 16:16).

He said that he could be saved ten thousand miles from water or one of our preachers. Well, he can't be saved without hearing the gospel of Christ preached. So some preacher has got to be there. And there is going to be an intermediate man either way you go. Barr said that the man could read a New Testament. Yes, but some man is going to have to print that New Testament. So now he has put a printer between a man and his God. Any way you take it, Mr. Barr, you are going to get in your third person.

He said that Mark 16:16 is declarative and doesn't make baptism conditional. But the last part of that verse says, He that believeth not shall be damned. So Mr. Barr doesn't think that faith is essential to salvation because that is just declarative, according to him. He that believeth not shall be damned. He says that it is declarative and doesn't make it essential at all! Pshaw!

Now he came to Eph. 5:26 and said that Rogers won't say that water washes away sins. No, but Rogers will say that being baptized in water is necessary to have your sins washed away in the blood of Jesus, Mr. Barr. Yes, you must be washed in water baptism in order to be washed in the blood of Jesus just exactly like the Bible says.

He talked about the palsied man. He said that Jesus saw "their faith" and that without faith it is impossible to be well pleasing unto God, that is, faith in Jesus in that particular instance. There is no evidence that this man was even conscious. Mr. Barr could not prove he was if his life depended upon it. But he said that Rogers said that they tore off the roof and he supposed that I meant by that that a man had to be baptized. No, I showed that it was by faith, but not at the point of faith. They did something, their faith acted, and they were blessed after their faith obeyed and acted.

He said that it is foolish to say that you speak where the Bible speaks and are silent where the Bible is silent. I know it would be foolish for a Baptist preacher to say that because I can demonstrate otherwise. I can show that he doesn't speak where the Bible speaks and that he is not silent where it is silent. But Peter said in I Peter 4:11, If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. Every time I have referred to this quibble of Mr. Barr's I have quoted I Peter 4:11. Mr. Barr, what have you said about I Peter 4:11? What have you said? He would have said, Now Peter, that is foolish, that is the old idea of papal infallibility. Peter said, Now brethren, you speak as the oracles of God. Barr says, I don't do it and I don't aim to do it, I don't even claim to speak where the Bible speaks.

He said he could find where the Bible says that by faith we are the children of God, by faith we have life, and by faith we have remission. Yes, but you can never find where it says that we are saved at the point of faith or by faith only. No where does the Bible say, "By faith before and without water baptism." That is Mr. Barr's proposition, but it is not in the Bible. In Gal. 3:26-27 the Bible says, Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For (now here is the reason) as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

He said that a faith that will not work will not save. Then it doesn't save until after it works. One part of his speech he says that faith first saves and then it produces works. Then he comes along and says that faith won't save unless it does work. Mr. Barr you don't know whether you are going or coming

He said if I could ride a dead horse to the creek he would

ride him on to heaven. And I said that if he could ride a dead faith to the mourner's bench then he could ride that same faith on to Heaven. He said, Why of course you could do that. In other words, Baptist doctrine is that absurd. You might as well try to ride a dead horse from here to Florence tonight, as to ride the faith that Barr advocates fr—on here to Heaven. You would get just as far one way as you Avail the other. And you are not going very far on either one of them.

He said that Rogers talked about being begotten of God and still a child of the Devil. Well, whether you are born at faith or at baptism, the begetting precedes the birth! Mr. Barr says that you are born at faith. But you are begotten before you are born. Therefore, Mr. Barr thinks you are begotten, you are a child of God, you have life, you are redeemed, and then AFTER that you believe, By his argument he eliminates faith. But he said that Rogers knew that the word "born" and the word "begotten" come from the same original word. Yes, and when it refers to a man or to a person that is masculine it is translated "begotten." If it refers to a woman it is "born." The very idea of getting "born" of a "he!" Being born of a "he!" Now the word in its archaic use sometimes covers both these, but in the finer translations, such as the American Standard Version, if it applies to a male, why the Bible then says you are "begotten" and when it applies to the female it says you are "born."

He said that Rogers believed that you had to out-run the Devil from the creek to Heaven. I believe what Peter said about it, when he said to his brethren, Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour (1 Peter 5:8).

He said that the Jew that wanted to be saved and has riot repented and believed will go to hell. Is it any worse for the good honest man that hasn't obeyed the gospel to go to hell than it is for the Jew that doesn't believe in Jesus to go to Hell? There is not any difference in it as far as the person is concerned.

He said that Rogers is the greatest sectarian in the world. I am like Paul, I am a member of that church sometimes called a "sect." They said the one that Paul was a member of was "that sect everywhere spoken against" (Acts 28:22), just like Mr. Barr spoke against the church of the Lord Jesus Christ

tonight. And Paul said, After the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers (Acts 24:14). But I am a member of the same one that Paul was a member of. And there were men then that blasphemed the body of Christ by calling it a see, just like there has been right here this night.

He said that Seventh-Day Adventists believe that baptism is necessary for salvation. Well, it is according to which bunch of the Seventh-Day Adventists you refer to. There are some Adventists that affirm that, and there are others that believe salvation is by faith only.

He said that he has given thirty-one affirmative arguments and that Rogers had touched only a few and that he had not answered them properly. Will you suggest one, Mr. Barr, that I have not answered? Will you tell me the argument or the verse that I haven't referred to or haven't dealt with during the first two nights? (Rogers pauses for Barr to give verse or argument) He said he gave thirty-one but Rogers only dealt with a few of them. Which one did Rogers observe the passover on? Mr. Barr observed the passover on Luke 7:29-30 where the Pharisees rejected the council of God by not being baptized. He hasn't mentioned it or breathed it in any form. How many verses now have you heard him call out that Mr. Rogers has not referred to?

I thank you very kindly, ladies and gentlemen, for your splendid attention tonight.

## THURSDAY NIGHT

Proposition: "The Scriptures teach that water baptism, to the penitent believer, is for (to obtain) the remission of alien sins.

Bill L. Rogers, Affirms  
Vernon L. Barr, Denies

### ROGERS' FIRST SPEECH Thursday Night

Mr. Barr, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I'm grateful that in the providence of God we can assemble tonight in this capacity to continue our investigation of the things that have been read in your hearing. We are here tonight under marching orders of the Son of God. The Bible says to "contend earnestly for the faith that once for all was delivered unto the saints." Any good dictionary will tell you that to "contend" means "to debate or dispute, to uphold by argument." Now, the Bible says that the people of God are thus to contend for the faith. It further says that we are to *earnestly* contend for the faith. And so we are here under direct orders from God. And we intend to contend, and not only to contend, but to earnestly contend for what we sincerely believe to be the truth of Almighty God. Mr. Barr believes, that what he's teaching is the word of God. And he therefore has the courage of his conviction to come here and to defend what he preaches. I told you at an earlier occasion that I do not believe the *doctrine* that Mr. Barr propagates, but I do respect and admire any man that *believes* he has the truth and has the courage and the interest to make an attempt to defend what he believes. And if I had a doctrine that I would not defend, then I would be ashamed to let anybody learn about it at all. And so, under proper circumstances and under correct arrangements, Mr. Barr and I are of that group of men who believe that honorable public debate is worth a great deal. Mr. Barr, you have my commendation for defending at least what you believe, even though I oppose heartily the thing that

you preach. You are to be admired for standing up for the things that you have endorsed.

Now then, before I enter into the discussion tonight, I should like to introduce first of all, as our agreements suggest, the questions for my opponent.

1. Do you claim that the kingdom had been set up at the time the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus transpired as recorded in John 3?

2. How many commands of God can one refuse to obey and still be saved? Mr. Barr thought that if I teach that a man must be baptized in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins I was therefore affirming that God demands perfect obedience. And if a person failed in any sense there would be no hope of forgiveness. But Mr. Barr now has a proposition that may be driven to another extreme. I want to know how many commands of Almighty God a person can refuse to obey and still be saved? Jesus said all authority has been given unto me in heaven and in earth. Upon that authority sent he his disciples forth to teach people and to baptize them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It (baptism) is a command of the God of heaven. It is performed in the name of the Lord of glory. It has all authority in heaven and in earth behind it. Now if a man can flounce the authority of God, and repudiate the will of his God, and reject the commandment of our Lord at *that point*, I want to know, Mr. Barr, just how many a man might handle that way and still expect to be saved in the after-awhile?

3. Since last night you said the man in the fox hole could read the New Testament and be saved without a preacher, what would be his condition if he were unable to read? What if he it, an illiterate mail and can not read at all? He therefore cannot read and learn it from the New Testament. But you say he would he damned unless he hears, unless he learns, unless he repents and unless he believes. What I want to know about is that man in the fox hole that wants to be saved, but yet cannot read? I just wonder what Mr. Barr will say about that contingency.

4. Since you affirmed that alien sinners repent before they believe, and since the Bible says that sinners repent "unto or *his* life," do you preach that they are saved before they believe?

5. Have you ever told, or would you tell a penitent, praying man what Ananias told Saul to do, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling upon the name of the Lord"? I want to know if Mr. Vernon L. Barr from Dallas, Texas has ever told a man, a penitent, praying man to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Now, he can tell us very quickly whether or not he has ever so done.

But now then to the proposition that we are affirming tonight. First of all, it is my lot to define the terms of the proposition. I shall read the proposition and then define the terms that are involved in it: "The Scriptures teach that water baptism to the penitent believer is for (to obtain) the remission of sins." By the "Scriptures" I mean the Bible, the Book of God. By "teach", I mean that the Bible imparts this information, either in so many words or in words which lead to that conclusion. By "water baptism", I mean an immersion in water into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. By "penitent believer", I mean one who has repented of his sins, and is trusting in Jesus for Salvation, one that believes and has repented of his sins and is relying upon the Son of God for the forgiveness of his sins. By "for", I defined in parenthesis, I mean "to obtain", or "to have" remission of sins. By "remission of sins", I simply mean forgiveness or salvation.

Now then, to the affirmative arguments that we will utilize to sustain that affirmation tonight. First of all. I call your attention to the second chapter of Acts. There Peter has delivered the sermon to the Jews upon the first Pentecost after our Lord's resurrection. He charges them with being guilty of the blood of the Son of Almighty God. As he thus delivered this powerful message, he points out that Jesus has been raised from the dead, and has taken his seat at God's right hand. And he charges "Let all the house of Israel know therefore assuredly. . ." The expression "know assuredly" simply means to *believe confidently*. Peter said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ this Jesus whom you have crucified." And the Bible says that when they heard this then "they were pricked in their hearts, and cried out unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, What shall we do?" They are now convicted of

sin. They believed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. They realize that they are sinners, that they are lost and condemned, undone, without God in the world. They therefore inquire, "Men and brethren, What shall we do?" Now, what shall we do for what? What are they interested in? Why, of course, "What shall we do that we may be saved? What shall we do that we may have forgiveness for the terrible sin of Crucifying the Son of Almighty God?" They inquired, "Men and brethren, What shall we do?" The Bible says that Peter said unto them, "Repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Let us look at the first part of the answer. They have inquired, "Men and brethren, What shall we do?" Why if Peter had just said, "Repent and be baptized", then we would have to accept the *complete* answer to the question, and the question relates to their salvation. "What shall we do", in other words, "in order to be saved?" And Peter points out that there are two things to do, in this particular instance. They've already been charged to know or to believe confidently that he is the Son of God. And then Peter says, "Repent and be baptized." In order to have a complete answer then to that particular question there we must have both the things that Peter says. After he charged them to know assuredly and they inquired what to do, they had to repent *and* be baptized.

But in order that there could be no misunderstanding at all concerning the *design* of the repentance and the baptism, Peter inserted or added this by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit: He said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins.*" What does my proposition say? It says that baptism to a penitent believer is for the remission of sin. Here are men that are cut to the heart. They are convicted of sin and inquired what to do. They have already been charged to believe, and then they are charged to repent and be baptized in Jesus name. What *for!* Well, the Bible says "for the remission of sins, and then to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Now, Mr. Barr, that is the exact wording of my proposition. That's the exact thing that I'm affirming. *And Mr. Barr tonight is denying the inspired word of the Almighty God! He's simply denying Acts 2:38 and repudiating the thing that God has given. I*

But let us look just a little bit further. I said that "for the remission of sin" means "to obtain the remission of sin." May I suggest also that the prepositional phrase "for the remission of sins" modifies both *repent* and *be baptized*. Just eliminate baptism and suppose that Peter said, "Repent every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." What would that mean? Why, Mr. Barr would admit that that means they were to repent in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins. Well, the Bible, not only says to repent for remission, it also says repent *and* be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. And so whatever repentance is for in Acts 2:38, then baptism is for. And if Ain Barr argues that Acts 2:38 means people are baptized because of the remission of sins, then people also *repent* because of remission of sin. For we have one particle "for", *and one particle cannot have two meanings in one construction*. Therefore, the Bible teaches that there are two things that Peter charged these to do in order to obtain forgiveness of sin. And what was it? To repent, number one; and be baptized, number two, in Jesus name for the remission of sins.

Now, let us go just a little bit further and see what the phrase "for the remission of sins" means. Well, I have affirmed that it mean-, "to obtain" the forgiveness of sins. Mr. Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, which by Mr. Ben M. Bogard in the Hardeman-Bogard Debate, is lauded as the greatest Greek Lexicographer in the world, translates the Greek prepositional phrase from which we obtain "for the remission of sins" in this fashion: (And he says there, by the way that it modifies baptism. It's under the word *baptismos* that he gives this translation.) He says that "for the remission of sins" ought to be translated, and he does translate it, "*to obtain the forgiveness of sins.*" The greatest Greek scholar, as far as New Testament Greek that the world has yet produced, says that when Peter said to repent and be baptized in Jesus name for the remission of sins that "for the remission of sins" means "to obtain the forgiveness of sin." What did I say I mean, when I say that people are to repent and to be baptized for remission of sins? I said "*to obtain* remission." I said "to obtain" remission, and by remission I meant forgiveness or salvation. Therefore Peter said, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you to obtain the forgiveness of sins." That is the highest

authority on God's earth tonight as far as New Testament Greek is concerned, and he says that it means exactly what Rogers has affirmed.

But let us go just a little bit further. Mr. Goodspeed is a Baptist scholar, and he's given us a translation of the Bible. He says, and translates Acts 2:38 after this fashion, "Peter said unto them Ye must repent, and everyone of you be baptized (now watch it) in order to have your sins forgiven, and then ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Why, that's the very thing I've affirmed, the very wording of the proposition. And to deny this proposition is to deny the word of Almighty God. You might as well come to that particular point, and recognize it tonight. Moreover, we find the expression "for the remission of sins", also in Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3 and Mr. Goodspeed translates it there that "John came preaching repentance and baptism to obtain the forgiveness of sins." What is it? "To obtain, to obtain the forgiveness of sins. Who translates it after that fashion? Mr. Goodspeed, who is a Baptist preacher. Well, we come next to Williams translation. He says that Peter charged these men to repent and then (and he inserts this, "as an expression of it") everyone of you be baptized (and here is his translation of *for the remission of sins*) that you may have your sin forgiven." Now, he said, "You are to repent, and as an expression of your repentance, you be baptized that you may have your sins forgiven." In translating that same Greek prepositional phrase from which we obtain, "for the remission of sins", in Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3 this man says, "He came and preached baptism conditioned upon repentance to obtain the remission of sins." Well, what does my proposition say? It says that baptism to a penitent believer is for, in the sense of to obtain the remission of sins. Who is Mr. Williams? Mr. Williams is a baptist scholar that has given us a translation of the Bible. And what does he say it means? He said it means "that you may have your sins forgiven;" that, it means "to obtain the forgiveness of sins.

Moreover in Matt. 26:28 as Jesus instituted the sacred Supper, he took of the fruit of the vine and said, "This is my blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Why did Jesus shed his blood? Why, certainly not because people had already obtained the remis-

sion of sins, but that they might obtain the remission of sins, and that he might obtain the remission of sins for them. We are saved then by the blood of Jesus. The question comes, when are we saved by the blood? When do we apply the blood? When do we enjoy the benefits of the blood of the Son of God? Well, Peter said it's when the believer, the man that knows assuredly or believes confidently, and repents of his sins, is baptized in Jesus name for the remission of sins. I said that people must be baptized relying upon Jesus. The Bible says that people are to repent and be baptized in Jesus name. That expression "in Jesus name" means upon his name, or relying upon the name of the Son of God. Any man that went to be baptized that did not go there relying upon the name of the Son of God, with his hope and his trust in Jesus the Lord of Glory, then that man remained a sinner. But The man who has believed in Jesus, that has repented of his sins, and that relies in Jesus and trusts in him and obeys the command to be baptized, then that man when he is baptized obtains the forgiveness of his sins; he is brought into contact with the blood of the Son of God that was shed in his death; he's inducted into the death of Christ as was demonstrated Upon last night, and is therefore saved. By what kind of faith? by faith that relies upon Jesus, and trusts upon him. If you haven't been baptized like the Bible says, if you've obeyed Baptist doctrine, the human commands and the doctrines of men, then Ladies and Gentlemen, let me persuade YOU tonight, let me beg and plead that you renounce human doctrines, renounce the idea that would deny the very wording of the Bible, and do exactly what Jesus says, without addition, without subtraction, and without deviation, If you haven't obeyed the gospel of Jesus Christ, then let me persuade you to do that now. Jesus loved you and died for you, and God loved you and sent his Son. Then why become a rebel and turn your back upon his word and refuse to do what Jesus has commanded. And the person that rejects the commands of Jesus that were given through the inspired apostle Peter, has in reality rejected the Lord of glory. He has rejected the Son of Almighty God! And if you haven't done what Jesus said, then by all means, tonight before this night is over, call one of these faithful gospel preachers, Brother Wilhelm, Brother Burnes, or some of these other faithful preachers and they will tell you

words whereby you and your house can be saved. And they will be glad to take you the same hour of the night, like the Bible says, and immerse you in the name of Jesus Christ to obtain the forgiveness of sins. The Baptist Church does not teach it and they do not practice it. If you've had Baptist baptism, you have not had the baptism commanded by the Son of God through the inspired Peter in Acts 2:38. And if you haven't had the baptism that God commands, you are yet in your sins, lost, and without God in the world. Therefore you ought to do it now, and there is no reason to die Without hope of salvation. You have the time and the opportunity. You can turn and read it in your Book just exactly like I did in mine. Therefore let me say to you that you had better hear what God commands. Don't listen to the quibbles and the dodges of these Baptist preachers that pervert the truth and deny what the Bible has to say on this particular subject.

Now I advance another point and that is: that baptism is into the Lord Jesus Christ. May I emphasize here that we are sons of God *in Christ*. In Gal. 3:26 the Bible says, "You are all the sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus." Now let us look at that in Goodspeed's translation. Goodspeed says: *In Christ Jesus* you are all the sons of God through your faith. Remember that it is *IN Christ Jesus*. In Christ Jesus you become a son of God. In 2 Tim. 2:10 the Bible says, I endure all things for the elect's sake that they may obtain the salvation that is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." Life is in Christ. John 3:14, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth may in *hint* (not out of him, as Mr. Barr thinks, but in him) have everlasting life." (R.V.) Forgiveness is in, *Christ*, Col. 1:14. Eph. 1:7, "In whom we have the remission of our sins (or the forgiveness of our sins) according to the riches of his grace. Eph. 1:3 says that every spiritual blessing is in Christ our Lord. And the Bible says in 2 Cor. 1:20 that all the promises of God are Amen *in Christ*. That is, they are fulfilled and they are enjoyed in the Lord. If anybody is ever saved, he will be saved by the grace of Almighty God. And yet the Bible says in 2 Tim. 2:1, "Thou therefore my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. Now, where do we become sons of God? GO. 3 16, in Christ. Where is salvation? 2 Tim 2:10, *in Christ*. Where is life? John 3:15, in

*Christ*. Where is forgiveness? It is *in Christ*, Col. 1:14. Where is every spiritual blessing? In Christ Jesus our Lord Eph. 1:3. Where do we enjoy all that God has promised? *In Jesus*, 2 Cor. 1:20. Where is a man saved by grace? Why he is saved by grace *in Christ Jesus*, 2 Tim. 2:1. Now then, since all of these things are IN the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to obtain these blessings we must enter *into that place where the blessings are located*. I also affirm that all the steps that are necessary to entering into Christ, all those steps, are necessary to being a child of God, to having life, to having forgiveness, to enjoying spiritual blessings. But the Bible says in Gal. 3 16, 27, "We are all the sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus (Now here is the reason), for as many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ did put on Christ." How did they get *into* the Lord Jesus Christ? What was the thing he is showing inducted them *into* the Lord? Paul said, "As many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ did put him on." The word "into" there is translated from the Greek preposition "his". Mr. Barr last night affirmed confidently that the Greek preposition "his" means "into". And he read a number of men that he called scholars and said that they proved that the word "his" meant into, and that therefore people believed into Christ. But here the Bible says that people are *baptized "his" Christ*. Mr. Barr affirmed last night that means into. One time he denied it. But last night he finally got around to the point that he admitted that "his" meant "into", into Jesus Christ", and I have no higher authority than Vernon L. Barr here tonight to testify to that particular point. Now then, since baptism is necessary to getting into Christ, is an essential step to being inducted into the Lord, and everything that is necessary to getting into Christ is necessary to enjoying the blessings that are in Christ, then baptism is absolutely essential to sonship in the Lord, to salvation, to life, to forgiveness, to enjoying all spiritual blessings, to enjoying the promises of God, and to being saved by grace — for grace is in Christ Jesus.

I want to point out that we are justified by faith. But the question is, when are we justified by faith? In Rom. 5:1 Paul said, "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Observe that we have the peace *through* the Lord Jesus Christ. It isn't out of him, but it is *through* the Lord that we enjoy the peace that Paul here re-

ferred to. But Paul said WE have peace with God. "Being justified by faith, WE have peace with God." And so he therefore includes himself. Saul was on the way to Damascus when arrested by a bright light and heard a voice saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" He said, "Who art thou, Lord?" He said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. Arise and enter into the city, and there it shall be told thee what thou must, M-U-S-T, must do." Well, the Bible says that Saul arose and went into the city. And in Acts 9:9 that Saul did not either eat or drink. He refused to eat and he refused to drink. *He had no peace.* And so he remained in that condition for about three days. When finally Ananias, at the command of God, went to him and said, "The Lord Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way has sent me unto you that you might receive your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit." And Paul says in Acts 22:16, Ananias said to him, "And now, why tarriest thou, Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling upon the name of the Lord. And the Bible says in Acts 9:18 that Saul arose and was baptized. The next verse, verse 19, says that Paul received food and was strengthened. *When did Saul have peace? When justified by faith.* But he had no peace until he arose and was baptized in the way that Jesus commanded. Yes, we are saved by faith, but saved by faith after it obeys, after our faith has taken God at his word and done exactly what he said. Well this is parallel with the Lord's statement in Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Last night Mr. Barr took the position that I and my brethren, every body that has been baptized like the Bible commands in Acts 2:38 for the remission of sins, that they are lost and on the road to hell. Then the Bible ought to say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be damned." That is what Barr taught last night. Yes, he said the man that believes and is baptized, then that man shall be damned, because he said that Rogers and all of his bunch are damned, they are on the road to hell. But we've done exactly, and that only, which God commanded in Mark 16:16. So Jesus used the wrong expression. He ought to have said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be damned." But he said, "He shall be saved." And that's just the difference between Vernon Barr and the Son of God.

I pointed out last night that salvation is in the name. Acts 10:43, remission *through* the name. John 20:30-31, the believer gets life in the name. Acts 4:12, "*wherein* we must be saved." I read verses showing that we are baptized *into* the name of Christ from the Revised Version. He never mentioned it. I've given him Luke 7:29-30 showing that to reject baptism is to reject the counsel of God. Heb. 12:25 teaches that a man can not be saved and reject the counsel of God. But he hasn't mentioned it. I pointed out John 3:5 that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit then he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. He has blustered bragged and blown and told what he was *going to do* with John 3:5 but so far he has dodged and sidestepped and has never come to the point that he is willing to debate that particular point.

And so again I say tonight that if you have had the baptism that "Barr preaches, then it was "because of remission of sins, not to obtain like the Bible says. And so his baptism is not Bible baptism. And the Bible says that people are saved by the *truth*, not by error. Mr. Barr is teaching error. You can't obey error and expect to be saved. You purify your souls in obeying the *truth*. 1 Peter 122. And if you obeyed Baptist doctrine, and have been baptized, arguing, complaining and confessing that you were already a child of almighty God, that you already had remission of sins, then you did not obey the truth and the Bible says that people are saved by obeying the truth. Listen attentively and carefully to the things that Mr. Barr has to say. See whether or not he comes right up and deals with the arguments that have been advanced fairly and forthrightly. I thank you very kindly, Ladies and Gentlemen.

## **BARR'S, FIRST SPEECH**

**Thursday night, September 25, 1958**

Gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, Mr. Rogers, ladies and gentlemen. It gives me a great deal of joy to be privileged, because of the gracious goodness of God, my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to come tonight to preach Jesus to this people. The difference between my friend and his people, and Baptists is that he will continue, as he has for two nights, plus one speech tonight, to exalt the Savior's ordinance, baptism, and try to point you to the ordinance for salvation. I will be laboring hard to point you to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Thank God for the privilege of doing it! According to our agreement, here are my questions for Mr. Rogers:

1. Does your candidate for baptism have the Son of God while on the way to the baptismal waters?
2. Is the faith of your candidate for baptism working by love, while on the way to the baptismal waters?
3. Does baptism to a proper subject change his heart, his character, or his feelings?
4. Is being born again and being baptized the same thing?
5. Is the Devil the father of the one begotten of God, before he is baptized?

My answers to his questions: (He has a copy of my questions, just keep those for me please)

1. Do you claim that the kingdom had been set up, at the time of the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus as recorded in John 3:3?  
Answer: I do not claim that the kingdom of John 3:5 is the church. I claim the church was set up before Pentecost.
2. How many commands of God can one refuse to obey and still be saved?  
Answer: One cannot refuse any command of God upon which salvation is conditioned and be saved.
3. Since last night you said the man in the foxhole could read

the New Testament and be saved without a preacher, what would be his condition if he were unable to read?

Answer: If he had heard about Jesus, heard the gospel before he got to the foxhole, he could be saved. I believe if he is there and wants to be saved, even though he cannot read, that God will get someone there to tell him about Jesus. Jesus said, "This is the Light that lighteth every man that comes into the world."

4. Since you affirmed that alien sinners repent before they believe, and since the Bible says that sinners repent unto "his" (or ice — call it ice if you want to — it makes no difference to me) do you teach that they are saved before they believe?

Answer: I affirmed that one cannot repent without his repentance culminating in saving faith. If he really repents it will always culminate in saving faith.

5. Have you ever, or would you tell a penitent praying man, what Ananias told Saul to do? "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the Name of the Lord?"

Answer: Under the same circumstances I would, and I have told them in substance what Ananias told Saul. When I am convinced that the penitent, praying man is saved, I tell him to be baptized. Baptism symbolically washes away his sins. The blood of Christ actually washes away his sins. Rev. 1:5 "Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood." The difference between Rogers and me is that I believe it is the blood, and he believes it is the water.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am glad he showed an inclination to want to fight, and he made a good speech. He said a lot of things, and he put words into my mouth. We are making a book, as my brethren assure me they are going to print this debate. I cannot afford to take the time to deal with all the side issues that have nothing to do with the proposition, and I will not do it. I will tear his speech piece from piece. I have not said, as he claimed I did last night, that he is weak, or even intimated that he is weak. I have said from the beginning that he is strong, and I mean it. He can do as good a job as any of them. But his doctrine is no good. It is not him; the weakness is in his doctrine, and not in the man.

I want to note his definition of the proposition, if I may, briefly. The Scriptures teach (you notice now, as it is important that you get the difference between us) that water baptism to the penitent believer is for, 'to obtain the remission of alien sins.' He left out the word 'alien'. Any one could do that, and it probably was a slip of the tongue. But the proposition says, 'alien sins.' Listen ladies and gentlemen, is this penitent believer who is trusting in Jesus for salvation saved? He said in defining his proposition that a penitent believer is one who is trusting in Jesus for salvation. Even in his own definition, his proposition has gone down; sunk, hook, line and sinker. Because, if the penitent believer is trusting in Jesus for salvation, the Lord is not going to turn His back on him. So he has him saved in defining his proposition before he ever gets him into the water. Notice also, if you please, that his proposition says that baptism to the penitent believer was to obtain the remission of alien sins. What is alien, and what are alien sins? They are sins that alienate from God. Alienated is to be separated from. So if a man, after he is baptized to obtain remission of alien sins, sins again, he must be baptized again, if the sins he commits are alien sins. If they are not alien sins what are they? He has to baptize his candidate every time he sins according to his own proposition. I call to your attention that I wrote to Bro. Hood, and told him that they slipped up on drawing up the proposition. I have the letter over there if he wants to see it. These are his propositions. He sent me six of them. These are some of the things I chose not to reply to because it takes up time to reply. He said I refused to sign the proposition. I did no such thing. He sent me six propositions, and I selected two out of them. He knows I have debated him on one other of the propositions, and I would on the others, but you have to limit them in a four night debate. I have debated every proposition he sent, numerous times, and so, I did not refuse to sign anything. I simply picked out two of his propositions exactly as he drew them up. I wrote Bro. Hood and told him that Rogers slipped up on the way he drew up his proposition. The most of them put, "for the remission of 'past' alien sins". He failed to get his word "past" in there. And if he actually affirms this proposition, he has to baptize them every time they sin, or he must say that such sins are not alien sins, that are committed by one who is saved. Now that

is the position that their fellow has himself into. 'For the remission of sins' he says means in order to obtain. We will see.

He comes to Acts 208 and makes his most lengthy argument on it I am glad that he did. Peter said unto them, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ. for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The Revised Version reads this way: "And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." I simply read them both in order to contrast the two. There are two separate commands here. There came on the day of Pentecost, under the power of the Holy Spirit-convicted preaching of the Apostle Peter, Conviction to the crowd that had crucified Jesus. Peter charged them with crucifying Him, and they said, "Sirs, what must we do?" Not only did they want to know what to do to be saved, but they also wanted to know what to do to let the people know that their allegiance is now changed; that we are saved, and our allegiance is changed. So there are two separate commands here. "Repent ye" is second person, plural number. "Be baptized every one of you" is third person, singular number. The first command was addressed to all the crowd. God calls all men everywhere to repent, Acts 17:30. But God does not call all men everywhere to be baptized; only those that repent, you understand. The command to be baptized is addressed to such as should repent. So, they cannot be connected to procure the same thing because the two commands were addressed to two different sets of people. Repentance is unto life, Acts 11:18. It is the very same thing Jesus teaches that men must do that they might believe, Matthew 21:32. So, by repenting, one comes into possession of faith which is needed to bring remission of sins. This same Apostle Peter said in Acts 10:43: "To Him (Jesus) give all the prophets witness; that through His Name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." What prophet of God ever witnessed 'that whosoever is baptized shall receive remission of sins?' But they all witnessed that if one believed in Jesus he would receive remission of sins. So then, repentance would bring them to faith, and remission of sins, and make them right before God. But they had publicly condemned and killed Jesus Christ. How could they right this before the world?

They could do this by publicly being baptized as a declaration of their change of attitude toward Jesus Christ, the One whom they had crucified. John baptized people because of repentance. Baptism declared that those baptized of John had repented. Even so was it here, in this particular passage of scripture. May I make this thing clear in the beginning. My friend seems to want to make the fight on the English preposition "for". I am ready for the fray. Yet, let me say in the very beginning that I am not even contending that "for" is the best translation of the Greek preposition "his" in Acts 2:38. I am not necessarily saying that it should be translated, "because of". But I am making this statement that if he is going to fight on the English preposition "for", then go to your dictionary. He will not find any standard dictionary giving the primary meaning of the English preposition "for" as being "in order to obtain". He will find but very few, possibly two or three that will give it as a third or fourth meaning of the word. In Matthew 12:41 it is said that they repented at the preaching of Jonas. The word "at" there is the same little Greek preposition "his" or "ice" (Mr. Rogers pronounced the preposition as ice), which ever you like, used in Acts 2:38 that is translated "for". Repented at or repented "his" the preaching of Jonas. Did they repent in order to obtain the preaching of Jonas? No, they repented because of the preaching of Jonas. Matthew 3:11, "Baptized unto (his) repentance." It certainly was not in order to obtain repentance, but they were baptized because they had repented. Revelation 16:10 (Please remember that I am arguing on the English preposition "for") is where he made his argument. Do not forget that, and I know that he knows what I am saying, and if he misrepresents me, I will call the people's attention to it. Now, Revelation 16:10: "And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues FOR pain". Did they gnaw their tongues 'in order to obtain' pain? No, of course not, as they gnawed their tongues because they already had pain—because of pain.

In Ezra 3:12, "Many shouted aloud FOR joy". Did they shout aloud 'in order to obtain' joy? No, they shouted because they already had joy. Yet, My friend says, 'in order to'.

I Corinthians 10:2 "They were all baptized unto (his) Moses

in the cloud and in the sea!" His is the same word used in Acts 2:38. Listen friends, they were not baptized 'in order to obtain' Moses. They were baptized with reference to Moses' leadership over them. Ah! friends, listen, he does not have a leg to stand on in this thing, and you will see it.

Acts 19:3 "Unto what were ye baptized?" His is the word translated "unto" in the verse. Can you make it 'in order to' what were ye baptized? 'In order to obtain' what were ye baptized? Of course not.

Romans 6:3 "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into (his) His death? Here (according to his interpretation) you would have people buried in order to be dead. And that is what he does. He buries a live man in order to kill him. That is his doctrine. That is exactly where it leads him to.

Matthew 3:11 "I indeed baptize you with water unto (his) repentance. This would put baptism before repentance if his position was correct. If we are baptized because of repentance, then we are baptized because of remission of sins. If we are buried by baptism because of death then we are baptized because of remission of sins. They were baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ, and not into the Name of Christ.

Now, listen, repentance and baptism cannot be in order to obtain the same thing in. Acts 2:38. Because, in English as in Greek, or in Greek as in English, the subject must agree with the predicate in person and number. I have quotations from numbers of Greek scholars, and even some of them are on his side of the question, that tell you what I have said is so. The subjects and predicates must agree, and these do not agree. The only time there is an exception, is that sometimes a singular takes a plural, when the noun is neuter. And I submit to you tonight that the pronouns in Acts 2:38 are masculine. So, the exception cannot work in that place. So, ladies and gentlemen, away goes his pet theory that he bases his entire salvation upon. There are about seventeen scriptures in the Bible that they misinterpret to build their whole water baptismal system on.

He says that Mr. Thayer translated "eis" 'in order to'. I am quoting from a booklet entitled: "Acts 2:38 Does not teach that Baptism is a necessary condition to the Remission of Sins". The book was written by Bro. L. S. Ballard and me. On pages 31 and 32 quoting Bro. Ballard: "Thayer's Greek English Lexicon, standard in all colleges and universities, in all the

many definitions given of the preposition (his) never defines "in order to", much less "in order to obtain", yet the Campbellites, in the face of these facts, tell us it means "in order to obtain" in Acts 2:38. Any one who takes such a position shows his utter disregard for the grammar of the verse, and of the Greek language. There is no rule in the grammar of the Greek that would justify such a definition, neither is there any rule in the Greek language, nor in the text, that justifies the coordinating of "repent and be baptized" and any one who perverts the language in such a loose way disparages his scholarship no matter how many degrees he may hold from the higher institutions of learning. The eight leading translations of the New Testament translate (his) 12,413 times and not one time do they translate it "in order to", yet in the face of all these, facts, heretics go on claiming that it means in order to obtain in Acts 2:38."

Now, look, ladies and gentlemen, he might have read some place where Thayer as a commentator — and I think he did because I think I have read it — where Thayer takes the same position he does. But go to his English-Greek Lexicon and you will not find him thus defining it. Thayer was a great Greek scholar, and there is no question about it. But as a theologian, my friend would not accept his theology. He believed if one dies he could bury a live person in baptism for the one who is already dead. I accept Mr. Thayer as a scholar, but not as a Bible commentator.

I want also to call your attention, if I may, to a statement he read from Bro. Williams. When you meet one of these fellows, they never get up anything new. I have brought a lot of live scholars into this debate, but he has brought dead ones. Bro. Williams has been dead for a little while, and Mr. Rogers makes a great ado about his being a Baptist preacher and he was a Baptist preacher, and a great one. Let me read you something. Let me give you a quotation from a letter from this same Bro. Charles B. Williams. I am quoting it from the book, (his own book that they misquote), open before me: "Peter said to them, 'You must repent—and, as an expression of it, let every one of you be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ — that your sins may be forgiven' . . . You can see at a glance I am sure, with my punctuation, it does not substantiate the Campbellite claim that you **MUST' BE BAPTIZED THAT**

YOUR SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN, but THE BAPTIST POSITION (and the position of other evangelicals) that baptism is merely an expression or symbol of repentance and the work it does in the soul; that repentance is the indispensable condition of FORGIVENESS OF SINS. The two dashes after "repent" and "Christ", separate baptism from forgiveness but make the clause, "that your sins may be forgiven", dependent on "repent", not on "be baptized". (Letter to G. E. Jones, 10-2-40). Now this was from a letter to Bro. Jones from Bro. Williams before his death. So, you see how they garble authors, that is all they know to do because his brethren did it before him. Alexander Campbell started doing it, and so they garble authors, and try to make you people believe that these Baptist men believe like they do.

He does the same thing with Goodspeed, as he garbles Goodspeed's statement. Goodspeed does not take and never did take the position that my friend does, that baptism was in order to obtain the remission of sins. He garbles authors as nearly all of them do.

Then he comes to Galatians 3:26, 27: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise". They take the 27th verse out of its setting and seek to make it yield support in the Romish doctrine of no baptism, no salvation. No intelligent person will take the position that the expression "in Christ" is to be taken literally here in Galatians 3:27. The contention is that one cannot receive remission of sins without being in Christ, and in that of course, my friend is right. But where they are wrong is that they teach no one can get into Christ except in the act of baptism.

Please note: 1 Cor. 10:1, 2, ". . . All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized "his" (unto) Moses in the cloud and in the sea. . . ." Were these people baptized into Moses? The same word that is used in Acts 2:38 5 used here. Of course not, it simply means what they then did, which is called their baptism, was expressive of their faith in and subjection to, Moses, as, their commander and leader. They were not baptized into Moses, nor were they bap-

tized in order to get with Moses. They were already with Moses before their baptism. So, true is it, that so many of us (children of God BY FAITH IN CHRIST JESUS) as have been baptized (eis) into Christ, have put on Christ.

Matthew 28:19: “. . . baptizing them (his) into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit". Now, what is the force of "into" (his) here? Does it mean that one is literally baptized into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? Of course not, it simply indicates that the party thus baptized does by his baptism declare his faith in these divine persons and his subjection to them. It does not mean that one cannot get with the divine persons apart from water baptism as my friend teaches.

Let Paul tell us (the same Paul that wrote Galatians 3:27) how one gets into Christ without baptism, "Yea doubtless, and I count all things but low for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found IN HIM, not having mine, own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, THE RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH IS OF GOD BY FAITH, "Phil. 3:8,9 (Not by baptism). Galatians 3:27 certainly lends no help to the Mormish and Roman Catholic doctrine of no baptism, no salvation. Mr. Rogers reminds us that "*his*" is into in Galatians 3:27, but he does not want it to have the same force when he comes to John 3:18. Well, it is the same word in both places. John 3:18 "He that believeth on "his" Him is not condemned. He that believeth "his" Him, in Him. So, one actually believes into Christ, and then he is symbolically baptized into Jesus Christ.

He agrees that we are justified by faith, and reads Romans 5:1 "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ". He says "Observe it says through our Lord Jesus Christ". Yes, let me tell you to make one other observation, ladies and gentlemen, and that is that it does not say 'through baptism', but it says through our Lord Jesus Christ. Thank you for that noble confession, Mr. Rogers.

Then he comes to Acts 22:16 "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord". My friend and his people take the posi-

tion that this scripture teaches there can be no remission of sins apart from baptism. Now look, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins". Saul was to do his own washing. "Wash away thy sins". The Lord washes away our sins in His own blood when we look to Jesus, and we symbolically wash away our own sins when we are baptized. If my opponent is right in his interpretation of Acts 22:16, then I am quite sure that Paul so understood that there could be no remission of sins, or justification apart from baptism. How do you account for the fact that Paul in writing almost one fourth of the New Testament, in all his writings on the subject of justification has not said one word about one being justified by baptism if he understood Ananias to be teaching no justification without baptism.

Can you imagine the man who wrote Ephesians 2:8, 9, teaching that you wash your own sins away in baptism? God said through Paul "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works lest any man should boast". Listen, can you imagine the man who wrote Romans 1:16 teaching that without baptism there is no justification. He said, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that BELIEVETH". Not to every one that is baptized, but to every one that believeth. So, listen, Paul certainly did not agree with him.

It is the blood of Christ which really cleanses from sin, the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son cleanseth us from all sin, 1 John 1:7. Revelation 1:5. "Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood". As the blood of Christ washes away sins, Ananias (in Acts 22:16) did not mean to tell Paul to literally wash away his sins in baptism. We are washed from our sins by the blood of Christ. We wash away our sins in baptism in form or symbolically. In the former we are passive, in the latter we are active. In the former Christ washes us, in the latter we wash ourselves. My friends, he does not have a leg to stand on. I will take away from him his speech, and then cover him up with scriptures like I have in these other two nights of the debate, and he knows I am going to do it.

Now he said, and I wish he would not misrepresent me, but it may be that he does not hear well — are you hard of hearing,

Mr. Rogers? You got up before these people and said that Barr said last night that Rogers and all his bunch are on the road to bell. I deny it. I did not say such a thing. I believe that in spite of your unscriptural doctrine that some of your people have repented and trusted Christ for salvation, and are saved. I said this, And there is a lot of difference from what he claims I said — I said that a man that smothers to death at the mourner's bench that has not repented and trusted Christ will go straight to hell just like the man that goes to the baptismal waters trusting baptism instead of Jesus, will die and go to hell. That is what I said, but he wants to do that to try and prejudice his own people against Mr. Barr. He gets up and puts words into my mouth, and he ought to apologize for it. I did not say what he charges me with, and he knows I did not say it, and I challenge him to play the tape on the machine and show where I said what he charges me with saying. He knows I did not say it, and the people know I did not say it, but he has a habit of making these charges.

He comes again to Luke 7:29, 30, and brings in a lot of things that have nothing to do with this debate. He tells us that in rejecting the baptism of John, they rejected the counsel of God. I did not go into it and make a lengthy reply, for the reason, that it actually had nothing whatever to do with the proposition of the first two nights, or tonight. To reject the counsel to be baptized, according to my friend Rogers, means you will go to hell and you cannot possibly be saved. He cannot find such in the Bible.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to stay in front of the microphone so you can hear me as I call your attention to the chart up here.

---

<b>ROGERS</b>	<b>VERSUS</b>	<b>GOD</b>
<b>Child of Devil</b>		<b>Child of God, Gal. 3:26</b>
<b>Impure Heart</b>		<b>Pure Heart, Acts 15:9</b>
<b>Filthy Soul</b>		<b>Clean Soul, Acts 15:9</b>
<b>Condemned</b>		<b>Not Condemned, John 3:18</b>
<b>No Peace With God</b>		<b>Peace With God, Rom. 5:1</b>
<b>Loves God in a Sense</b>		<b>Born of God, I John 4:7</b>
<b>Baptism Saves</b>		<b>Jesus Saves, Acts 16:31</b>
<b>Saved by Works</b>		<b>Not by Works, Rom. 4:4-5</b>

**WHICH WOULD YOU BAPTIZE?**

This debate all the way through from beginning to end has been Rogers versus God Almighty. It has not been Rogers versus Barr. It has been Rogers versus God. Rogers has taken the position — yes bring me that other microphone if you can get it over here (Barr had stepped away from the pulpit microphone to argue from his chart) that his candidate for baptism is a child of the devil. But God says in Galatians 3:26 “For ye are all the children of God BY FAITH in Christ Jesus. So, friends, I tell you, it is a contest between Rogers and between Almighty God. Mr. Rogers says that his candidate for baptism has an impure heart. But in Acts 15:9 God says, 'purifying their hearts BY FAITH'. Mr. Rogers says his candidate for baptism has a filthy soul. But Acts 15:9 says 'purifying their hearts BY FAITH'. So, it is Rogers versus God. Mr. Rogers says his candidate for baptism is a condemned man. But Jesus Christ, the Son of God in John 3:18 says, 'He that believeth on Him is not condemned'. So, I tell you again that it is Rogers versus God. Mr. Rogers says that his candidate for baptism has no peace with God. But Romans 5:1 “Therefore being justified BY FAITH we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. So, the contest is between Rogers and God. Rogers says that a penitent believer does not have peace with God. Paul says that he does have peace. His candidate for baptism loves God in a sense, he says. 1 John 4:7 says, 'Everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. So, it is Rogers versus God. Listen, Rogers says baptism saves. Look over, if you will, to Acts 16:31, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house". In Luke 7: 50, Jesus said, "Thy FAITH hath saved thee". So, it is Rogers versus God. He has never found Jesus saying to any man, "Thy baptism hath saved thee".

Then he said saved by works, saved by works, that is what Rogers says. But God said through Paul, "Now to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly his faith is counted for righteousness". But Rogers says he is saved by works. And actually when it all simmers down, Rogers believes that you can do every work in the Bible, and if you are not baptized you will die and go to hell. That is Roger's doctrine. Which would you baptize? (referring to the chart) This one over here (pointing to the left side of the chart) is the one Rogers baptizes. This is the one (pointing to the

right side of the chart) the Baptists baptize. Thank God! for good Rd Bible Baptist doctrine, and the joy that is mine in preaching it to people.

Listen, ladies and gentlemen, if you have been misled by the doctrine that my friend propagates, I beg you to forsake it. I have nothing against him (Rogers) I said, and I repeat it, that I think he is a fine young man. I like him, even more than the average one of his brethren that I have debated, and I speak this sincerely. But, Oh! his doctrine. Jesus said, 'If the blind lead the blind they will both fall into the ditch. I am trying to keep you from falling into the ditch with him. That is what I am trying to keep you from doing.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you have never gone to Jesus for salvation, please remember that the Son of God said in John 5:39, 40 to a group of unsaved religious Pharisees, who thought they were going to be saved because they had been circumcised, because they kept the Law of Moses, because they had done many other things. Jesus said to them, "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life". Ah! ladies and gentlemen, if you would have life you must go to Jesus. He is the Life-giver. In Him and Him alone is life, and you go to Him BY FAITH.

I say again, that he has not read in the Bible where the thief was ever baptized. Yet, he gets up here and tells you that he speaks where the Bible speaks, and remains silent where the Bible is silent. He has not read nor shall he read any where in the Bible where it says the thief was baptized — It is silent on it He gets up and crowds the issue, and seeks to make you believe that he might have been in the crowd from Judea that went out and were baptized. Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen that old thief was saved, both of them could have been saved if they would have been. (time called) Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

## ROGERS SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

### Thursday Night

Mr. Barr, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen; I now appear before you for my last speech this night, and to reply to the speech that has just been made by Mr. Barr. The first thing that I wish to do is to review or to answer the questions that he has given me.

1. Does your candidate for baptism have the Son of God while on the way to the baptismal waters? No, not in the sense that Jesus has already saved him.

2. Is your candidate for baptism's faith working by love when on the way to the baptismal waters? Yes, but "faith working by love" *includes* obedience to the command to be baptized. And even then, faith working by love will *not save* until that faith has worked to the point that God commands for the remission of sins, namely, being baptized into the Lord Jesus Christ.

3. Does baptism to a proper subject change his heart, his character or his feelings? If by the expression *changed you* mean does this person become a *saved* person in contrast with a lost person, why then he does undergo *that change*, and enjoys salvation, and enjoys peace *after* he has been baptized as I illustrated with the case of Saud, which Mr. Barr has been so strangely silent about. You notice, he never dealt with Saul's not having peace until he obeyed the command to be baptized.

4. Is being born again and being baptized the same thing? Baptism is a part of the new birth. It is the consummating, or the *completing*, act of the new birth, Mr. Barr. It is not all of it, any more than you are affirming that faith is all there A to the new birth. But baptism is the filial act in the new birth, where a person is inducted into Christ, wherein he becomes a child of God. Gal. 3:26-27.

5. Is the Devil the father of the one begotten of God before baptism? May I emphasize here that the word *begotten* as thus used is a figurative expression. It does not mean that a person becomes a child of God by merely being begotten. But (144)

John said he's given the *right to become* a child of God, Mr. Barr. John 1:12-13. The word *born* in verse 13 of John 1 is referred to as *begotten* in the margin of the Revised Version. Those thus *begotten* are given the right to BECOME the sons of God. Mr. Barr thinks that they believe and that they are already the sons of God. But the Bible says that they may *become* the sons of God. And Mr. Barr has already admitted that you cannot become what you already are. Therefore, the one that is begotten is not yet a child of God, because he's given the right to BECOME such. When he exercises his right to act by faith to be baptized into the body of Christ and into Christ, *then* that person obtains the forgiveness of sins, and at that time becomes a child of the living God. The written answer to this is that a person is still a child of the Devil until he exercises his right to become a child of God by being baptized into Christ.

Now then, I should like to notice the answers that he has given to my questions.

1. Do you claim that the kingdom had been set up at the time the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus. transpired as recorded in John 3? Mr. Barr had said that Rogers teaches that the kingdom is the church, and therefore inasmuch as the kingdom is the church and Rogers further argued that the church was not established until Pentecost, then this (Jno. 3:5) could not possibly refer to the idea of entering into the church by being *baptized*. That was his thought. But he answers and says that he does not claim that the kingdom of John 3:5 is the church. Then the kingdom of John 3:5 is future. And yet the Bible says that man must be born of water and the spirit in order to enter it. And so the law concerning the entrance into a thing may be given *before* that kingdom is instituted. Because it (the kingdom in John 3:5) either refers to the *church* or to the *future* kingdom, the heavenly kingdom of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. If it is the *church*, it is future *according to Mr. Barr*, and Jesus gave the rules and the conditions of entering into the kingdom before the kingdom was ever established. Because Mr. Barr says that the kingdom was not established until after *John was delivered up*. Therefore, whether he says the church or the kingdom in heaven, either one, Mr. Barr has Jesus laying down his rules for entrance into it before that kingdom was established. And so

he does exactly what I was doing. So, Mr. Barr, what is sauce for the goose is salad dressing for the gander. If it's all right for Barr, then it's all right for Rogers.

2. How many commands of God can one refuse to obey and still be saved? Well, he said, "He cannot refuse to obey any *on which salvation is* conditioned." Well, in one speech you said that the work of God, and the only work (or the "one work" to use your exact expression) is to *believe*. You have argued that a man need not, and does not, do any thing to be saved except *repent* and *believe*. A man may therefore repent and believe, he may reject the command of God to be honest, to pay his debts, to love his neighbor, and to love his wife, he may love everybody else's wife, he may refuse the law of God that forbids a man becoming a drunkard and refuse every command that God ever gave except repenting and believing. Now that, Friends, is Baptist doctrine. And it is just as corrupt as it possibly can be. Mr. Barr thinks that you can slap God in the face, disrespect him, repudiate his work, and reject him and still go home to heaven when you die. That is one of the worse doctrines that any man ever stood on the platform and propagated. Mr. Barr, if there are any other commandments that you must do in order to be saved, then come up and name them, and tell me just how many of them you can refuse to obey and still go home to heaven when you die.

If you remember last night he said if a man loved God he will keep his commandments. Therefore if a man doesn't keep the commandments of God, he doesn't love God. He doesn't love the Lord. Therefore, Mr. Barr, if a man refuses to keep the commandments of God, any of them that he understands and knows that he ought to do, then that man that refuses to keep those commands does not love God. Because you said if he loves God he will *keep* the commands. And so he doesn't love God. Mr. Barr gets a man to heaven that is a hater of Almighty God, and doesn't even love the Lord. Now that's, Baptist doctrine too. And I just wonder if you approve of any such doctrine.

But since you said last night that the man in the fox hole could read the New Testament and be saved without a preacher, what would be his condition if he were unable to read? He said, "Well, if he hears before he got there, why then he could repent and believe." Yes, and we're talking about one that

*hasn't heard.* And he said if he did really want to be saved, why then God could get him a preacher, God could send him a preacher. Well, it would be just as easy for God to send a man a Baptistry as it would a preacher. And so if God is going to do all the work like that, the preacher could just go ahead and baptize him after God sent him, couldn't he? Mr. Barr, are you going to limit God's power and say he could send him a preacher but he couldn't furnish the water for him to baptize him in? Now that is the condition that a man gets in that starts quibbling about contingencies in the plan of salvation. There isn't anybody that doesn't have problems like that except the Universalists.

4. Since you affirm that alien sinners repent before they believe, and since the Bible says that sinners repent unto or "his" life, do you think they are saved before they believe. He said, "Well, repentance always culminates in saving faith." But the point is Mr. Barr, even if he goes ahead and believes and is saved after he believes, according to your theology, the Bible says that a man repents "his" life; and you said if a man does something "his" life, he is inducted into that thing. Therefore, since you teach that a man repents first and then believes later, he repents into life — is first saved — and then later the man believes. That's the thing that Mr. Barr is trying to avoid.

5. Have you ever told or would you tell a penitent praying man what Ananias told Saul to do, 'Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord'? Well he said, "Under the same circumstances" and when he was convinced that he was already saved. In other words Mr. Barr says, "When I'm fully convinced that a man is already saved, he has no sins to wash away, he's pure, he's spotless as the driven snow, when he's already clean, then I tell him to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord. -Now, Mr. Barr, it doesn't take a genius to see through that. You tell a man that has already been washed to get up and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord. That's as thin as skimmed pond water as sure as you live, and anybody under high heaven ought to be able to see that it won't stand up.

I come to his idea of believing into Christ, and he said that he had read some scholars. Well, that might be a matter of definition of terms. The men that he read are not recognized

as authorities in the held of New Testament Greek. I have here the *Warren—Ballard Debate*. In this Brother Warren quotes from some of the men that translated the American Standard Revised Version. Henry Cadbury, one of the translators, said, " '*Pisteuo eis*' should be translated 'believe in' since the distinction between '*eis*' and '*en*' is not maintained, especially when there is no verb of motion. With verbs of motion, all Grammarians agree '*eis*' means 'into', '*en*' means 'in'." Then Roland Leavell, President of the New Orleans Theological Seminary, points out, "The preposition '*eis*' was developed from the preposition '*en*' and it's original idea was static, within. Such ideas as 'into' and 'unto' and 'to' are not in the preposition itself, but are resultant ideas of the accusative case which means extension and verbs of motion. Properly the preposition '*eis*' should be translated 'believe on' or 'believe in'." Now that was the President of a Baptist Theological Seminary down in New Orleans. Mr. Craig, who also is a recognized scholar, is a translator of the Bible, says, "The Greek preposition '*eis*' following the verb 'to believe' is a peculiarity of the Gospel of John. I do not think it should be translated in any other way than 'in'." These men, Mr. Barr, are scholars. They're not like these fellows you've quoted that are not authorities and are not recognized by any body of people. A. T. Robertson, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary said, " 'his' itself means only 'in' . . . the idea of 'into', if present comes from the accusative case, extension, and the verb of motion and the context." And a number of others there are quoted that attest to the same thing. And so these fellows that he has quoted that are not authorities, they're not scholars in the proper sense of the term, just simply fly in the face of those people that are experts in the original language.

---

ROGERS	VERSUS	GOD
Child of Devil		Child of God, Gal. 3:26
Impure Heart		Pure Heart, Acts 15:9
Filthy Soul		Clean Soul, Acts 15:9
Condemned		Not Condemned, John 3:18
No Peace With God		Peace With God, Rom. 5:1
Loves God in a Sense		Born of God, I John 4:7
Baptism Saves		Jesus Saves, Acts 16:31
Saved by Works		Not by Works, Rom. 4:4-5

WHICH WOULD YOU BAPTIZE?

Well I want to observe right here the chart that he has upon the board. He said, "Which would you baptize, the man that Rogers baptizes or the one that Barr will baptize?" And he has over here (indicating the chart), that Rogers has a child of the Devil. And on the other side he says that God says that a believer is a child of God. Not *at the point* of faith, Mr. Barr. Your very first verse there, Gal. 3:26, says that "you are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Goodspeed says that "in Christ Jesus you are the children of God by your faith." Verse 27, "FOR" — I pointed out that the word for is from the word gar which means "*to introduce the reason*" — "*For* as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ did put on Christ." Why are they children of God by faith? Because they are IN Christ. How did they get there? The Bible says that they were "baptized into Christ." What were they until they got into Christ? Children of the Devil. When did they get into Christ? After they were baptized. They were OUT OF CHRIST until baptized. But they were not children of God until after they got into Christ; and therefore children of the devil until baptized into the Lord where they become sons of the Living God.

He said that Rogers' (candidate) has an impure heart. And he says the Bible says in Acts 15:9 that God purifies their hearts by faith. Yes, but NOT "by faith only." And Peter said in I Peter 1:22, "Seeing you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." Rogers says your heart is impure even if you believe until that faith is obedient and does the thing that God commands to induct you into Christ.

Well, he says that Rogers says you have an unclean soul and that Peter says you have a clean soul by faith. Yes, but not "by faith only." What kind of faith is it that cleanses the soul? The Bible says I Peter 1:22 just quoted, "You purified your souls in OBEYING the truth." It is a faith that OBEYS. It's a faith that does what God commands. Mr. Barr thinks you're purified by faith that's as dead as the proverbial doornail. That's a faith that is without works, and it is therefore a dead faith. James 2:17. But he said, "Rogers baptizes a condemned man." Yes sir, because every man out of Christ, an alien sinner is condemned. The Bible says in Rom. 8:1,

"There A therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Where does a man escape condemnation? IN Christ, when he gets in Christ. But how does a man get into Christ? Romans 6:3-4, "Do you not know," Paul said, "that we were baptized into Christ?" And so the believer that is out from under condemnation is a baptized believer. And these, all of these over on the right side of the chart, are those in reality whose faith has led them to be baptized like God commanded.

But he said that "Rogers' candidate has no peace. You 11 remember that Saul had no peace, that he was without sight for three days and nights and would neither eat nor drink, until the man came and said, "Why do you tarry? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." When Saul arose and was baptized (Acts 9:18) verse 19 says that he took food and was strengthened. When did Saul have peace? When justified by faith. But he did not have peace *until he obeyed the command to be baptized.*, Therefore, Saul was not justified by faith until he obeyed that command.

Well he said Rogers said you "love in a sense." I said the man that is baptized loves in the sense that he's keeping the commandment of God. 1 John 5:3. But he said the one that loves is already born of God. Yes, but the man that loves is the man that is DOING the commands of God. It's the love that works. It's not a dead love, one that fails to keep God's commandment. And so the man that loves in the sense that Jesus teaches in 1 John 5:3, then that man is born again. But that isn't love alone, It's a love that DOES what God commands. "This is the love of God that ye keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous.

He said that Rogers says baptism saves us, and that he teaches that Jesus saves us. I say that baptism saves in the *same sense* that Peter said it saves. 1 Peter 3:21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now SAVE us." Mr. Barr says, "That's human doctrine, That's not so." Well, PETER is the one that wrote it. And Peter said that it does save. Just like the Bible says in Luke 7:50, "Thy *faith* hath saved thee." It simply means that faith was a condition, and baptism was a condition of salvation. Jesus saves, but *when* does he save? Before we believe? No, sin Does he save before a man obeys

by being baptized in his name? No. Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."

He said that Rogers teaches that a man is justified by works. Yes, there is a type of work that a man is justified by. "This is the WORK of God that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent." Then he comes and says Rom. 4:5, "Now to him that worketh not, but believeth upon him that justifieth the ungodly, then his faith is counted for righteousness." And he thinks that excludes baptism. But, beloved, in answering the questions along that line, I said, "Is baptism of the law of works or the law of faith?" He said, "*Neither*". Therefore Rom. 4:5 does not exclude baptism because Mr. Barr said that baptism is not of the law of works. Rom. 4:5 refers to the works of the law. Rom. 3:27. Therefore, you can see that we're not claiming to be justified by the works of the law. But we are justified by faith. That's a work. By repentance. That's a work, Jonah 3:10. And by baptism, which the Bible does not call a work, but I will admit in his definition of the term. It is a work in the same category as repentance and faith. James said—and the reason Rogers preaches that works saves is because James says, James 2:24, "Ye see then how that B-Y, by works a man is justified and not by faith only."

Well, he came and he said that Rogers did not say "alien sins." It is in the original proposition, and I simply failed to copy it down in my notes here. "Alien sins" means sins that a person commits before he becomes a child of God. That's the way Mr. Barr defined alien sinners when he defined that. An alien sinner is one that has not become a child of God. That I the one that I referred to in my proposition.

But he comes along and he says that if you're trusting in Jesus, why then you are already saved. But the Bible says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." Mr. Barr says, "He that believes is already saved because he's trusting, and may be baptized if the Baptist Church votes him in." Well, now you can see the difference between Baptist doctrine and Bible doctrine.

And so he came along and said that if a man is baptized and commits sins, why then those sins will alienate him from God and those are alien sins. Those sin-, will alienate him from

God, but I say that an alien sinner is a person that has not become a child of God. And the reason that I don't baptize a person again that has already obeyed the gospel is for the same reason that Mr. Barr doesn't have to be born into his family a second time. When he came into it the first time, he came as the son of his parents. He might sin and be kicked out of the family, disinherited, or become a reprobate, but he'll always be a son. But may I emphasize that he can be separated from his father. And so a child of God may sin and be separated from his God, but he's still a child of God, in the family of the Lord. The Bible says that man had believed and had been baptized (Acts 9:13), but when he sinned Peter said to "repent therefore of this thy wickedness and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee."

Then he said "repent ye" is second person plural, and "be baptized every one of you" is third person singular; and that these cannot be joined to secure the same results. *Who said it?* Mr. Vernon L. Barr. Why he said those things are not joined together, and that "every one of you" is not joined together (with the plural). I have here a quotation from Thayer's Lexicon., And I have the Lexicon right there. Concerning the expression that is translated "every one of you" the word *is hekastos*, It is defined, "When it denotes individually every one of many, is often added appositively to nouns, pronouns, and verbs in the plural number." Who said it? Mr. Thayer. The world's greatest New Testament Greek Lexicographer. He said that it is "often added" and often joined to nouns, pronouns, and verbs in the plural number. Mr. Barr says it cannot be joined. Who said it? Mr. Barr. He doesn't know anything about grammar evidently. And this particular point he ought to deal with. They can, Mr. Barr, be joined together, and that to give the same result.

But he said that he knew that this referred to two different sets of people. I know a man by the name of Pendleton that wrote a Baptist Church Manual. He was trying to teach the Methodists better than to baptize babies, and so he used Acts 208 and pointed out that people were to *repent and* be baptized. He says, "'Repent and be baptized every one of you.' no man will say that the command to *repent is* applicable to infants, and it is certain the same persons were called on to repent and to be baptized." Now, who said that? Mr. Pendle-

ton, the man that wrote the confession of faith that a great many, many baptists, throughout the United States endorse and hold to as their confession of faith. There you are. And he says that the *same people* were told to repent and to be baptized.

Well he came to Acts 10:43, "To him give all the prophets witness that whosoever believeth should receive remission of sins." Yes, but it says that "*through his name* whosoever believeth should receive remission of sins." And how do you get *into* the name of Christ? The Bible says by being baptized into the name

He said that Rogers made the argument on the English word *for*. Rogers did not make his argument on the English word *for*. I pointed out there that the Greek preposition *his* is the thing. I pointed out the various translations and gave you Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon to prove the point. Well, he said that he didn't-even claim that "because of" was the best translation of Acts 2:38. Then he gave Matt. 12:41, "They repented at the preaching of Jonah", and so that means "because of the preaching of Jonas." That is certainly not a proper or correct interpretation or translation of that. But just suppose we grant it. Peter said, "Repent (number one) and be baptized (number two) for the remission of sins." Mr. Barr, suppose you say that Peter there means "because of". Then you *repent* "because of" the remission of sins. And then, Matt. 3:11 he said that they were baptized unto repentance." Well, suppose that we grant his interpretation, which is false to the core, but just grant it for argument's sake, and say that that's *because of*, and translate it that way in Acts 2:38; you *repent* because of remission of sins. Mr. Barr, do people repent because they are already saved or in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins? And he gave Rev. 16:10, "They cried out for pain." Yes, the word "for" there is the Greek word "*ek*", out of. Literally, they cried out of pain. Mr. Barr, why didn't you read this passage like that using the preposition "his"? And then he said that some people shout "for joy". Well, if you were translating that into a Greek sentence, you would not use the Greek word "*his*" for "for".

And then he in I Cor. 10:2 said that the people were baptized unto Moses. That's when they came under his full authority and leadership. And that's when you come under the full

authority and the leadership of the Lord—when you are baptized into him for the remission of sins.

And he quoted the pamphlet written by himself and L. S. Ballard, and he said that Thayer might have said in some commentary somewhere that it was to obtain the remission of sins, and as a commentator he said that. "But, beloved," he said, "you'll not find that in his Lexicon." This is the book, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, here on *page 94* this is what he has to say in translating the prepositional phrase for "for the remission of sins," he translates "*to obtain the forgiveness of sins.*" Mr. Barr, here's the book. It's not a commentary. That's Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon. He said, "Thayer might have said it in a commentary, but Thayer didn't say it in his Lexicon." You go back and tell Mr. Ballard he had better correct his book. Under the Greek preposition "his" he says the expression "in order to" is not given as the meaning of that term. But here under the Greek word *baptize* he defines the Greek preposition "his" and says that it means "to obtain the remission of sins." Mr. Barr, do you want to take it back? or will you get up and contend that it's not in the book? There's the book, and you may examine it when you come to the platform. And you can go back and tell Mr. Ballard that there are many things that he has to learn along that line.

Well, he came along and said it is translated so many times, and not once "in order to." Well, *how many times "because of"*, Mr. Barr? How many times "because of"? He got up and spouted off, "because of, because of, because of." How *many times is it translated "because of"*, Mr. Barr?

Then he came to Williams, and he said that Mr. Williams wrote and said, "If you will observe my punctuation." Yes, and we are pointing out that he translated the Greek prepositional phrase "for the remission of sins", "that you may have your sins forgiven." I knew that Mr. Williams didn't believe what Peter said. I knew that Mr. Goodspeed didn't believe it. I know that Mr. Barr doesn't believe what Peter said. But nevertheless they translated it correctly. And just because they don't believe it is no reason for them to mistranslate it. Certainly, they don't believe it. He doesn't believe it. Mr. Goodspeed doesn't believe it. But it is in the Bible anyhow, and it *is there in their translations.*

He said we take the 27th verse of Gal. 3 out of its context. We do no such thing. We put it in its context, and show that people are children of God by faith in Christ, FOR (the reason given) they are baptized into him.

He said on Matt. 28:19 does it (baptism) bring us literally into the name? Looking further there on page 94 (Thayer) you'll find that this expression means, "To be brought by baptism into union with the Lord Jesus Christ."

And he said that Phil. 3:9 shows that it is without baptism. But Paul said in Rom. 6:3-4, "Do you not know that as many of us, its (he included himself) as were baptized into Christ did put him on?"

And he came to John 3:18, that we believe "his" him. One of your scholars, so-called, last night said we place our faith "into" that person. Yes, but that faith doesn't place us into him. We place our *faith* into him, but the faith doesn't put us into him. Baptism, according to the command of God, puts us into him, and we put our faith into Christ.

Well, he said it must be symbolical, because you couldn't literally wash yourself. The Bible says in Rev. 7:14, "*They* washed their robes." They did it, Mr. Barr, "and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." How did they do it? Acts 22:16, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord."

He said that Rogers must be hard of hearing — that he didn't say that we're going to hell. Well, we'll see about that, and we'll let the audience decide. And we'll get the tapes tomorrow night, and possibly play those for you here. Mr. Barr did say it, and Mr. Barr knows well that he did.

He said that Luke 7:29-30 had nothing to do with this debate. Well he said that they rejected the counsel of God by not being baptized of him. I thought baptism had to do with the debate. And the Bible says that they rejected the counsel of God by not being baptized. And the same Bible says that the man who rejects him that warns from heaven cannot hope to be saved.

And then he talked about the thief on the cross being baptized, and said, "Rogers speaks where the Bible speaks, and is silent where the Bible is silent, but read where the thief was baptized." I said I could come nearer doing that than you

could to reading that he was not. You affirm forthrightly that he was not baptized, and the Bible doesn't say it.

Friends, nay arguments stand untouched and unscathed. The Bible says in Acts 2:38 to inquiring, penitents, when they said, "Men and brethren, What shall we do? Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remissions of sins — or, to obtain the remission of sins." And so in Acts 2:38 people are charged to repent and to be baptized in Jesus name for the remission of sins. And the Greek prepositional phrase in Thayer's Lexicon is "to obtain the forgiveness of sins." Alm Barr doesn't believe that; Alm Barr doesn't preach that. Mr. Barr has objected to it, and quibbled and dodged, and even though he said, "I'm not saying I believe 'because of' is the best translation", why he gave that anyway. Even though it is not the best. Mr. Barr is satisfied with something less than the best. I would not be satisfied with anything less than the best. And the very best authority in the world on the Greek language says that it means "to obtain the remission of sins", that it is "in order to have your sins forgiven."

Then men are to repent and be baptized in the name of the Lord, relying upon Jesus, believing in him. We don't believe in the creek; we believe in the Son of God that commanded us to be baptized in his name in order to obtain the remission of sins. Do it, Friends, while time and opportunity are yours, Don't rebel against God, and reject his love and spurn his invitation. Don't die reveling in your sins, and fail to enter glory in the after-awhile. I thank you very kindly.

## **BARR'S SECOND SPEECH**

**Thursday night, Sept. 25**

Gentlemen moderators, my friend, Mr. Rogers, ladies and gentlemen. I am grateful to the great God of the universe who saves and keeps, sustains and leads His children in the world, for the privilege of being here to show up the fallacious doctrine taught by my friend. It is damning a lot of souls, for the reason that it is causing, many folk to look to the Savior's ordinance instead of looking to the Savior for salvation.

Now, I choose to believe that Mr. Rogers just imply does not know any better, but I have opened his Thayer's Greek Lexicon to the preposition "his" where Thayer defines it. Bro. Ballard said, and I read to you in the book, (booklet on Acts 2:38) and may I do it again that Thayer's Greek English Lexicon, standard in all colleges and universities in all the definitions given of the preposition "his" never defines it 'in order to' much less "in order to obtain". Yet, in the face of these facts the Campbellites tell us it means in order to obtain in Acts 2:38. Here is his (Alm Rogers') book (Thayer's Lexicon). It is not mine. I have looked at Thayer's Greek English Lexicon, and I have told you that, as a commentator, I would not accept him and neither would Mr. Rogers. Thayer was a baptismal regenerationist, like this man, only he believed further than this man, as he believed that the fellow who died, and had not been baptized, that you could take a live man and baptize him in the place of the dead fellow.

On the page on "baptizo", where Mr. Rogers read, Thayer is commenting on the meaning of Acts 2:38. But over here on page 183 where he defines the preposition "eis" he was too much of a scholar to translate it "in order to" or "in order to obtain." Now, here it is: "Eis", a preposition governing the accusative, denoting the entrance into, or direction, and limit, into, to, toward, for, or; and in not one of them does he use it, 'in order to' much less 'in order to obtain.' Now, give him his book back, and let us see if he will get up and read it where Thayer defines the preposition that was under discussion. Now look, ladies and gentlemen these fellows get up when folks do

not know any better, and they have not studied these things, and make some folks believe them. It happens that I have studied that Lexicon too. God bless you, I am here to see that he does not get by with anything. I am here to show the fallacy of his doctrine from beginning to end. May I repeat again that Bro. Ballard was eminently correct, when he said, in all the definitions that Thayer gave of "his" he never did define it "in order to" much less "in order to obtain." He does it exactly like L. S. Ballard said. I have known Ballard since I was a boy, and he does not write something unless he checks the source of his information. Well, I have checked the source of information also. But of course, if I had not been here, you folks, some folks, might have thought that Thayer actually defined "his" the way Rogers claims he did. Thayer did no such thing, ladies and gentlemen.

I am going to have another chart, and brethren I want these charts exactly like they are up here in the book. I will leave the charts with you, and I want them that way in the book.

Now, to the questions. He evaded some questions tonight for the reason that he is getting into trouble on them.

1. Does your candidate for baptism have the Son of God while on the way to the baptismal waters? He (Rogers) writes, "No. No, not in the sense that Jesus has already saved him." But he said, "No". I want another chart on this one tomorrow night showing that Rogers said a penitent believer, unbaptized, does not have Jesus. But in 1 John 5:12 the Book says, "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." You cannot defend false doctrine without getting your self into these sort of predicaments.

2. Is the faith of your candidate for baptism working by love, while on the way to the baptismal waters? He says, "Yes". Well, thank you, that was a noble confession. You said in both speeches last night that the faith that saves, is the faith that works by love. And I say it is too, because the Bible says it. So, he has admitted tonight that his candidate's faith is working by love, when he repents, when he trusts the Lord, when he confesses Jesus, and when he agrees to be baptized when he is on his way to the baptismal waters. So, I proved my side of the proposition, both by God Almighty, and even Mr. Rogers. Yet, he thus crosses himself on everything

else he has said in this debate, and I prove it by him in this particular question.

3. Does baptism to a proper subject, change his heart, his character, or his feeling? He evaded that question completely. If answering questions, would have gotten me into as much trouble as they have gotten him into, I would evade them too. Yes sir, He said if by changed I meant, does he become saved, 'Yes.' I know you believe that, as that is what you are affirming, he becomes saved when he is baptized, but that was not what I asked you. I asked you if baptism to a proper subject changes his heart, his character, his feelings. Is he in the same shape after he is baptized, as he was before. But he evaded the question. Well I cannot get anything on the chart on that. I thought I would have something on the chart on that, and I would have if he had not evaded it.

He also evaded the next question, four. I asked, 'Is being born again and being baptized the same thing?' He said, "Baptism is a part of the new birth, the consummating act." I did not ask him that. He could have answered the question. Now look, Mr. Rogers, you could have answered this. Is being born again and being baptized the same thing? He could have said "no" or he could have said "yes", and then made his explanation. Could he not, ladies and gentlemen? But these questions have gotten him into so much trouble, he is afraid to answer. I predict that he will do the same thing tomorrow night. Now, you try to defend false doctrine, and you will get in trouble always in answering questions. The fact is that I can read from Campbell on down where they take the position that it (being born again and being baptized) is the same thing. But he (Rogers) is a little afraid of it tonight.

5. Is the devil the father of the one begotten of God? He said a person is still a child of the devil until he exercises his right to become a child of God, by being baptized into Christ. Now listen, ladies and gentlemen, he has made the argument in this debate for two nights that a proper subject for baptism is begotten of God, but he is still unsaved, he is still a child of the devil until he is baptized. So, I have said, and I repeat it again, he has one who is begotten of God; God is the begetter of one, but the devil is his father. That cannot be true either in the spiritual or natural realm. The begetter of the child in the natural or in the spiritual realm is the father of that child.

The fact of the business is, the word translated "begotten" and "born", as he knows and has admitted, in the Bible is the same word. He tries, and Campbell was the one that started it, and 11 have the "Christian System" out in my car, where he tries to make the water the mother, and God the Father. They all take that position, and they preach it, but when you get them in a debate they do not come out plain on a lot of things they teach their people, when no one is there to show the falsity of it.

Now, he gets up and he thinks he said something that is pertinent to the proposition when he said, "Saul had no peace until he was baptized." He said Barr ignored it. Well, it was such a silly thing that I did not want to waste time. But since he made such a to-do over it I want him to get up tomorrow night, and prove that Saul had no peace until he was baptized. The scales fell off his eyes, and he saw physically, and he ate before he was baptized; and yet, he has it all in the water. So, that is just his ipse dixit, and was an assumption on his part. I am not here to deal with assumptions, but with God Almighty's truth.

Now look, Peter said, "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." This man believes you are born of literal water, ladies and gentlemen. The purest water we know anything about, has some corruption in it. So, according to this man he is born of corruptible seed, but, Baptists and others (Thank God!) are born of incorruptible seed, because they are born of God. That is the Difference between his doctrine, and the doctrine that Baptists stand for.

He comes to the questions, and he says, the rules to enter the church. He says if the church is future that it did not make any difference if it was the kingdom in heaven or upon the earth, and that the Lord was simply giving the rules as to how to get into it. Well, look, of course the difference between my friend and Baptists is that he puts salvation in the church, and we put it in Christ. He believes every accountable being in the world is going to hell, if he dies not a member of the church that he (Rogers) is a member of, and he will not deny that they all teach it But Baptists teach that every one is going to heaven who has repented to God and believes in Jesus Christ to the salvation of his soul. And yet, he (Rogers) has Jesus

telling Nicodemus how to get into a church that does not even exist. Ladies and gentlemen, you know it, and I know it, and God knows it, and Rogers knows it, and his moderator knows it, that they teach and preach all over this country that the first gospel sermon 'was preached on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus. But he gets up here and gets in a tight, and now he has Jesus preaching a gospel sermon to Nicodemus, in John 3:5. Now Jesus said, "This is the work of God that you believe on him, whom he hath sent."

Then he leaves the proposition completely; and listen friends, and I say it with kindness, if my doctrine were as weak as the doctrine this man seeks to defend, I would leave my proposition top. He said that Barr says you can slap God in the face, steal, commit adultery, and go straight on to heaven. He said that is the corrupt Baptist doctrine. What does that have to do with this proposition? If that were true, and it is not true, would that prove that baptism gets rid of your past sins like he is affirming? Do you not see, friends, what he is doing? He is trying to divert your minds from the truth on this proposition, and it is the devil who is giving him the cunning to try to do it. Now, that is not Baptist doctrine, and I deny it, sir. It is not so, and it is just words you try to put in my mouth. He says that Barr gets a man to heaven that hates God. And he says that is Baptist doctrine. That is not Baptist doctrine, and Barr did not say it. He just thinks Barr said it. If he can stand before his God, and say, Yes God, I got up there and said that he gets a man to heaven that hates God. If he can do that then I am sorry for him, and I want you to pray for him, as I will pray for him.

Then he wants to know about the fellow in the fox hole. He wants to know if the preacher could get to him, as I say, why would not the preacher baptize him. Well, I am sure if he were able to be baptized, and if he should believe in Jesus, if the preacher were like Jesus, and like Paul and others he would baptize him. But he would not baptize him in order to get rid of his sins. Because he would know that Jesus never did say, Thy baptism saved thee, or that Jesus never did teach, Except ye are baptized you will be damned, and so he would know better than my friend and his people who teach baptismal salvation.

He comes again to Acts 22:16, "Arise and be baptized, and

wash away thy sins, calling on the Name of the Lord.” It must be a figurative washing or a literal washing one. He does not take the position, and neither do his people, and he cannot afford to, that a literal washing is referred to. Ananias told Saul to arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins. He was to be active in it, but you are passive when your sins are washed in the blood of Jesus Christ. So, of course it was a figurative washing, and it was not a literal washing at all. He wanted to know if somebody would tell a man who is already washed to get up and wash away his sins. Of course he would, to symbolically wash away his sins, to declare or make public declaration that he believes in Jesus.

He comes to A. T. Robertson, and quotes from him. I have read A. T. Robertson much, and I could go and get hold of his book and read, but friends suffice it to say that A. T. Robertson never taught in his life in any thing he ever wrote, the doctrine this man propagates here tonight. It is true he was a great scholar.

He comes to Galatians 3:27 and says that "for" is translated from the Greek word "gar", that introduces the reason for. In many versions it says, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have been clothed in Christ." The soldier becomes a soldier when he is sworn in, but they issue him a uniform afterwards, and he puts the uniform on, and it identifies him as a soldier. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Then when you are baptized, you put on Jesus, and identify yourself with the disciples of Christ.

He reminds us that Peter said, "You purified your souls, by obeying the truth." That is right, but Rogers teaches, purify your souls by obeying baptism. You can obey everything else, and you will never get a pure soul until you are baptized. That is on the record, is it not? So, Peter taught quite different from Mr. Rogers and his people.

He claims Mr. Barr has a dead faith. Mr. Barr does not have any such thing. Mr. Barr told you, that if you could ride a dead horse to the creek that he could ride him into heaven. Men are saved by a live faith, and faith demonstrates itself in works. But works do not make faith, any more than trying to work a dead horse will make him come alive.

All right, now he comes to Romans 8:1 "Therefore being justified" just a minute as my mind is confused on the verse,

give me my Bible. (Mr. Rogers starts the quotation for Barr) "Therefore there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." The Revised Version does not have the latter phrase in it. You people understand that when you get up here, and you have hundreds of scriptures on your mind that you can forget them. I thank you for giving me the start on it, so that it came back to my mind. No friends, no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, but the difference between us is, he teaches you that there is no way in the world to get into Christ, but in the water. And I say no matter where you are, even if you are hot within a thousand miles of water, you can get into Christ, by faith. I proved that from Philippians 3:8, 9, and he has not said anything about it yet, and he has had two speeches, and not a word about it.

Now then I challenge him to show that Paul had no peace before he was baptized. I challenge him to show that peace came to him after he was baptized. Such is not in the Bible.

He claims that Barr says that 1 Peter 3:21 is human doctrine. *Why* do you say things like that? Barr never said it in his life, and you know that Barr never said it. Here is what 1 Peter 3:21 says, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." It is the like figure; baptism is a figure. I carry a picture of my wife in my pocket. I have been married to her many years. She is the mother of my children, and the grandmother of my grandchild. I carried a picture of my wife for quite a long while before we were married, but when I was ready to be married, I did not marry the figure, or the picture of my wife; I married the real girl. This man is trying to marry the picture, baptism, instead of the Son of God Himself. I wish he would flee from that, and go to Jesus Himself.

He says that Romans 4:5 refers to the works of the law. I challenge him to prove it. The Bible does not say so. Titus 3:5 says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Now look folks! we had a part in baptism. We went down with the man to the water, and walked into the water with him, and he baptized us. So,

the Bible does not say that it is works of the law, but Rogers says that. He adds to the Word of God more than any man I have ever seen, but all his people do it. They have to in order to get their doctrine into the Bible, as it is not in the Bible.

He says again, saved by works, and he quotes James 2:24, "Ye see how a man is justified by works and not by faith only." But James did not say a word in the world about baptism. And notice it is works, w-o-r-k-s, plural, but Roger's doctrine is one work, baptism, and you are hell bound if you fail to get it. James did not say a thing in the world about baptism. James said, Ye show me your faith, etc., SHOW, SHOW, SHOW. That is how man justifies himself before other men, and not before God. Paul tells us in Romans 4:5 how to be justified before God.

Next he comes and talks about the Baptist Church voting them in. What does that have to do with this proposition? Not a thing in the world. But if I had as weak a doctrine to defend as he has I would talk that way too.

He comes and says the reason they do not baptize them every time they sin is that when you are once born you are always a child of God. Then every person who dies lost, as he claims they can, will go to hell a child of God. Hell will be filled up with the Children of God. Can you believe that kind of a doctrine, ladies and gentlemen. That is what it amounts to, and that is the position he gets himself into. Hell will be filled up with the children of God, according to his doctrine. If it takes baptism to make a child of God out of him the first time, and then he falls, and is lost, you have to baptize him again, or leave him like he is. So he believes in pitching God's children into hell. If that be true the devil will laugh at God, and say, "Look here God, at all of your children we have down here in hell." Ah! I am glad I do not have to preach that sort of doctrine.

He refers to Pendleton's Church Manual, and reads from it. Suffice, it to say that Pendleton never taught in all his life, the Fame doctrine this man teaches, that is that baptism is in order to obtain remission of past sins.

Then he comes to Acts 10:43, "To Him (Jesus) give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Mr. Rogers has never

noticed the argument I have made each night of the debate on the fact that all the prophets witnessed, and yet none of them witnessed to baptism. He conveniently forgets that argument. And of course he would have to make it read, through baptism one receives remission of sins.

I showed that "his" is used in the sense of "because of" in the Bible. They repented at the preaching of Jonas, and I simply showed that it was used in such a sense in the Bible. "Gnawed their tongues FOR pain", "Shouted FOR joy." I did not claim that it was necessarily the word "his". I reminded you he was arguing on the English proposition "for", and he did argue on it, and I was answering the arguments he made on it. He says he challenges me, and says if you should quote from the Hebrew, "Shout for joy," that it would not be translated "his". I challenge you, Mr. Rogers to take it back. Ha! ha! you haul off and say things that you do not know anything under God's shining stars about. If you would study a little more you would not get in such messes as that, and that is as sure as you live. Now, I challenge you to prove your contention, sir,

He comes again to John 3:5, and he is not going to make an argument on it so I am going to make it for him. In John 3:5 Jesus answered and said, "Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Baptism is an important duty, but it does not pertain to lost sinners. It, of course, will not regenerate or make lost sinners Christians. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is a dangerous error. The moral tendency of this insidious doctrine is hurtful, and ruinous, and it deserves a thorough and unsparing refutation. I am going to do it by the help of God. John 3:5 is adduced as evidence of baptismal salvation. The word water in this passage does not refer to baptism. He seeks to make it say baptism. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," John 3:6. Then that which is born of water is water. This is only carrying out the analogy. If not, why not? One a spiritual child, one a fleshly child, and one a water child. To prove that the word "water" in the text does not mean baptism nor refer to literal water as a means of salvation, I state; Water is a symbol of the Spirit that cleanses,

or purifies, the moral character in regeneration. We are born of water, even the Spirit, in regeneration.

Notice John 4:14, "But whoso drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." Then John 7:37, 39 He speaks of that flowing water, and He said that it is the Spirit of which He speaks. And so, do you not see, ladies and Gentlemen, and that is just a little bit of the fight I really prepared for him, as I thought he was going to make a fight on it. But he has done very little, and he has shied from it.

He came to Romans 6:1-5, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." In Romans Paul discusses the theme of justification. He never mentions baptism until he has finished his argument on how we are justified or saved, and then he comes to the question as to how people who are justified by faith should live.

He introduces baptism to show that by that act they had declared their death to sin; and that they were to walk in newness of life. Up to the sixth chapter of Romans the word faith has been used twenty three times, believe ten times, justified seven times, justification three times. But not ONE TIME DID HE REFER TO BAPTISM until he got to chapter six. He mentioned baptism when he came to teach them how to live.

"Baptized unto Moses," sheltered by the blood, and led by Moses for three days before their baptism. He tried to put words in my mouth, and sought to make me say that it was there that they acknowledged leadership, and that it was there that they recognized him as their supreme leader. I did not say it, and if he understood me to say it, he just failed to listen well. No, they were sheltered by the blood, and led by Moses for at least three days, before they were baptized "his" Moses. And so I have taken every point away from him, and I even

feel a little sorry for him. I may let up a little bit but no I will not do that. The fourth verse of Romans 6 says that baptism is a burial, and a burial is for the dead. People are not buried in order to kill them. We become Christ's when we are crucified with him, Galatians 5:24. Romans 6:6 says we become dead to sin and freed from sin. So we bury a man dead to sin, and alive unto God. But he buries dead men to make them alive.

Now I want to make a little argument on 1 Peter 3:21. He did not, but I want to as I have some time left. "Wherein (that is the ark) few, that is eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." A rule of interpretation generally adopted, is this: When a difficult passage is of doubtful interpretation, it must be looked at in the light of other scripture containing the same doctrine. When Mark 16:16, John 3:5, Acts 22:16 and a few other verses are resorted to, to show how and when a man receives remission of sins any interpretation of the passages that conflict with, or contradicts the plain teaching of others is to be rejected. Mr. Rogers and friends have thus interpreted the scriptures named, including the one I am now discussing. The passages easily admit of an interpretation that is in agreement with the general scripture on the subject of remission of sins.

Peter in I Peter 3:21 tells us that baptism saves us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Here, as in Mark 16:16 and Acts 22:16, my friend adds to the Word of God, says the "save" in the text means remission of past sins. He says it, the text does not. Noah's salvation in the ark was a figure or type; so baptism is a figure or type, therefore called a "like figure". Note that Noah's salvation in the ark is a figure of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and salvation through Him, (Hebrews 11:7); the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Noah's faith looked through his temporal salvation in the ark to that spiritual salvation in the blood of Him who was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification. Here, then, we see that of which Noah's salvation was typical. Baptism is typical of the same thing. Now the ark actually saved the folks from being destroyed in the flood. The people who did not get into the ark, but stayed in the water drowned, every

one of them. Did they not? And so that is what they are going to do, drown in hell, if they go out into eternity depending on baptism to save them. I think some of them are saved in spite of their doctrine, you understand, but many of them are lost because they have never looked to Jesus Christ.

He comes next to Mark 16:16. He did not make an argument on it, but I am going to make it for him. I can make a better argument on it than he can, and I do not mean to brag about it. But I have studied his doctrine, and I know it better than he does. And I can make a better argument on it than he can, and if he doubts it, I challenge him to give me a little time, and I will prove it. I will make a better argument on his side of the proposition, and yet I know his side is not the truth. Now then, Mark 16:16 "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Now this is what Jesus said. Here is what Rogers teaches, and I dare him to deny it; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but be that believeth and is not baptized, shall be damned.

Hand me that Mormon Bible, will you please Wayne? (speaking to his moderator, Elder Wayne Branson). Jesus teaches, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned.," But Rogers teaches, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth and is not baptized shall be damned. That is what he teaches, and I challenge him to say that he does not. In 3rd Nephi, chapter 11, verses 33 and 34, in the Book of Mormon, "And whoso believeth in me and is baptized, the same shall be saved. And they are they who shall inherit the kingdom of God, and whoso believeth not in me and is not baptized, shall be damned." That is his doctrine, and every bit of it is there in the Mormon Bible. He cannot find it in God's Bible, because it is not in there, but it is in the Mormon Bible. You people must understand that Mark 16:16 is a declarative statement, and was never meant to teach that baptism was a condition upon which one's being saved was contingent. I challenge the opposition to find the noun 'baptism' or the verb 'baptize' used in a conditional clause one time in the New Testament, with the promise that by submitting to it he shall be saved. The Bible also declares that he who believes shall be saved, Acts 16:31; John 3:36. In

no place is baptism, tithes, the Lord's supper, and such used as conditions requisite to salvation.

Now, you listen to what I am about to say; I promise to shake hands with Rogers, and quit this debate, and declare him the winner if he will find anywhere in the Bible where God uses the noun 'baptism' or the verb 'baptize' in a conditional clause just one time in the New Testament with the promise that by submitting to baptism you shall be saved. Now friends he has a mighty weak cause, if he cannot do it, and I call him to the fray.

ROGERS	VERSUS	GOD
Child of Devil		Child of God, Gal. 3:26
Impure Heart		Pure Heart, Acts 15:9
Filthy Soul		Clean Soul, Acts 15:9
Condemned		Not Condemned, John 3:18
No Peace With God		Peace With God, Rom. 5:1
Loves God in a Sense		Born of God, I John 4:7
Baptism Saves		Jesus Saves, Acts 16:31
Saved by Works		Not by Works, Rom. 4:4-5

I call your attention to the chart again, as I certainly want you to remember that this is a discussion between Rogers and God. Rogers says that the penitent believer is a child of the devil. But God says through Paul in Galatians 3:26, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." So it is Rogers versus God. Rogers says they are children of the devil, but God says they are children of God. Rogers says that the penitent believer has an impure heart; Acts 15:9, "Purifying their hearts by faith." God says when he has faith he has a pure heart. So it is Rogers versus God. Rogers says the penitent believer has a filthy soul, but God said, "Purifying their hearts by faith." Since we have faith before baptism we have a pure heart before baptism. "Rogers says that the penitent believer is condemned. But God says in John 3:18, "He that believeth on him (Jesus) is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, . . ." So Rogers is fighting God. Rogers is fighting the Word of God. I beg him not to do it, and I beg you not to follow him into the ditch, ladies and gentlemen. This debate has turned out to be a debate between Rogers and God, and not between Rogers and Barr.

He also says the penitent believer has no peace with God. But God says in Romans 5:1, "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Peace with God, when? at faith, and we trust Him before we are baptized. So Rogers says, No, he has no peace. God says, Rogers you are wrong, he does have peace. Rogers says the penitent believer loves God in a sense. He could not afford to say that he loves God. God says in I John 4:7, "Every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God." Rogers says, Hold on God, that is not so because here is one that loves God in a sense, that is going to hell, he is a child of the devil until he gets baptized. He has a filthy soul, an impure heart, he is condemned, he has no peace with God, he just loves God in a sense, and he is not born. So it is Rogers versus God. Listen, Rogers says that baptism saves. Jesus or the Word says, "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me." Jesus said in John 3:14,15, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." So it is Rogers versus God. I am glad that God is on my side, or that I am on God's side.

Rogers says, saved by works. But he actually teaches and has taught it throughout this debate that you are saved by one work, and that one work is baptism. But God said, "It is not by works of righteousness which we have done: but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit."

Now ladies and gentlemen (How much time do I have? speaking to his Moderator.) Let me say along with my moderator, Bro. Wayne Branson, that I certainly do not have any identification with the Southern Baptist Convention. If they have a preacher alive that has the courage to defend what they claim to believe, I do not know where he is. I am glad I am not identified with them. They are not sponsoring me. Thank God for the churches of the American Baptist Association, which churches I work with, and for the Big Bear Creek Baptist Association. I have an article prepared, signed by the moderator, and I will give it to the paper tomorrow. I hope they will publish it. The Convention forces wanted to make it look as if the Texas preacher was here on his own, and without any endorsement. They seem to want a little publicity.

They (Southern Baptist Convention) are the ones who rubber stamped the Supreme Court decision that enforces the mixing of the races in the public schools, and it is against the wishes of both the colored and white races, in many instances. Thank God; the Baptists I work with say they believe it is wrong to force them to mix, scripturally wrong, and constitutionally wrong, and from every stand point wrong, to force the mixing. I am glad to be associated with the group of Baptists I work with. I would be ashamed if I had any kind of identification with the Convention Baptists. (Time called) Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

# ROGERS' FIRST SPEECH

## Friday Night

My worthy opponent, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen: I'm grateful that in the grace of Almighty God that we have the privilege again tonight to come here in such a splendid capacity to continue our investigation. of the Book of God, and in particular upon that subject that has been read in your hearing. We are grateful for the fine support we have had, for the splendid interest that you have evidenced from the very commencement. You have been, indeed, a wonderful audience, listening carefully and attentively and respectfully to all that has been said. And we are certain that such interest will characterize our audience for tonight.

Before I go into my speech for tonight, I should like to read the questions that we have for Mr. Barr. Already we have banded lam his copy so we need not walk to his table.

1. Can one be saved who does not love God?
2. Does one love God who refuses to obey his commandments?
3. Which comes first in the conversion of an alien, faith or love -
4. Would Israel have been saved from Egyptian bondage if they had not crossed the Red Sea?
5. Since Baptists teach that baptism is the first work of faith, and since Jesus said that members of the church who sin must repent and do the first works (Rev. 2:5), do you teach members of the church who sin to be baptized again?

I hope that Mr. Barr will take time out to answer these particular questions. I hope that he will deal with them in a forthright manner.

First of all I should like to make a statement about a quotation. that I gave for Mr. Barr last night. When I said that Mr. Barr had said that Ain "Rogers and those that were baptized like Mr. Rogers teaches were lost and on the road to Hell, Mr. Barr assured me that he did not say that. I did not know In that I had misunderstood him. I have not listened to the

tapes, but some of the brethren listened to those tapes, and they say that he did not make that exact expression. So certainly I have no reason to try to charge Mr. Barr with anything that he has not said. We therefore withdraw that particular point. But I am glad that Mr. Barr has admitted that those people that believe in Jesus as the Son of God, repent of their sins, confess their faith in Christ, and are baptized in his name for the remission of sins are saved. Now then, we are safe and we cannot be wrong if it were to turn out that Mr. Barr is entirely right, and that men are justified by faith alone. Why we have all believed in the Lord Jesus Christ and we are therefore saved. And even though we go ahead and accept the other and believe and be baptized in Jesus' name for the remission of sins, Mr. Barr says that we are safe and that everything is alright and well with us. But, if on the other hand if it turns out that Mr. Barr is wrong, then we are safe. But those who believe and preach what he preaches are not safe. So if you want to be absolutely and infallibly safe then accept the things that Mr. Rogers is here teaching tonight, because Mr. Barr admits that that is the way that is right and cannot be wrong. We have the faith that he demands and in addition have the baptism that the Bible demands. And he says he does not believe and he will not argue that we are lost or that we are on the road to Hell. Thank you, Mr. Barr, I am so glad that I misunderstood you. I am thrilled to my very toes that you admit that we are the children of God, sanctified and made ready for the Land of Glory. And certainly that is a wonderful confession for Mr. Barr to make.

Now then I come to some of the things that were said upon last night. He said that Thayer did not say "to obtain" or "in order to" in his definition of the preposition "his." He said, Oh, I do believe that he said it means "to obtain" as a commentator in some commentary but not in his lexicon. When I responded to that particular point I pointed out that under the definition of the Greek word "his" that Mr. Thayer does not give "in order to" as a definition of that word. But in his lexicon, not in some commentary as Mr. Barr said, but rather in his lexicon on page 94, Mr. Thayer says that the prepositional phrase rendered "for the remission of sins" in Acts 2:38 means "to obtain the remission of sins." Where is it? It is in Mr. Thayer's lexicon and it is not in somebody's commentary. He

then came along and said, Well, Mr. Thayer was a Baptismal regenerationist and that he taught that even people who were dead could be saved by somebody else being baptized for them. Mr. Barr refers to I Cor. 15:29 when Paul is answering the heresy that there would be no resurrection of the dead and he exploded that heresy with another heresy. And he pointed out that there were some at Corinth that were being baptized for the dead. But instead of accepting the resurrection, they denied it. He then pointed out how ridiculous, absurd, and silly it would be to be baptized for a dead person, if that person was gone forever and there was no resurrection from the dead. And Mr. Thayer's translation of 1 Cor. 15:29 is a perfect translation of it. And there isn't a Greek scholar on the face of God's earth tonight but that will admit that that is the proper translation of it.

He said in this particular point, that people "shout for joy." And I said that if you were translating that into the Greek you would not use the Greek preposition "his." He laughed real big and said that Rogers is talking about something he knows nothing about. He said, Prove it, prove to us that you would not use the preposition "his." He said that Rogers just didn't know. Well, Rogers knows this much, Mr. Barr, that the Greek preposition "his" according to Thayer in a preposition governing the accusative. In Davis' Greek Grammar on page 44 it says that "his" governs the accusative only. The same thing is true in Huddleston's on page 219. I know also that the source of the whence case is the genitive in the Greek. Or if I am going to give the "to" or the "for" idea, or the dative then I realize that I could not use the word "eis" because it governs only the accusative. And so if I had that much knowledge then I would know enough to know that if I were going to translate that particular sentence that you have given that I would not use the Greek preposition "eis." Mr. Barr, if you don't know that "eis" is a preposition governing the accusative, you don't know enough about Greek to stand in judgment on anybody's knowledge about Greek. And so just come back up and deal with it. But he wanted some illustrations. Look at Luke 6:23. The Bible says there that certain ones that were there "leaped for joy." See if you can find the Greek preposition "eis" in that particular passage, Mr. Barr. In Rev. 16:10 the Bible says that certain ones "gnawed their

teeth for pain." The word "for" there is from the Greek word "ek." In verse 11 the Bible says they blasphemed God "on account of their misery." That particular word is "ek." It is not "eis" like you would argue. And so there you have it in the Bible, you have it in the grammars, and you have it in the lexicons. I may not be a Greek scholar, but I know enough to follow Mr. Vernon Barr wherever he would like to go.

We come now then to the idea of being begotten of God. He said that I was saying that a child begotten of God is still a child of the Devil. And he said that Rogers ought to know that the begetter is the father of the child before birth and after birth. Well, he says that a man is born at faith. And I also know that the begetting always comes before the birth. Therefore, a man is begotten some time before he believes. Later he believes. And Mr. Barr says that he is born when he believes. He says that a person is the father of the one begotten, but he is begotten before he is born at birth, and therefore, Mr. Barr has a man a child of God and has God his father before he even has faith at all. Therefore, Mr. Barr can go back and join up with some of his older ancestors and just take the old unconditional idea entirely.

We come now to John 3:5. He said to me, I want to fight on John 3:5, I will meet you on John 3:5, let's have a scrap on John 3:5. Well, I tried to, and I made the argument again and again. And he reminded me about two cats that were about to come together and instead of meeting they just went around each other. Mr. Barr wasn't meeting the thing, he was going around it. But finally these cats came together and they just climbed each other out of sight. Nobody saw them any more at all, but it rained fur for four days. Alright now, Mr. Barr, you have finally met it head on. And it is going to rain theological fuzz for four months in Sheffield, Alabama. Let us look at it now.

(1) The first quibble he gave was this: He said that the verse does not say that we are born of baptism. Well, I pointed out that neither does it say that we are born of faith. And so if this disproves baptism, it would also disprove faith by the same argument that he has made. But it does say that we are born of water and of the Spirit.

(2) But he said last night that according to my argument, that I made water the mother of the child of God. Let us see

about that. I notice in 1 Peter 1:23 that the Bible says, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." We are begotten by the word. Mr. Barr, is the word our father? No sir, Who is our father? God is our father. Well, how does he beget us? What instrument does he use with which to beget us? The word of God, that is the instrument. We are begotten by the word, but the word is not our father. God is our father. And so the Bible says in Gal. 4:26, "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. She is our mother, but let me inquire, What does she use in bringing us forth? John 3:5, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. The Jerusalem that is above is our mother, and she uses the instrument of the water, she uses the instrument of the ordinance of baptism in the name of the Sacred Three to bring us into the family of God. And the water is no more our mother than the word is our father. God is our Father and the mother that is our's is the Jerusalem that is above.

(3) But he said last night that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of Spirit is spirit. Then he looked right wise and said, I guess therefore that whatever is born of water is water. And there was quite a bit of chuckling about that particular point. Well, Jesus the Son of God is the one that said that except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God. And so, since the Bible says we must be born of the water, and since Barr says that which is born of water is water, I suppose that it is so. But just a little bit later he said that meant "living water" and he used John 4 to try to prove it. Then, according to that, that which is born of living water is living water! Wouldn't that be true? But go a little bit further; that which is born of flesh is flesh, that which is born of Spirit is spirit, that which is born of water is water, and that which is born of woman is woman! Therefore, call Mr. Barr "Sister" from now on! Now that is the logic, or the lack of logic that our friend Mr. Barr has advanced in this debate.

(4) Let us go just a little bit further. He said that it was the living water and referred to John 4 where it states that the man that drinks of this water shall never thirst. But the water used in John 3 is not the water that you drink, Mr. Barr.

In that figurative sense it is that which you are born of. And not only that but in the verse before, Jesus said, If you would have asked of me I would have given you living water. Does John 3:5 say, Except a man be born of living water he cannot enter the kingdom of God? No sir, When the word water is used in a figurative sense there is always something in the context that will indicate such to you. And so you can tell living water by looking at it and the -expression that modifies it. You can see that it is a figurative expression. It is speaking of the benefits that we enjoy in Christ our Lord.

(5) Let us notice another point. He said last night that water was a corruptible seed. Why it isn't, Mr. Barr. The Bible says, The seed is the word of God (Luke 8:11). To come up and say that the seed is the water is just to manufacture some more Baptist Moonshine that we talked about the other night. It is just not in God's Book. Mr. Barr is the one that said that, and the Bible does not say it. We are begotten by the word and the word is the seed of God. But in the New Testament, when the Bible speaks about water in contrast with that which was mixed with the blood of goats and calves and things of that nature in the Old Testament, the Bible says, Having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and your bodies washed with pure water (Heb. 10:22). And so you can put that down and talk to us about it there.

(6) But he said that John 3:5 did not mean that this was a condition of entrance into the church because he said that the church had not been established. Well then I asked him if the church had been established according to Barr? He knows that he believes that it was established some time after this and after John was delivered up. So if it is the church then, Mr. Barr has the conditions of entrance into it given before the church was established, according to Barr's position. So Mr. Barr, just like Rogers, has the conditions given before the church was established.

(7) But last night he said, Oh, I don't say that the kingdom in John 3:5 is the church. Well, the kingdom hasn't come according to Barr. And if it hasn't come, then Jesus gave the terms and conditions of entering into his kingdom not only three and one-half years before that kingdom came into being, but more than two thousand years before it came into being. So you see that Mr. Barr is the one that has the problem.

(8) Moreover, the Bible teaches in this passage that the man that enjoys the New Birth enters this kingdom. And if you don't enter this kingdom now, there is no New Birth for people today! Mr. Barr, I told, you about John 3:5. You come to the lick-log and we will see what you can do with that particular passage.

I come to Acts 22:16 where the Bible says that Ananias said to Saul, And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. He said, That is a figurative washing. Well, Mr. Barr, do you believe that when the Bible says that when we are washed in the blood, that that means that God takes the literal blood of Jesus and rubs it on us? Do you think that? Or is that a figurative washing that literally means the forgiveness or the pardon of our sins? The Bible says here, the people are to be baptized to wash away their sins. The baptism is not the washing, but it is necessary to the washing. In Acts 9:6 Jesus said to Paul, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. The same word is toed in John 3:7, Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. And so Jesus said to Paul, It will be told you what you must do. When Ananias came he told him to arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. Friends and neighbors, if you have not done that, you haven't done what Jesus said that Paul must do. If Paul were a man that had peace, he is the most miserable man that I ever heard or read of in all of my life. For he went to the city of Damascus, he was three days without sight, and he did neither eat nor drink. But he was continually in prayer. Here is a man that is concerned, a man that is anxious, a man that is worried, a man that has no peace. And yet when Jesus sends Ananias to him, Ananias tells him what to do: He tells him to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins. And the Bible says that Paul arose and was baptized. Then the Bible teaches that after he did that Paul received his food and was strengthened. When did he accept food and drink? When was Paul strengthened? After he was baptized. He had peace then, after he was baptized, Mr. Barr. And you might investigate that particular thing. Put this down, Jesus said in John 16:33, In me, you may have peace. And in Romans 6:3-4 Paul said, Did you not know, that so many of us (Paul includes himself) as were bap-

tized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? But Jesus said, IN ME, you will have peace. And Paul said, I was baptized into Christ. He said, As many of us as were baptized into Christ. And so Paul got peace in Christ after being baptized. But he said, Did not Rogers know that when Ananias came that there fell from Saul's eyes scales? Didn't Rogers know that? Yes, but I know too that the Bible does not teach that receiving of physical sight is equal to the receiving of the remission of sins. That may be Baptist doctrine, but it is not Bible doctrine.

And so we come to Gal. 3:26-27. And he tried to make an argument on that. Last night, Mr. Barr's modesty was overwhelming. He got up and he said that he would make Mr. Rogers arguments for him. He said that he could do a much better job in presenting those arguments than Mr. Rogers could and that he knew a wonderful lot more about it than Mr. Rogers did anyhow. And so he would get up and he would make the arguments for me. That reminds me of a statement in the Bible that says a man ought not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think. And the same Book of God says, Let another mouth praise thee and not thine own, and another and not thine own lips. I heard a wise man say one time, Except a man tooteth his own horn, the same shall not be tooted. And maybe Mr. Barr was wearied about that point. But we will come and make our own arguments instead of having Mr. Barr to make them for us. Now in Gal. 3:26-27 the Bible says that we are all the sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. And then he tells us why. You are (that is right now) the children of God by faith. The place is, IN Christ Jesus. Now then, the reason is given and introduced by the Greek word "gar." For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ Jesus, did put him on. And so if you have not been baptized into Christ, then you are out of Christ. And if you are out of Christ, then you are not a son of God by faith in Christ. You can not be a son of God until you get into the Lord Jesus Christ. And the Bible teaches that you are baptized into Him. He said that that is like a man getting into the army: first he is in the Army, and then he puts on the uniform to show that he is in the Army. Well, according to that illustration, a man is first saved, he is a child of God, he has remission of sins, and then clothes himself with Christ to show that he has

already been saved. But the Bible says that when a man clothes himself with Christ is when he is baptized into Him. Therefore, you are out of Christ until you are clothed with Him. And Mr. Barr thinks you have remission, salvation, justification outside of the Lord Jesus Christ. He not only eliminates baptism as a condition of salvation, but he eliminates the Son of God at the very heart of the claim. That is the doctrine that Mr. Barr has advocated here in this debate.

He said that Rogers never would look at all the prophets. He said that the Bible says in Acts 10:43 that all the prophets gave Jesus witness, that whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins. Mr. Barr, why do you leave out "through his name"? Continually throughout this debate, Mr. Barr has read that after that fashion without the expression "through his name." Yes, all the prophets taught that through the name of the Lord Jesus all believers would receive the remission of sins. But how does a believer get into the name of the Lord Jesus? I made the argument again and again that we are baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. I pointed out from Gal. 3:8, And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed, i.e. in thy seed (Gen. 22:18). That is what all of the prophets taught. People are saved in the seed, not out of the seed like Mr. Barr believes. It is IN THE SEED that man would find the forgiveness of sins. But the Bible says in Gal. 3:27 that we are baptized into Christ, who is the seed (Gal. 3:16).

He came to I Peter 3:20-21 where the Bible there says, When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, or the mere removing of physical stain, as some translations give it, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. But Mr. Barr says that this is a figure and therefore he thinks that it is not real. He talked about a picture that he carried about of his wife before he married her. He said that he didn't marry a picture. Well, I point out then that the word "figure" does not mean that the thing is not real. In Rom. 5:14 the Bible says of Adam, that he was a figure of him that was to come. So I suppose

that Mother Eve was just married to a picture! Don't you suppose so? Would not that be the case according to Mr. Barr's logic and argument? And the Bible teaches that Jesus is the very image of God (Heb. 1:3). What is a picture? Why it is the image of a person. So Jesus is not real at all. He is just the figure of some sort in Barr's theology, because the Bible speaks of him as being the image of God. But regardless of what baptism is, the Bible says it now saves us. Do you believe that? I do. The Bible says, The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us. But OF WHAT is it a figure? Mr. Barr thinks it is a figure of our salvation. But the Bible says that it is a figure of Noah's salvation. And in the margin of the Revised Version it says it is the Anti-Type, the Anti-Type of Noah's salvation. And as the water therefore lifted up the ark and separated Noah from a world condemned, so water baptism is the line of demarcation between the world of the lost, and the people of Almighty God. That is the point and Mr. Barr cannot deal with the argument at all.

We come to Rom. 6:3-4. In this instance he said that I bury a man that is dead to sin, and alive to God. Mr. Barr, I thought that you buried dead people! Mr. Barr says that he buries a live man. Why the Bible teaches that we are raised to walk in newness of life. Mr. Barr says that you are raised in newness of life and then buried. And the Bible teaches that you are buried with Christ in baptism, and then raised to the newness of life. Mr. Barr gets the resurrection before the burial, and then takes a live man and buries him! And then somebody snickers and thinks that somebody is making a silly argument. Why, I never saw such. A man takes a live man and buries a live man. The very idea of suggesting that.

But he said that faith is mentioned twenty-three times, I believe, and justification is mentioned so many times before Romans 6 where baptism is mentioned. I think if he will investigate he will find that obedience to faith is found in: Rom. 1:5. And if he will read a little bit more, he will find that faith is used about ten or eleven times, believe and belief six or eight times, and justified six times before Rom. 5:5 which mentions love. So I guess that Mr. Barr thinks that if you believe then you are justified, even before you love God, just because these things are mentioned a great many times before

love is mentioned. Mr. Barr, that is the LAMEST LOGIC I ever heard!

He came to Israel's salvation. He said that they were under the blood when they came to the Red Sea. I asked him tonight, if they would have been saved from the land of Egypt if they had not crossed the Red Sea? But Mr. Barr, Who was under the blood back there? Who was tinder the blood? Only the first born were the ones that were saved from death. Therefore, only the first born ones ought to have been baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, according to Mr. Barr. Because he said that only those who are protected by the blood have a right to be baptized. And so Mr. Barr's got the whole family of Israel being baptized when, according to his theology, only a small group ought to have been baptized! Moreover, Moses said to the children of Israel three days after the sprinkling of the Passover blood, Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of Jehovah, which he will work for you TO-DAY (Exodus 14:13). Mr. Barr says that they got their salvation three days before in the land of Egypt. Moses said, You will see it TO-DAY. And when the waters parted, and by faith Israel passed through, then Moses said, Thus God saved Israel THAT DAY (Exodus 14:30), not three days before, Mr. "Barr. But, Thus God saved Israel "that Day" out of the hands of the Egyptians. Now then, if you have not done what God commands, you are yet in a foreign land, condemned in your sins. Friends and neighbors, don't die in the Devil's kingdom, but obey the gospel of our Lord and do the thing that he has commanded.

He said that Rogers needed a Mormon Bible. No, Rogers, doesn't need a Mormon Bible to oppose this proposition. Rogers proves it by the Bible. He said that he read where it said that if a man is not baptized he would be damned. The Bible that Mr. Barr needs is the Olive Pell Bible. Mr. Barr, this is the way the Olive Pell Bible gives Mark 16:16: He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. She left baptism out altogether. Now that is what he does. That is what he does. Here is the book you need, Mr. Barr. In John 3:5, instead of saying, except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God, she says, Except a man be born of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God. So that is Mr. Barr's doctrine. She has cut the Bible

down to a fifth of its original size. But Mr. Barr can take his Baptist penknife and cut it down to a lot less than that. Yes indeed, he can. You need an Olive Pell Bible or a Barr Bible because the Book of God is not the one that you (Mr. Barr) need. She left out 1 Peter 4:11, If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. And I don't blame her.

But he said, Show a conditional clause. Well, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned (Mark 16:16). He shall be saved, modified by a restricted clause, That believeth and is baptized. Also, Goodspeed translates Acts 2:38, that people repent and be baptized, that you may have your sins forgiven. That is a clause of purpose, Mr. Barr. John 3:5 says, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That is a conditional clause, Mr. Barr. And so there you have it RESTRICTED, you have it in a clause of PURPOSE, and you have it in a clause of CONDITION. I think that ought to satisfy our opponent tonight.

May I again inform you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that Mr. Barr believes that Rogers and his brethren are safe, that they are on their way to eternal Glory, because they believed in the Lord of all the earth. We believe in Him and we have done the thing that he has said to do. And if we go ahead and are baptized for the remission of sins, like Peter said, we are still safe and secure. We are right and cannot be wrong. But if it turns out that the Bible is right, and I am sure that it will in the Day of Judgment, then Mr. Barr is wrong. Then the man that tries to get to Heaven on faith only or on Baptist baptism (which is error) is a man that is up for a sad disappointment. The Bible says in 1 Peter 1:22, Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit. Baptist doctrine is not the truth. Baptist doctrine is error. And the Bible says that ye purify your souls in obeying the truth. Jesus said, Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free (Jn. 8:32). Not error, and not the doctrine that Mr. Barr preaches, but it is the truth of Almighty God that will save and sanctify and redeem when we believe it with all of our heart, and obey it in sincerity and in truth. Do what God says while time and opportunity are yours. And I thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the splendid attention that you have given me.

## **BARR'S FIRST SPEECH**

**Friday night — September 26, 1958**

Gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, Mr. Rogers, ladies and gentlemen: I am thankful to the great God of the universe, the God who saves, the God who keeps, and the God who cares, for this extended privilege of defending the truth. If Mr. Rogers were permitted to be the judge, if he were the God, and you would listen to his vilification of Baptist doctrine, and its error and all, we would be in bad shape, we Baptist folks, but fortunately he is not God, and fortunately he is not the judge.

He has a copy of my questions, and he will give them back to me after he writes answers to them and reads his answers.

1. Are all accountable persons, who have not been baptized into the church of your membership, lost and on their road to hell?
2. Do you teach that one is born of literal water?
3. Are your people born of corruptible seed or incorruptible seed -
4. Is there any corruption in literal water?
5. Are all, that you baptize, children of the Devil, until their baptism is completed?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I hope he will not evade these questions. A straight-forward answer will show his willingness for the people to have the truth. Usually, they will evade the first question I asked. I ask him not to evade it. If it is true, and they believe it is true, and they teach it — that all Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and every one else who have not been baptized into the membership of the church with which he is identified, are lost and on their road to hell. They believe every one went to hell who died not in the membership of their church. And if it is true, friends, then he ought to have the courage to tell you. Should he not? And if it is true, for God's sake, teach us about it, so you can baptize the whole flock of us. But of course it is not true, you understand.

My answer to his questions:

1. Can one be saved who does not love God? Answer: Yes, he can repent and trust Christ for salvation.

2. Does one love God who refuses to obey His commandments? Answer: It is possible for one to refuse to obey a command of God's, and yet be saved. Peter refused to obey commands of the Lord, when he cursed and denied the Lord three times. Now, I am not saying, and I hope he will not get up and say that Mr. Barr took the position, that one may refuse to obey the commands of the Lord, upon which salvation is conditioned. I do not take that position you understand. I am not going to misrepresent him, for I have a cause to defend that does not take any misrepresentation. I will tell the truth, because it is the truth that will stand.

4. Would Israel have been saved from Egyptian bondage if they had not crossed the Red Sea? Answer: No, but, of course, it is absolutely a suppositional case. They did cross it, you understand. But they were under the blood and the leadership of Moses, three days before they ever got to the Red Sea.

5. Do Baptists teach that baptism is the first work of faith, and since Jesus said that members of the church who sin, must repent and do the first works, do you teach members of the church who sin to be baptized again? Answer: Notice that "works" is plural. No, and note that his scripture has W-O-R-K-S, plural, but he puts it all in one work — baptism. Now listen, ladies and gentlemen, here is his doctrine in a nutshell. If you are a Baptist, though you have heard about Christ, how God loved you, and sent Jesus to die for you, how He was buried and raised from the dead; you can believe in the Lord Jesus Christ with all your heart, you can repent of all your sins, you can confess Jesus publicly before men, and you can be immersed in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and, yet, my opponent believes you will go straight to hell, not for lack of faith in Jesus Christ, but for lack of faith in baptism's getting the Job done. Now, he knows that is his doctrine, God knows it, and you people know it, and I am here, of course, to expose that doctrine.

Now, because I shall certainly not take advantage of my friend knowingly, in any way, I am going to bring up some

objections, and a new argument or two. I will not use them in my last speech. I will reply to his speech.

Now, here are some objections to his doctrine. I object to the plan of salvation my friend propagates, "No baptism, no salvation." Now look, if baptism is for, (to obtain remission of alien sins), and a man, after he is baptized, sins, and the sins he commits are alien sins, and he is thereby alienated from God, then I submit that his own proposition calls for him to baptize them every time they sin. Why, he would drown some of them, yes sir, Every time they sin he must baptize them, and he has to do it according to his own proposition. And he is the one who drew the proposition up. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if he would learn a little more about how to draw up propositions, he would not get into that kind of a mess, and I have not actually pressed him like I ought to have. It may be that I will get all stirred up and press him more in this last speech. Now note these objections to his doctrine.

1. Many of their own members do not believe that all accountable beings, who have not been immersed, are lost and on their road to hell. Yet, if their doctrine be true, then countless thousands of pious men and women, who have lived dedicated lives in God's service, who were not baptized, are now in hell, if his doctrine be true.

2. This system of sacramental salvation, takes the salvation of a penitent believer out of the hands of Jesus Christ, the one mediator between God and man, and puts him into the hands of a second mediator, the administrator of baptism.

3. If his doctrine be true, it is easier to be saved in wet weather than in dry weather.

4. If his doctrine be true, then one who lives in a country where there is much water, has a much better chance to be saved than they who live on the desert.

5. If this doctrine be true, then you take a tape measure and find out exactly how far it is to their Savior. You just take a tape measure and measure how far it is to enough water to be baptized, if that is the only place you can find salvation. They think they have God fenced up in a water hole, and in their church. But it is not so.

6. If his doctrine be true, then salvation comes and goes, as the water ebbs and flows.

7. It limits the efficacy of the blood of Christ to the Physical element of water.

8. It would make the salvation of multitudes impossible on the desert or on the battle field. He may have a preacher, a Bible, repentance, faith, confession, but if not enough water to immerse him, he is damned, and he is sunk. world without en? Plot because of lack of faith, not because he has not called on the Lord, but because of lack of enough water to immerse him. I object to such a doctrine.

9. I object to his doctrine because it flatly contradicts the Word of God in hundreds of places. I have shown you in the Bible, for instance, John 3:18 where Jesus said, "He that believeth on Him is not condemned," But Rogers says, "Yes he is condemned, and he cannot possibly be saved until he is baptized." -

10. I object to his doctrine because it makes the Devil the father of one begotten of God. They say that the believer is begotten of God, but he is a child of Satan until he is baptized.

11. I object to his doctrine because it makes one to be born of corruptible seed, because water is corruptible. The purest water in the world has some corruption in it.

Mr. Green, in his HANDBOOK to the Grammar of the Greek Testament gives the following meaning of "his;" 5. 'into', symbolically as marking the entrance into a state or sphere. (See under "en" 4.) So we enter his, *Christon*, into Christ, actually by faith, symbolically by baptism, Christians being *en Christo*, in Christ." Quoted from Folk-McQuiddy Discussion, page 319.

It is my friend and his people who contend for a dead faith, for a faith which is cold and dry and dead, until it strikes the water. Presto! It is made alive when it strikes the water, and that is their doctrine. Then, and not until then, does it become alive. His faith is like a fish. It can live only in the water. According to my friend and his people, the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, which was shed for the remission of sins, is dependent for its efficacy on water! The blood, then becomes efficacious only in the water! Think of it! That is his doctrine, and the efficacy of the water is dependent on some man to apply it!

He gets up here and thinks he has made a showing, and he has done as good as any of them. You cannot do anything with false doctrine.

I want you to note, if you will please, a quotation from Dr. Mary E. McKinney, professor of Greek and Latin at Austin College, Sherman, Texas, dated September 6, 1958: "After the verb *pisteuo* meaning *to believe*, to trust, to have faith, the normal translation is in for the Greek *his*. The versions, I know, translate *his* as in, after *pisteuo*. The preposition *his* means "to, into, or in," that is, into and remains in. After the word baptize, the American idiom is into and after the word believe, the American idiom is in. Now, whoever believes in Christ, has accepted Christ, and has put himself into Christ, and has put Christ on himself. Baptism is the symbol and the witness to other people that we have accepted Christ. The answer to your question: Not on the wording of the version, but on the meaning of the Greek itself, "All who believe in Christ are saved," and then when we are baptized as a public witness of this faith, we join His flock of disciples. Hence you speak correctly, in my opinion, when you say that one believes in (or less idiomatically INTO) Christ and by that very believing is saved. -

Now, listen, friends, Mr. Rogers said last evening that the scholars I quoted from were not scholars at all. He quoted men who have been dead for a long time, and they are scholars, but they do not disagree with the scholars I read. In what school is my opponent the Greek professor? In what school are you the Latin professor? I have read you what Greek and Latin professors say, and I could read you many more if time would permit me to do it.

I started to read in another speech from Mr. Frank Staggs, professor of New Testament Greek, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana. "You are correct in your position that the basic idea in the Greek preposition *eis* is "into." Of course other factors in the sentence help determine the best translation. As you indicate some translations render the preposition "into" when used with the Greek word for believe or trust. This of course makes awkward English, but it is true to the New Testament teaching about the believer's relationship to Christ. In Galatians 3:27 and Romans 6:3, one must remember the sense in which "baptism" is used. I suggest that Luke 12:50 and Mark 10:38 give the Background for this usage. Water baptism don't save anyone, but "baptism" into Christ in the sense of "death" with Christ is a reality in our salvation. Paul expressed the same idea in Gala-

tians 2:20: "Crucified with Christ." Is the proper interpretation of eis, in order to obtain? None of the translations commonly used among men even translate eis, in order to, much less in order to obtain. Let me give you some scriptures in which the Greek preposition eis is used:

1. Matthew 3:11, "I indeed baptize you with water unto (his) repentance." The word "unto" is eis. All right, is the proper translation "in order to obtain?" Would you read it, I indeed baptize you with water in order to obtain repentance?

Matthew 28:19, "Baptizing them in (eis) the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." "In" is eis, and it would not be in order to obtain the name of the Father, etc.

Mark 1:9, "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in (eis) (in order to obtain?) Jordan."

Acts 8:16, "Only they were baptized eis (in order to obtain?) the name of the Lord Jesus.

Acts 19:3, "We were baptized eis (in order to obtain?) John's baptism."

Acts 19:5, "When they heard this they were baptized eis (in order to obtain?) the name of the Lord Jesus."

Romans 6:3, 4, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized eis (in order to obtain?) death." So you see how foolish it would be to translate it, in order to obtain, as he has it in his proposition.

1 Corinthians 1:15, "Lest any should say that I had baptized his (in order to obtain?) mine own name."

1 Corinthians 12:13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized eis (in order to obtain?) one body."

Galatians 3:27, "For as many of you as have been baptized eis (in order to obtain?) Christ, have put on Christ."

Hence we see that his rendering of eis in connection with baptism, makes nonsense of all these passages, and yet they are precisely similar in construction to Acts 2:38.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, my brethren assure me they are going to put the debate in book form, and I am being deliberate, because I want the people to see the foolishness of this "water plan of salvation" even after I am dead and gone.

Mr. Rogers tells us that some of his brethren listened to the tapes, and that Mr. Barr did not say Mr. Rogers and his whole bunch were going to hell. Of course I did not say it, and I know that I did not say it. And so I appreciate the fact that

he got up and said he withdrew that statement, and that was the gentlemanly thing to do, of course. But he tried to make you believe that I take the position that they are all all right, and that all of them are going to heaven. I do not take that position at all. Listen, I said I believed that some of them are saved in spite of their doctrine. I said that any individual in the world who goes to the baptismal waters, expecting to receive remission of sins, in the act of baptism, is lost, and on his road to hell. I think some have trusted Christ in spite of the ungodly, damnable doctrine this man teaches. He thinks salvation is some kind of a two-chance affair, you see. He would say, "Come on and leave the Baptists, and join up, because you have a good chance. Barr says we are all right." He intimated that Barr said that, but Barr did not say any such thing. It is a rare thing for one of them to be saved, I am quite sure. But some are saved in spite of their doctrine. I am sorry for them, and I would to God I could get them to look to Christ instead of baptism for salvation. So, he says that Mr. Barr has neither the faith nor the baptism of the Bible. He says that he has the faith and the baptism of the Bible. Now, I deny it as he has neither the faith nor the baptism of the Bible. Neither one, neither one, and it is just an assumption on his part. Barr did not say that they were all saved at all. He did not come right out and say that I said they were all saved, but he intimated that I believed it. He, with all of his brethren, has a cute way of trying to make you say something that you do not say. False doctrine demands that you do those things. Baptists do not have to do such, for they have the truth.

He comes again to Mr. Thayer, and he says that Mr. Barr Paid that somewhere, it seemed that he had read where Thayer was commenting on the Greek preposition, *his*, and I did say that. Then, when I looked at the Lexicon, I saw that his commenting which I had read was in his Lexicon. He commented quite a little in it. When he comes to define a word, I accept him as a scholar in his defining of words. But Rogers will not accept him as a commentator. In the Lexicon where he was commenting on Acts 2:38 on the expression, *his ephesin hamartion*, for the remission of sins, he said, in order to forgiveness of sins. I do not accept him as a commentator, and he will not either, because he comments that you can baptize a live man

for a dead one. That is what Mr. Thayer believes. I accept him as a lexicographer when he gave the definition of *eis*. He did not give a definition, "in order to," much less in order to obtain. It was exactly as I said, and my opponent gained nothing by his argument. I choose to believe that he just did not know any better, when he got up and made the argument, because I do not like to believe he deliberately misrepresents things.

All right now, he comes to "shout for joy", and he said *his* governs the accusative. Listen, in the translation of the word, "for," shout for joy, and it is not a Greek word at all. It is not the Greek word "*his*", as it is a Hebrew word. He has not proved his contention yet, and he will not in his next speech, and he will not at any time that it is translated something other than *his*. He said he would not use *his* in translating it. He is like I am, he hasn't enough sense to translate it. I do not have, and you do not either, Bill, and you know you do not have enough sense to translate it. So, why make a statement like that.

He says there is a begetting before a birth. But let him prove it is so in the spiritual realm, let him prove it. The word begotten and born is translated from the same word. What he says is true in the natural realm, but not in the spiritual. But he has God begetting the believer and yet the Devil still his father until he is baptized. Now, that is silly, is it not?

He comes and says that I have made no argument on John 3:5, but he is very mistaken about it. You know if these fellows can get a laugh they think they are doing something, but it does not have a thing in the world to do with the proposition. I am not here to try to labor for laughs, as I am here to try to teach you the truth. I showed him that Jesus said in John 3:6, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." I also said if he would follow through then that which is born of water is water. Ah, but he comes back and says that which is born of woman is woman. No, it is flesh, it might be a woman, a little woman. It might be a man, you understand, but it is flesh, as that is what Jesus said. Let us take what Jesus says about a thing.

He said Jerusalem is our mother, or Jerusalem is the mother, the instrument for God. So, beloved, you can see the silliness of his arguments. He makes the water an instrument in born-

ing one. Well, we are going to find out just what he believes, along that line, when he answers my questions.

He talks about Baptist moonshine and all of that. You remember that he said that Mr. Barr does not believe in the new birth, but of course that is just his assertion, and it is not so. Mr. Barr and all Baptists believe strongly in, and teach the new birth, and he knows it. He thinks I was bragging because I said I can make a better argument on his own scripture than he can. I challenge him to stay thirty minutes, and I will take his side of the proposition, and make a better argument on it than he can. No, I was not trying to brag, as I have studied your doctrine more than you have, because I have lived longer than you have. Listen, I was not trying to brag at all, but do you remember who the fellow was that got up and said he could take care of Baptist doctrine? Do you remember who the fellow was who said that two or three times? Mr. Rogers' fuddy-duddy brag was that he could take care of this damnable Baptist doctrine. Of course he does not brag.

Now then he comes to Acts 22:16, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." I showed him that Saul was taught to arise and to wash away his sins, and of course it is either a literal or symbolical washing, and so it must be a symbolical washing because Saul was told to do it. But, Revelation 1:5, "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood." God does the washing with the blood. He wants to know if God takes literal blood and rubs it on. No, but listen, Revelation 1:5 says, "He loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood." So, it has to be blood or water one, and I know it is blood. The other washing Saul was told to, do himself. He does not reply to arguments made; he conveniently forgets to do that.

He calls attention to John 16:33, "In Me ye have peace," of course. I have shown him, — "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." I quoted him Philippians 3:8, 9, how that we get into Christ, *BY FAITH*, in the Lord. So, of course, he has peace, but Rogers says he does not have peace until he is baptized. So, baptism is a mighty powerful thing according to him. Now listen, he says he is able to defeat Baptist doctrine. Well, ladies and gentlemen, you are the ones who are to judge that, and it

does not seem to me like he even made very much effort in trying to do it.

He comes to Galatians 3:26, 27, "For ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you, (Who? Ye children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus) as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," — are clothed in Christ. In Romans 14 the people are saved and he will not deny it, and Paul said to them, "Put ye on Christ." Dress up in Him, by obeying Him, by standing for His doctrine, and so on. It is exactly like I said, that the soldier becomes a soldier when he is sworn in, and when you put the uniform on him, it identifies him as a soldier. My opponent does not know the difference between one's being saved, and one's identifying himself with God's people in baptism.

Then he comes to Acts 10:43, and I am so glad the debate is going to be made into a book, because I am remembering all these things, and you are going to remember them for awhile, and then read them in the book. Peter said unto Him (that is Jesus) give all the prophets witness, that whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins. And Mr. Rogers comes and says, Yes, through His Name. Notice he said *through His Name*. But listen, friends, why does he not read just ONE prophet that said that, Ye are baptized into His Name! Just one? Peter said all of them witnessed that the one who believed in Him, received remission of sins. You see he leaves that part off, because he does not know what to do with it.

Now, he says Mr. Barr believes out of the seat, and not into the seat, and that is another one of his *ipse-dixits*. Mr. Barr does not do any such thing.

He comes again to 1 Peter 3:21. You remember that he said the Bible says, "baptism now saves." And then he did not remember to quote it all. They all do that, and Baptist debaters catch them in it. No, the Bible says no such thing. The Bible says, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Now, to make it say, "baptism doth no"- save us/" you have got to cut the middle out of the verse, and I say it is worse than an infidel handling the Word of God to do A. It is a figure, and it is a likeness, buried in the likeness of His

death. Baptism is a likeness or a picture, and he goes to a picture for salvation.

So he comes again to Romans 6:3, 4. And he said that Mr. Barr says he buries a live man. Why do you say those things, Mr. Rogers? Don't you hear well? You need to play the tapes. Mr. Barr said, and the tapes will show it, that Baptists bury dead men; one who is dead to sin, and alive unto God. But Mr. Rogers, and his people bury a dead man to make him alive. Now, that is what they do, bury a dead man to make him alive. Who ever heard of the like.

All right now, he comes to Romans 1:5 and says it speaks there of obedience to faith. Yes, but it did not say obedience to baptism, and that is what you teach. According to you one can obey every other command in the Bible, and will still go to hell, if he is not baptized. You make it the most important item of the truth of God. It is important, but not that important.

He said, "Oh, it was just the first born that was saved there in Egypt" But the whole family was behind the blood marked door, or in the house behind the blood marked door. It was the first born that was spared. How desperate men are, to go to extremes to try and prove a false doctrine. And he read the scripture where it says, God saved Israel that day. Well, of course He saved them from the pursuing enemy, but it certainly did not mean spiritual salvation, and he knows it, God knows it, and you people know it, if you read your Bibles. So, they were certainly not saved spiritually on that day.

His doctrine is in the Mormon Bible, and I read it to you, ladies and gentlemen, last night. God knows it, and he knows it, and the Mormons know it. His doctrine is not in God's Bible, but it is in the Mormon Bible. Well, he said, "Speak as the oracles of God," and of course that is what the Book says. Both of us ought to be constantly trying to speak as the oracles of God speaks. But to get up and say that you always speak when the Bible speaks, and are silent when it is silent, is equivalent to saying that you are infallible, and that you cannot possibly make a mistake. You know it is so, Bill. Why don't you come and admit the truth? And I have asked him to read the scripture that says the thief was baptized. He took the position that he thought the thief was baptized. He never has read it, and he never will read it, for it is not in there. The

Bible is silent on it, and yet he gets up and breaks his own rule.

He comes again to Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Let us ask Jesus who it is that will be saved. "Jesus, who is it that will be damned?"

"He that believeth not."

"But, Jesus, how about the fellow that believes but is not baptized? Will he be damned? -

He that believeth not, is the one that will be damned, is what Jesus said. Don't you see it? So he tries to make a conditional sentence out of Mark 16:16.

Now ladies and gentlemen, before we go again to the chart, I say to you like I said last night, that this is not a contest between Rogers and Barr, but it is a contest between Rogers and God. He is opposing God.

ROGERS	VERSUS	GOD
Child of Devil		Child of God, Gal. 3:26
Impure Heart		Pure Heart, Acts 15:9
Filthy Soul		Clean Soul, Acts 15:9
Condemned		Not Condemned, John 3:18
No Peace With God		Peace With God, Rom. 5:1
Loves God in a Sense		Born of God, I John 4:7
Baptism Saves		Jesus Saves, Acts 16:31
Saved by Works		Not by Works, Rom. 4:4-5
Without Christ		Hath Christ, I John 5:12
Faith Working by Love		God and Rogers say Such Faith Saves
Born of Corruptible Seed (Water)		Born of Incorruptible Seed I Peter 1:23
Begotten of God but Child of Devil		Begotten and Born of God I John 5:1

**WHICH WOULD YOU BAPTIZE?  
HOW WERE YOU BAPTIZED?**

Mr. Rogers says that his candidate for baptism is a child of the Devil. God says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith." Since one has faith before he is baptized, then one is a child of God before baptism. But Mr. Rogers says, "Hold on God, you are wrong. He is a child of the Devil until he is baptized." Mr. Rogers says that a proper candidate for baptism, the believer, has an impure heart. But God said in Acts 15:9, ". . .

purifying their hearts by faith." Since you come to faith before baptism then you come to a pure heart before baptism. So, Mr. Rogers has to fly in the face of God, and that is exactly what he does, and he does it against God. Mr. Rogers says that the believer, yet unbaptized, has a filthy soul. But Acts 15:9 says he purified his heart by faith. So it is Rogers versus God. He has to fight God. He has to fly in the face of God, and say it is not so, He has a filthy soul until he is baptized. Mr. Rogers says his candidate for baptism is condemned, though he has believed in Christ, though he has repented, he is condemned. But Jesus said in John 3:18. "He that believeth on Him is not condemned." So, since you believe before you are baptized, then you come to where you are not condemned. And again it is Rogers against God. He flies in the face of God. He has to deny God's Word in order to take the position he takes. He says a proper candidate for baptism does not have peace with God. He must be baptized before he has any peace with God, according to my friend. Romans 5:1, "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Since we have come to trust in the Lord, have faith in Him before baptism, then we are at peace with Him before baptism. So Mr. Rogers has to fight-God, and he is fighting God when he takes the positions he has taken.

Now, he says his candidate for baptism loves God in a sense, in that he keeps His commandments. In I John 4:7 God say', that everyone that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. So he is fighting God again. God says that he is born and knows God, but Mr. Rogers says, "Not so." Mr. Rogers says that baptism saves, but God did not say it. God tells us in Acts 16:31 about two preachers, who were asked the question, "What must I do to be saved?" The preachers replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

"Look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved." But Rogers says, "Hold on God, do not look to Jesus, but look to baptism." You can look to Jesus and not be baptized and you will go to hell, is his doctrine. It is Rogers against Almighty God. Mr. Rogers says that we are "Saved by works." But God says in Romans 4:5, "Now to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." So, it is a battle of Rogers against

Got I am happy that I can just take God's Word and show you that it is Rogers and God that is doing the battling, and not Rogers and Barr. You may be sure that God Almighty always wins.

He said last night that his candidate for baptism is without Christ. He does not have Christ, in the sense that he is saved. I John 5:12, "He that hath the Son hath life: but he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." So he has a man going to the baptismal waters a child of the Devil, with an impure heart, a filthy soul, condemned before God, no peace with God, loving God in a sense, but baptism is going to save him. He is saved by works, but he does not have Christ. Who saves him if he does not have Christ? The preacher and the water, and that is all under God's shining stars they have. It is preacher and water salvation as sure as you live.

Now listen, he says that the faith that saves is the faith that works by love, and so do I say it. And he says that faith is working by love when one is on his way to the baptismal waters. So Rogers gives up his proposition, and God and Rogers both say that such a faith saves. Of course he does not believe it, but he gets to talking some times, and he does not know what he is saying, and he is liable to say anything.

Born of corruptible seed, or water, as he takes the position that one is born of water, and he knows that is his position. If he does not take that position in this debate, it will be because he is trapped. Yet, the Bible says, "Being born again not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever." John 1:1-3; "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, etc." So, the "Word" refers to Jesus.

Now, which of these would you baptize? This one on the left side of the chart is the one my friend baptizes. That is the one he baptizes according to the position he has taken. Here, is the one over on the right side of the chart that Baptists baptize. Now, ladies and gentlemen, how were you baptized? Were you baptized like the one on the left side of the chart? I am talking to you people who are members of the church Mr. Rogers is representing. Were you a child of the Devil? Did you have an impure heart? Was your soul filthy? Did you not have peace with God? (Time called.) Thank you, thank you very kindly, thank you ladies and gentlemen.

## **ROGERS SECOND SPEECH**

### **Friday Night**

Mr. Barr, Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen: I now come before you for my last speech in this debate. Before I enter in a review of those things that have been said and my concluding remarks, I should like to express my appreciation again for the splendid attention and interest that you have shown and for the fact that you have come here for the purpose of studying the Word of Almighty God. We are glad that you have come, and Oust and pray that our study together will be a benefit to you. I want to express my appreciation to the Fox Trap church, to Brother Lyle, and to all the brethren that have had a part in making this debate possible. I believe that much good will come from an open study of the word of God. I am grateful therefore that these brethren have seen fit to contend earnestly for the faith that was once for all delivered unto be saints.

First of all I will answer the questions that Mr. Barr has asked:

1. Are all accountable persons who have not been baptized into the church in which you have your membership lost and on the road to Hell? I am a member of the Lord's church, the one you read about in the Bible, Mr. Barr. And as you said in the Barr-O'Dowd Debate on page 76, "The Bible teaches that only the saved are added to the church." And the Bible teaches in Acts 2:47 that all of the saved are added. Therefore, I am a member of that church to which every saved person is, added. Mr. Barr did not have to ask that question. He met Mr. Rogers in a four-night debate at Corinth, Mississippi in which I affirmed that the Church of Christ is scriptural in origin, in name, in doctrine, and in practice, and out of it no responsible person can be saved in this dispensation. Mr. Barr, I affirmed that and you had my name already signed to that proposition. So why ask the question? Why waste the time bothering with it?

2. Do you teach that one is born of literal water? One is born of water in the same sense that one is begotten of the word. And in the same sense that you said that he is washed in the blood. You said, Why no, the blood doesn't literally wash away sins. And so if we use it in that particular sense, we know that idea of being born of water simply means that we are baptized in obedience to the commands of God. And that is the best answer that I have for it.

3. Are your people born of a corruptible seed, or an incorruptible seed? Why they are born of an incorruptible seed, but the seed is the word of God, Mr. Barr (1 Peter 1:23). And no scripture in the Bible says that water is the seed. That is Mr. Barr's theology.

4. Is there any corruption in literal water? Water that is not mixed with blood and the ashes of a heifer and so forth, as mentioned in the Old Testament (Numbers 19), is referred to in the New Testament as "pure water" (Heb. 10:22). I mentioned that in my speech awhile ago and Mr. Barr observed the passover on it. He never did deal with it or touch it at all. He just passed over everything that I said about it.

5. Are all that you baptize, children~ of the Devil until their baptism is completed? Well, I am going to anticipate Mr. Barr on this particular question. I will say that a person is out of Christ and is a child of the Devil until he is baptized. But here is the quibble that Baptist preachers have used at this particular point. They say that you can take a person that is a child of the Devil, you take him out in the creek until he is up to his knees, and he is still a child of the Devil. You lead him out waist deep, and he is still a child of the Devil. You lead him out shoulder deep, and he is still a child of the Devil. You put him under all but his nose, and he is still a child of the Devil. And so he ridicules the command of God in that fashion. Let me tell you; you have to be baptized to be a member of the Baptist Church. You lead him out knee deep and he is not a member of the Baptist Church. He is not a member of the Bride of Christ and has no right to the Lord's Supper, according to Mr. Vernon L. Barr. You lead him out waist deep and he is still not a member of the Bride of Christ and he still has no right to the Lord's Supper, according to Mr. Barr. You lead him out shoulder deep, and he is still not a member of

the Bride of Christ and he has no right to the Sacred Supper. You get him under all but his nose, and he is still not a member of the Baptist Church, which he says is the Bride of Christ, and he will still not have a right to the Sacred Supper. Mr. Barr, if you will tell me when a person is inducted into the Baptist Church by baptism, then I will tell you that the same time a person is baptized in the way that God commands he becomes a child of the Living God. If he comes back and says that you are not baptized into the Baptist Church, I just point out 1 Cor. 12:13 that states that people were baptized into the New Testament Church. If they are not baptized into that one you are a member of, it is not the New Testament Church! Here are the questions to which Mr. Barr has the answers.

*Now then I come to the answers that he has given to my questions:*

1. Can one be saved who does not love God? He said, Yes sir, if he repents and believes. Mr. Barr, I would turn my back to the audience if I got up and told a group of intelligent people that you call go home to Heaven in the after awhile without loving the Almighty God. Now friends, talk about doctrines, that is Baptist doctrine. And he said, That is slander, when I say that is Baptist doctrine. Well now, that is exactly what it is. If it is slander, I am just referring to it because that is what it is. I asked, Can a man go home to Heaven without loving God? Can you be saved without loving God? He said, Yes, if he repents and believes, even though the Bible says in 1 Cor. 16:22 that the man that loves not the Lord Jesus Christ then let him be Anathema. Let him be accursed. Mr. Barr said that if you believe in one, you believe in the other. Therefore, if you love one, then you love, the other. If you fail to love one, you fail to love the other. Jesus said, through the Apostle Paul, If you love not the Lord Jesus Christ, then you are Anathema. The Bible further teaches that to fail to love is in reality to hate. Mr. Barr is actually teaching that you call go home to the glad by and by, hating and despising your God. You either love him or you hate him. Do you love him, Mr. Barr? or do you hate him? You said you could go to heaven without loving God. Mr. Barr, do you love God or do you hate God when you are in that particular condition? Yes, I would be ashamed of it and I would be like these poor Bap-

tist people that are shaking their head. *No!* No, they don't believe any such damnable doctrine, that a man can go to Heaven and be with God without loving God. I never heard such in all of my life. I never heard of a man that purported to be a gospel preacher that would get up and say that you could go home to Heaven without loving Almighty God just provided you repent and believe.

2. I asked him, Does one love God who refuses to obey his commandments? He did not come right out and say, Yes. But the other night he said that if a man loves God, he will keep his commandments. Therefore, if a man refuses to be baptized, it is because he doesn't love Almighty God. Yet he thinks a man can have faith and his conversion be genuine while he refuses to obey the commands of God and while that man is in rebellion against his Lord. Now this is some of the worst doctrine that I have ever heard in all my life. Well, I am going to read right here a statement by Mr. J. R. Graves. Mr. Graves is a Baptist preacher and he denied vehemently that baptism sustained any relation to salvation. But he didn't have the modernistic and liberal idea that Mr. Barr has. He said, "But the Scriptures afford no ground for any one to hope for salvation who has the light and will not use it — who cares not to know what Christ requires of him, and who has an opportunity to be baptized as Christ was, and will not take up his cross and follow him. We have no right to say that such a one is a child of God; he does not give us the evidence of it: for by their fruits, not professions, we are to know them." He further said, "I can not think him safe whose course, whatever be his profession, is a course of sin and willful or willing disobedience." And yet Mr. Barr has affirmed that tonight. And again, Mr. Graves says on page 52 of this book (*The Relation of Baptism to Salvation*, by J. R. Graves), "This refusal on the part of a professed disciple to hear the voice and obey the command of the Master for personal considerations and the assurance of salvation, is not consonant with the gospel scheme. That scheme, indeed, saves merely by grace, through faith — saves without the least merit on the part of man; but does it save rebels? does it license contempt of divine authority? . . . Is the gospel a doctrine of licentiousness? is it sent to open the flood-gates of error? to beget sin? to warrant us to serve our own wills and notions, fancies and conveniences? . . . The

gospel knows no one, however high in profession, who does not love and obey the commandments of Christ; and they wholly mistake it who suppose themselves saved in willing or willful disobedience. Ignorance of the law, when they have it, and have sense to understand and opportunity to obey it, will not avail; nor will the plea of sincerity in their error ... Rejectors of immersion! ponder these things." He is speaking to the Methodist folks. He was trying to get them to be immersed. But he taught here that if you fail to do what Jesus said and be buried with him in baptism, you are "rebels against Christ, and consequently exposed to his wrath." Even though he does not believe that there is any merit or any grace conferred in the act of baptism, per se. But he claimed that "Such aversion to do the will of Christ should be an all-convincing evidence to you that your heart is not right in the sight of God." And so he says, "Your flagrant and inexcusable neglect of divine law declares you the enemy of Christ." Jesus said, If you love me you will keep my commandments. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. But Mr. Barr tonight said that if you will repent and believe then you can be saved whether you obey God any further or not. You can refuse to obey the command to be baptized and go home to Heaven. You don't even have to love God if you will just repent and believe! You Baptist people are too fine, honorable and upright to endorse and approve and support any such doctrine as that. As Mr. Graves has said, It is a doctrine of lasciviousness. It is an approval of sin. It encourages rebellion against Almighty God. Do not die with such an attitude toward your Lord.

3. I asked, Which comes first in the conversion of an alien, faith or love? Again he observed the Passover. If he had said, Faith, he knows that he argues that a man is born the very moment he believes. If he had said, Love, he would have argued in 1 John 4:7 that a man is born by love. And so either way he went, if he had said love is before faith, then he would have a man a child of God before faith. If he said that he is born at faith, and faith comes before loving, then he would have you born without love. So he observed the Passover and didn't answer it at all.

4. Would Israel have been saved from Egyptian bondage if

they had not crossed the Red Sea? He said, No. Mr. Barr, that is the very point that we are debating. They would not have been saved. But he says that they were all under the blood. The Bible says that the first-born were the ones saved from death. But Mr. Barr is arguing otherwise. But moreover, the Bible says that God saved Israel "that day." Mr. Barr thinks that they were saved before. I am willing to take what God has said.

5. Since Baptist's teach that baptism is the first work of faith, and since Jesus said that members of the church who sin must repent and do the first works, do you teach members of the church who sin to be baptized again? He said, No, because the word (works) is plural there. Well, whether it is plural or singular, it still would include baptism. Mr. Ballard said on page 84 of the Warren-Ballard Debate, that baptism is the first act after faith. So then you have baptism number one, and a number of others that follow. But anyway baptism would be involved in the first works. Last night he said that if baptism is for the remission of sins, then we ought to baptize over again people of God that sin. Well then, if baptism is one of the first works that they did, then they would have to be baptized over again, according to his argument and Rev. 20.

I come now to a review of a few of the things that he has said. Then I will hurriedly pass to the chart we have. He had discussed and objected to the expression "to obtain." He said it would necessitate baptizing again. Well, you have to be baptized to get into the Baptist Church the first time. If you sin they will turn you out. When they come back, do you have to baptize them over, Mr. Barr? How do you get them back into the Baptist Church after you get rid of them one time? And he said that our own members do not believe it. I don't care if there wasn't a person on God's earth that believes it but me, the Bible still teaches it.

He said that if baptism were essential to salvation, it would be easier to be saved in wet weather than dry. So it would be easier to become a member of the Baptist Church in wet weather than dry!

He said that a person that was on land where there was not

any water would have a hard time obeying the gospel. He would have a hard time being a member of the Baptist Church too, Mr. Barr!

And he said that you could take a tape-measure and measure the distance to Christ just by measuring from here to the baptistry or to the creek. Yes, and if salvation comes at the point of faith which is brought about by Baptist preachers delivering Baptist doctrine, you can measure the distance to salvation by measuring from here to the Baptist Church building. That is how far it is from here to Christ, according to Vernon L. Barr. Measure how far it is to the nearest Mourner's Bench and you will know how far it is to Christ!

He said that we limit the power of the blood of Christ. We do no such thing! Then he said that we contradict the word of God. No sir, we harmonize the word of God.

Then he said that when these people who were baptized "his" Christ, it did not mean "unto." Well, Mr. Barr, any way that you take it, the Bible says that you are to repent AND be baptized for the remission of sins. Whatever you repent for, in Act-, 2:38, you are baptized for the same reason. Now you Baptist people stop to think. What does Mr. Barr teach that you repent for?! Does he teach you to repent because you are already saved? Does he? Or doesn't he teach you to repent in order to be saved? Well, the Bible says to do two things. It says, (number one) Repent, and (number two) be baptized everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. The prepositional phrase "for the remission of sins" modifies both "repent" and "be baptized." I showed from Thayer's Greek-English lexicon in the word "hekastos" that such is true. Mr. Barr hasn't dealt with it. Let us emphasize that if he says you are baptized because of remission of sins, that word "for" cannot mean "because of" as it modifies baptism and at the same time mean "in order to obtain" as it modifies repent. Therefore, Mr. Barr is going to either have to give up repentance as a condition of salvation, or else come to the lick log and admit that men both repent AND are baptized ill order to have their sins forgiven.

<b>ROGERS</b>	<b>VERSUS</b>	<b>GOD</b>
<b>Child of Devil</b>		<b>Child of God, Gal. 3:26</b>
<b>Impure Heart</b>		<b>Pure Heart, Acts 15:9</b>
<b>Filthy Soul</b>		<b>Clean Soul, Acts 15:9</b>
<b>Condemned</b>		<b>Not Condemned, John 3:18</b>
<b>No Peace With God</b>		<b>Peace With God, Rom. 5:1</b>
<b>Loves God in a Sense</b>		<b>Born of God, I John 4:7</b>
<b>Baptism Saves</b>		<b>Jesus Saves, Acts 16:31</b>
<b>Saved by Works</b>		<b>Not by Works, Rom. 4:4-5</b>
<b>Without Christ</b>		<b>Hath Christ, I John 5:12</b>
<b>Faith Working by Love</b>		<b>God and Rogers say Such Faith Saves</b>
<b>Born of Corruptible Seed</b>		<b>Born of Incorruptible Seed</b>
<b>(Water)</b>		<b>I Peter 1:23</b>
<b>Begotten of God but Child of Devil</b>		<b>Begotten and Born of God I John 5:1</b>

**WHICH WOULD YOU BAPTIZE?  
HOW WERE YOU BAPTIZED?**

---

I want to refer now then to the chart. First of all let me suggest concerning the chart that we have here that Mr. Barr has put up that I have emphasized that I believe every passage that he has quoted. And that every passage he has referred to A speaking of an obedient faith. When the Bible speaks of a child of God, it is one that Paul said has been baptized into Christ That is the one. That is the one that is a child of God by faith. And thus these people over here (on the chart) had already been baptized.

Acts 15:9, God purified their hearts by faith. Yes, but what kind of faith? It is an obedient faith! They were baptized in the name of the Lord. And moreover, the Bible says ill Acts 15:9 that their souls were purified, but it was by a faith that obeys. And those people were baptized in Jesus' name. And baptism in Jesus' name is for the remission of sins.

In John 3:18, the believer is not condemned. But the Bible says there is no condemnation IN CHRIST (Rom. 8:1). But we are baptized INTO Christ. And so everything that he says refers to a baptized believer.

He said that the Bible doesn't say that baptism saves and that Rogers didn't quote all of the verse. Then there is not a verse of scripture on your chart, Mr. Barr, because you haven't quoted all of any one of the verses. And therefore, you don't have a verse of scripture on your chart, according to your logic.

<b>BARR</b>	<b>VERSUS</b>	<b>GOD</b>
<b>Belief — Salvation — Baptism.</b>		<b>Belief plus baptism equals</b>
		<b>Salvation, Mark 16:16.</b>
<b>Repentance — Remission</b>		<b>Repentance plus</b>
		<b>Baptism equals</b>
<b>Baptism.</b>		<b>Remission, Acts 2:38.</b>
<b>In Christ — Baptized.</b>		<b>Baptized into Christ, Romans 6:</b>
		<b>3,4.</b>
<b>Washed — Baptized.</b>		<b>Baptized, Washed, Acts 22:16.</b>
<b>Baptism Does Not Save.</b>		<b>Baptism Does Now Save,</b>
		<b>1 Peter 3:21.</b>
<b>At Point of Faith, A Child</b>		<b>At Point of Faith. A Child of</b>
<b>of God.</b>		<b>the Devil, John 8:30-44.</b>

---

### WHICH WILL YOU ACCEPT?

---

Now then, look up here on this side (Rogers refers to his own chart). We have Barr versus Almighty God. It shows right here that Mr. Barr teaches that a man believes and then gets salvation, then Mr. Barr has baptism. But God said in Mark 16:16, (1) Believe, (2) be baptized, (3) he shall be saved. Barr has it, Belief, salvation, baptism. Barr puts his ecclesiastical hand and his theological clutch upon baptism and wrests it from the word of Almighty God and changes the word of the Lord. That is Mr. Barr v.s. Almighty God.

And then Barr says, Repent and you will obtain remission of sins, then after you obtain remission of sins, be baptized. God says, Repent ye, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins (or unto the remission of sins, or as Thayer gives it, "to obtain" remission of sins), and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Barr says, Repentance, then remission, then baptism. God Almighty says, Repentance, baptism, and then remission, instead of being like Mr. Barr has it. So then it is Barr v.s. Almighty God. Are you going to accept Vernon Barr or the word of God? I am going to accept God! And all the quibbles, all the dodges, all the twisting, and all the turns will not take one verse from God's Holy Book.

Barr says that you are in Christ first, that you believe into Christ, before you are baptized, though the Bible doesn't say it. Barr said it. Barr said that you believe into Christ and then you are in Christ. But the Bible says in Rom. 6:3-4, and GO. 3 2607 that we are baptized into Christ First, the baptism, then the induction into Christ. You will just have to take either Barr or the word of God. Barr says, In Christ,

then baptized. The Bible says, Baptized, then Christ. I will accept God. Which do you accept?

Over here he says that you are first washed, you are first cleansed, and then you are baptized. The Bible says, Be baptized and wash away thy sins. First, baptism, and then you are washed. That is what the Bible says. Mr. Barr says, First the washing, and then the baptism. That is Barr v.s. Almighty God. He has lifted and snatched out of the Sacred Writing the position of baptism.

And here we find again that Mr. Barr says baptism does not save. And whether it is a picture or whether it is a gray horse or whatever it is, the Bible says it does NOW save us. Barr says it does not save, it does not save us. Well, whatever it is, be it picture or otherwise, the passage doesn't say that it saves us figuratively. That is Vernon L. Barr. But the Bible says that baptism does now save us. Barr says baptism does not save us. If you can not understand the difference between that, then you need not worry about getting home to heaven in the after while.

You just look at this: He says a person is a child of God at the point of faith. The Bible says in John 8:30-34 that Jesus said to the Jews that believed on Him that they were to continue in His word. And he said in verse 44, Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. I suppose they were begotten too, Mr. Barr, since they believed. And 1 John 5.1 says that everyone that believes is begotten of God. But Jesus said that they are children of the Devil. Vernon L. Barr says that you are already a child of God at the point of faith, before and without continuing. But the Bible says that you are a child of the Devil at the point of faith and without further works. It is either Vernon Barr or the word of Almighty God.

I beseech you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to accept what God has said. I have given you nothing but the word of the Lord. I have pointed out the harmony between all of the verses that Mr. Barr has introduced in this debate and those that I have affirmed.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the God of Heaven loves your soul. The Bible says in John 3:16, For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but should have everlasting life. Mr. Barr

has admitted in the course of this debate, that the word "believeth" is a comprehensive term. And that it does not exclude other conditions of salvation. But may I emphasize the great interest that God has in you. He wants you to be saved. And the best way that I can ever state that, is by comparison. Suppose that tonight some man were to come to my house and were to inform me, and we were to see flashed upon the television screens and to hear in every medium of communication, that some strange and horrible malady had entered into the world, and that every man, and every woman, boy and girl must die unless some remedy is discovered. And after careful analysis and proper research the doctors tell us that if they can find just one person in all the world who is pure of that disease, who is clean, then his blood can save all mankind. I have one son, an only begotten son, of my own. And so one day a doctor and a lawyer come to my house. They check my blood, but it will not do, I am contaminated with that horrible disease. And then they check my wife, but she will not do. They check my daughter, but she will not do. And then they come to my darling son. They check him and then they check him again and then they say he will serve for a sacrifice for the world. They tell me, You need not give your answer now, but wait and tomorrow at this time you can tell us. And so I that night would walk the floor. My heart would be broken. My back would be bent with the burden of the world, because I know that I could give my son and save every person in all the world from a horrible death. I would see his hands under his cheek, curls upon his forehead, and I would remember the first step that he ever took, I would remember the first word he uttered, and I would know how much I loved him and how much I would be grieved to be separated from him. And I might even be bitter and wonder why on earth did not ,ionic reprobate, some man in the institution, or the wicked that is about to die for his crime, could not die and give his blood for the life of men? But thank God, I have not that decision to make. But God did make that decision and sent His Son. He did it because of the worth of the soul. He wants you to be saved. God loves you and therefore Jesus died for you. He robbed himself of Glory, of Heaven and everything, that you and I could hope to have. He came into this low earth of sin and sorrow, and wrapped himself in human flesh, and

finally in the human robes of bloody suffering. On Calvary's cross he called sinful humanity to his love. And the Bible says that he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them who obey him. On the third day after that, he burst the bars of the tomb asunder and came forth to plant the Rose of Im mortality upon his grave. And then he met with his disciples upon the sacred mountain in Galilee. And he said unto them, You go into all the world and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you, and 10, I am with you always even unto the end of the world. He gave them the Banner of Love and he put in their hand the Torch of Truth. And they were to go to every city, town, and hamlet; to every nation, tribe, and tongue in all of the world, and teach them to repent and to turn to God. Upon the first Pentecost in Acts 2, Peter carried out the Great Commission, and charged inquiring sinners, You must repent and be baptized, every one of you (as Goodspeed translates it) in order to have your sins forgiven. God is interested in your soul. He has provided a sacrifice of the Lord. He loved you enough to send His Son to die for you. Why reject His love, rebel at His commands, and serve God after human doctrines and commandments. Tonight I beg and I persuade that if you haven't obeyed the gospel of our Lord, that tonight you count the worth of your soul, realize that it is an eternal thing. Know that error will not save. And the only thing that can redeem and the only thing that can save is to obey the gospel of God. That will bring you into eternal life, and that will take you home to Heaven in the afterwhile. The Bible teaches that after awhile this old earth is going to stagger under the burden of accumulated ages. The sun will no longer make it's arched journey across the sky and the moon will refuse to emit it's silvery rays. God will fold up the heavens as a well worn vestery and place them aside. And everything that is temporal will pass away with a great noise. But my soul and yours, friends and beloved, will live forever. It is the most precious thing in all the world. And therefore, by all means let us do what God commands. Let us believe His word and do what God commands.

God said to Cornelius, You send for Peter and he will tell you words, whereby thou shalt be saved and thy house. To

night, if you haven't obeyed the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, if you haven't believed in Him, if you haven't trusted Him with all of your heart, turned in sorrow from every sin, confessed the faith that you possess in the Lord of Glory, and haven't been baptized like the Bible says, in Jesus' name, for the remission of sins; then before this night shall close, call Brother Burns, Brother Wilhelm, Brother Rester, or some other faithful gospel preacher and they will be glad to serve just like Peter did. And if you want to hear further, they will tell you words whereby you can be saved and your house. And they will be glad to take you and in the name of the Sacred Three, they will immerse you in order that you may have your sins forgiven. That is the thing that God commands.

I will tell you tonight that there has never been any darker doctrine ever invented than the idea that if a man will merely repent and believe in Jesus he is a child of God. And that is all there is he has to do, that he may die without loving God, turn his back upon the commandments of Jehovah, trample them under his feet, never obey one command of God except to repent and believe, and then go home to Heaven. But that is just not so. And if you have ever read the Bible, if you have the slightest knowledge of what it teaches, you ought to be able to understand that such is not true. Then I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, Why accept the doctrine of this man? For it is, as I have illustrated, Barr v.s. Almighty God. Remember every verse in the Bible that mentions salvation in connection with baptism places the salvation after the baptism.

He that believeth (number one), and is baptized (number two), shall be saved (number three).

Repent (number one), and be baptized (number two), for the remission of sins (number three).

Arise (number one), and be baptized (number two), and wash away thy sins (number three).

Rom. 6:3-4, Do you not know that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ did put on Christ. First baptism, and then in Christ. But he says that Barr buries a dead man and then turns around and says that he is alive unto God. Mr. Barr you said that I bury a man to kill him. I do, to kill him to the guilt of sin, which is a negative way of saying that he is made alive in the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul said, As many of you 'a& were baptized into the death of Christ were baptized

into Him. And therefore we were buried with Him in baptism into death. Yes, into our death, or our separation from the guilt of sin.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you believe the word of God. The man that will tell you to do anything less than what God commands is your worst enemy. And the world may come and the world may go, but there is one Book that will stand throughout the eternal ages. And when you and I stand before the Great White Throne, that Book will be opened and then it will read just exactly as it now does. Will you then obey sincerely, fervently, and with a humble heart while time and opportunity are yours?

God bless you and watch after you is my prayer. And a very pleasant good night -to you.

**BARR'S SECOND SPEECH**  
**Friday night, September 26, 1958**

Gentlemen moderators, my honorable opponent, ladies and gentlemen: In just exactly thirty minutes from now this debate will have come to an end. It has been a wonderful pleasure for me to have been here to defend the truth of God. I will ask for a few moments at the close of the debate to express my appreciation to all concerned, which is usually customary with the debaters and moderators, as far as that is concerned.

---

<b>BARR</b>	<b>VERSUS</b>	<b>GOD</b>
<b>Belief — Salvation — Baptism.</b>		<b>Belief plus baptism equals Salvation, Mark 16:16.</b>
<b>Repentance — Remission — Baptism.</b>		<b>Repentance plus Baptism equals Remission, Acts 2:38.</b>
<b>In Christ — Baptized.</b>		<b>Baptized into Christ, Romans 6: 3,4.</b>
<b>Washed — Baptized.</b>		<b>Baptized, Washed, Acts 22:11</b>
<b>Baptism Does Not Save.</b>		<b>Baptism Does Now Save, 1 Peter 3:21.</b>
<b>At Point of Faith, A Child of God.</b>		<b>At Point of Faith, A Child of the Devil, John 8:30-44.</b>

---

**WHICH WILL YOU ACCEPT?**

---

I think I shall go to his chart first, and I want you to notice, ladies and gentlemen, that the chart says, "Barr versus God." And I want to show you that he does no better at arithmetic than he does with the Bible. He says Barr versus God, and then puts over here under number one: Belief-Salvation-Baptism. The Bible says in Acts 16:31, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." That is Baptist doctrine. So, he believes before he is baptized, and he is saved before his baptism. So, Barr is with God on number one on his chart. On the other side of his chart under the heading God he has, 'Belief + Baptism -- Salvation?' God did not say any such thing. In Mark 16:16 Jesus said, "He

that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: But he that believeth not shall be damned." That is a declarative sentence and shows that salvation depended on belief and not baptism. He says, "Belief plus Baptism equals Salvation." If that be true, then every mathematician knows that, Belief minus Baptism equals one-half Salvation. And he has a man half saved. God did not say such a thing, and it is Rogers over on that side of the chart, and not God. Turn this chart around and you will have it God versus Rogers, and you will have it right again.

He says that Barr says, "Repent, remission of sins, then baptism." I said that in Acts 11:18 God says that repentance is unto life. That is what the Book says, and one is baptized because he has Jesus. "He that hath the Son hath life," and you certainly have Jesus before baptism. So, this over here is not only Barr, but it is also God. And this is Rogers over on the other side on the chart, and not God.

Then he said that Acts 2:38 teaches, Repentance plus Baptism equals Salvation. Acts 2:38 teaches no such thing. I showed you where Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." I showed that according to the grammar used that it cannot possibly mean that Repentance plus Baptism equals Remission. If it were so then Repentance minus Baptism would equal one-half Salvation. You, would. have one only half saved.

Then he comes to number three on his chart and says that Barr says you are in Christ first, and then baptized into Him. He says, Romans 6:3, 4, teaches you are baptized into Christ. I showed that according to Philippians 3:8, 9 that it is BY FAITH that one gets into Christ, and then one is baptized into Christ symbolically. He baptizes one to get him with Christ. And so Barr and God are on one side of the chart, and Rogers is on the other side.

Then under number four on his chart he has under Bar that one is washed, and then baptized. In Revelation 1:5, "Unto Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood." We get to the blood before water. Then he goes to the other side of the chart and says we are baptized first, and then washed, and he cites us to Acts 22:16.

I am with God on that, as God washed our sins away first in the blood at faith, and we are told to wash away our own sins symbolically in baptism.

Next he comes to number five on his chart and says that Barr says, "Baptism does not save." I have told him over and over that baptism did not save me, but that Jesus Christ saved me. That is the difference between Mr. Rogers and me. I preach that Jesus saves and he preaches that baptism saves. Thank God for the privilege of preaching that Jesus saves. Then he goes to the other side of the chart and says that according to 1, Peter 3:21 baptism doth also now save us. All right, how? It is by the resurrection of Jesus Christ that we are saved according to the verse cited, and it is only symbolically that we are saved by baptism. I have given him many, many scriptures that teach us that we are saved BY FAITH in Christ. For instance Galatians 3:26 says, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ."

Then he comes to number six on his chart and tells us that Barr says you become children of God at the point of faith. Barr has given hundreds of scriptures that teach that one is saved when he trusts in Jesus Christ for salvation. Then he says that God, on the other side of his chart, takes the position that the believer is a child of the Devil, and he cites John 8:30, 34, 44. Some of those were children of God because they had believed "eis" Christ, and the other crowd only believed about I-Tim, and were not children of God, and some of them did not believe in Him or believe about Him, and of course they were children of the Devil. Those who go to the baptismal waters expecting to find Christ are on their road to hell. Now, we are through with his little chart, and I like to tear them up because they always put false doctrine on their charts.

Now to the questions. Bill, why do you do things like this? He asked me the question, "Can one be saved who does not love God?" I said and he has the written answer to the question, and I have it somewhere here, also written down — my written answer to the question was, "Yes," if he repents to God, and believes in the Lord Jesus Christ as his Savior. I take the position that an unsaved man, who does not love God, can be saved if he repents to God and trusts in Jesus Christ. Mr. Rogers got up and tried to make it appear that

I taught that one could go to heaven who hated God, and one who did not love God. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I did not do it, God knows I did not, and I think Rogers knows I did not, and the people know I did not. Now, why does he do things like that. Mr. Rogers, a cause is mighty weak when you take something a man says and try to twist it around, and seek to make it appear that he says a man can -go to heaven hating God. I simply showed him that a man that does not love Go, and who is lost can be saved if he repents to God and believes in Jesus.

2. (Barr's written answers are handed to him by his Moderator) Here are my answers in my own handwriting. "Yes, if he repents and trusts Christ for salvation." I want to keep these written answers. I certainly said that one must repent and trust Christ, and I presumed that Rogers spoke of an unsaved man in his question. So, my opponent gets up and twists what I said in ray answer to his question. When a man has to use those kind of tactics, brother, his doctrine is weak and he knows it. When I have to defend a doctrine which is that weak, I will get off the platform and never try to debate again. And I will not knowingly misrepresent him or any other man. But let me get to the answer to his second question: "Does one love God who refuses to obey His commandments?" I showed him that men who loved God, can and have on some occasions refused to obey His commandments. For instance, the Apostle Peter refused to obey His commandments when he cursed and denied the Lord three times. But Peter was a child of God. He had much to say about that, but I gave him the truth about it, and he knows I did, and you people know I did.

3. "Which comes first in the conversion of an alien? Faith or love?" If he will look at my written answers, he will see where I put down faith. And then the love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Spirit. He got up and actually twisted what I said in answering that question. And he had the written answer there. Why do you twist, Bill Rogers? If you had a cause that was not so weak you would not have to twist. If you would preach Jesus Christ, God's crucified, buried and resurrected Son as the One to whom the sinner must look you would not have to enter into such trick-

ery to try and make the people believe the false doctrine for which you stand.

4. "Would Israel have been saved from Egyptian bondage if they had not crossed the Red Sea?" (At this point Mr. Rogers said that he did not have Mr. Barr's written answers to his questions.) 'Well, I beg your pardon, and I am sorry as I thought you did have them. I am sorry if I misrepresented him about them as I will not knowingly misrepresent any man. I do not have to do that for I have the truth. You may smile if you like, God knows that I honestly thought he had my written answers.\* I had answered every one of his questions without any evasion of any sort.

Now my answer to his fourth question: In answer to the question, I said, "No, of course not. But they were under the blood and the leadership of Moses before they got to the Red Sea."

I showed you that people do not have to be baptized again. I also showed you that the word "works" is plural in order to show you that he puts it down to one work — baptism, you understand.

Let us note his answers to my questions. Well, he just flat-footedly tells you that every accountable person in this dispensation, that is not a member of the church of which he is a member is lost and on the road to hell. Ladies and gentlemen, it matters, not how much your dad or mother, who may be dead and gone on, may have loved God Almighty, if they were Baptists, or Methodists, or Presbyterians, no matter how pious a life they lived even if they loved God with all their hearts, and if they believed in Jesus Christ with all their hearts, if they had repented of all their sins, even if they had been immersed, they went straight to hell, if they were not members of Rogers' church. 1-16 thinks he has God fenced up in that church of which he is a member. You cannot fence God up. God is everywhere. God tells us we can be saved if we are not in ten thousand miles of one of his preachers, or one of the churches he represents. I asked him if he taught that one is born of literal water, and he answered, that one is born of water in the same

**\*Wayne Branson, Moderator for Mr. Barr stated to Mr. Barr at the close of the sessions on Friday night that he had offered the written answers to Mr. Rogers' questions to Mr. Rogers, and that Mr. Rogers declined them, saying that he already had the answers written down.**

sense one is begotten of the Word. He knows, and I know, and God knows, and you people know they go all over this country teaching that you must be born of water. And when they get in a debate they are afraid to answer, and so Rogers was evasive in his answer to the question. They teach everywhere that one is born of water. He spoke of the water, not mingled with blood, as being pure water, but all of us know, and he knows there is no water that is one hundred per cent pure. All of it has some corruption in it. So, if they are born of water, like they teach all over the country, then they are born of something that is corruptible. He says it is the word of God in I Peter 1:23. All right, Jesus says that He is the Word, or the Book teaches that He is the Word, in John 1:1-3.

I asked him if there was corruption in literal water, and he talked about the water spoken of in the Old Bible, and actually intimates that there is water that does not have some corruption in it. Now, he knows better than that, ladies and gentlemen, and you know it, and God knows it.

Now, question number five: "Are all that you baptize, children of the Devil until their baptism is completed?" He says, "Yes." He said he anticipated what Mr. Barr would say. Look, ladies and gentlemen, I did not intend to use what he said I would use, but I have used it, and I have heard it used, and so since he made me think of it I will use it. According to his doctrine, you can hear the Word, you can believe with all your heart in Jesus, you can repent of all your sins, you can confess Jesus Christ publicly before men, you can desire to be baptized, you can want to be saved more than any thing in the world, you can wade out into the water, and you are still a child of the Devil, and on your road to hell. You can not only put him under to where his nose is sticking out, and he is still a child of the Devil, but according to most of them, you could raise him up out of the water, and he is still on the road to hell. Some of them will tell you that he has to come up, be raised out of the water, and get up out of the water, before his baptism is completed. I have a record of some of his men in my notes who took that position. A friend of mine once said, "It would be terrible if an alligator got his foot, would it not?" His foot would have to go to hell, and the rest of him that got out would go to heaven. So, do you not see the power these people put in water? It is water, water, water.

They ought to sing, "Amazing water, how sweet the sound that saved a wretch like me. I once was lost, but now I'm found, was blind but now I see. It was baptism that taught my heart to fear, and baptism my fears relieved. How precious did that baptism appear, the hour I was first baptized. Thru many dangers, toils and snares, I have already come. It is baptism that hath brought me safe thus far, and baptism will lead me home. When we have been there ten thousand years, bright shining as the sun, we'll still have no less days to sing baptism's praise than when we first begun." That is the way they ought to sing it. And if I was going to believe their doctrine, I would sing it that way. I would rewrite the song and sing it that way as sure as you live.

Now, he is no good even at arithmetic. This fellow cannot even work arithmetic. All of us know that if Belief plus Baptism equals Salvation, then Belief minus Baptism equals one half salvation. So, what would happen to him if he died just half saved? Half of him would go to heaven, and half of him would go to hell, according to that argument. So, do you not see where false doctrine will get you? It gets one into a terrible predicament.

He said the Lord added the saved to the church, but it does not say He added all the saved to the church. And it did not say that He added them to get them saved, but He added the saved. They were already saved, and then added afterwards.

He keeps saying Mr. Barr observed the passover. Well, if I wanted to waste a lot of time, and I do not, I could bring up the questions he evaded last night and say he observed the passover on them. I could pick up every one of them and go through them and say he observed the passover on them, but I am not going to do it, as it takes up too much time. But that is a little favorite phrase of his, and I do not mind it a bit in the world.

He charges Mr Barr with ridiculing the command of God. Mr. Barr does not do any such a thing. Mr. Barr honors the command of God. But Mr. Barr ridicules the damnable doctrine that you cannot be saved but in the act of baptism. He thinks he has God shut up in THE water and in his church. That is what I ridicule, because God's Book teaches against such.

He talks a lot about the Baptist church, and being baptized into it. That does not have a thing under God's shining stars to do with his affirmative proposition. Of course he would like

to get me to make a long argument in reply, so that you would forget that I am exposing his "Water baptism, plan of salvation." He is afraid he is going to lose some of you, and I think he will. I think some of you will look to Christ and be saved and get out of that false church that Campbell and others started.

He says Barr teaches you can go to heaven without loving God. "Barr does not do any such thing. He knows Barr does not do A, and he just made a statement that is not true. I guess he thinks it is the truth, but it is not, ladies and gentlemen. Now an unsaved man who does not love God can, of course, be saved if he repents toward God, and trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ. Rogers charges Barr with teaching that one can go to heaven hating God, but Barr does no such thing. But if you would let him make out Barr's case he would do pretty good. They get them a blackboard, and they get them a chart, and they get after these people, and they deceive so very many people. The people have nobody present to show them how deceitful they are, and they get up and do it. Often times you cannot even get them to take their positions when you get them into a debate. I tell you friends, their doctrine is as weak as weak can be, because it is not found in the Word of God. But it is found in the Mormon Bible, and that is where you will find it.

He quotes from J. R. Graves where Dr. Graves was talking about a rebel. Well, he was not talking about a lost rebel, or a rebel who does not follow the Lord in baptism. J. R. Graves spent a life time fighting this damnable doctrine Mr. Rogers teaches, and he knows that and he told you so. Graves was a Baptist preacher, and he recognized that people can rebel against God after they are saved; like Peter rebelled against Him, when he cursed and denied the Lord thrice.

I said according to his proposition he would have to baptize them every time they sinned. He saw the predicament he was in, and it was his proposition as he drew it up. Ladies and gentlemen, he signed his name to honorably affirm the proposition, "The scriptures teach that water baptism to a penitent believer is for, to obtain the remission of, alien sins." Well, of course a sin is an alien sin when it is committed no matter if one is baptized or not baptized. So, if he would honorably do what he signed his name to do, he would have to baptize them

every time they sin, or they will go to hell as sure as there is a God sitting on the circle of the heavens. Yes, he would drown some of them, as sure as you live.

He comes again to talk about the Baptist church. He says you baptize them, and then you turn them out, and you will have to baptize them back in again. You see he seeks to do here the thing he tries to make you believe is so; that is that Baptists teach that everyone is going to hell who is not in a Baptist church. But Baptists do no such thing. Baptists teach that all will go to hell who do not repent to God and trust in Jesus with all their heart. But my opponent teaches that everybody is going to hell who is not a member of his church.

He said, "Show me how far it is to the mourner's bench, and I will show you how far it is to their Christ." But that is not so. A man can erect a mourner's bench in his heart any where under God's shining stars. Brother, you can sit there at your table, and have a mourner's bench in your heart. It simply is not so when you, or anybody else, says a man has to kneel down to a bench, and mourn in order to be saved. To say such is to say something that is not true, as the Bible does not teach it. But he can go and get down at the mourner's bench and repent and trust the Lord and be saved there, and I think many such have been saved. I believe people have been saved walking down the road, and at different places, you understand. No, we do not make a God out of the mourner's bench, like you do out of water baptism, and you know it is your God, because you can do every thing else but be baptized, and you will go to hell, according to your doctrine.

The Bible teaches that repentance is unto life. I showed you that according to the grammatical construction of Acts 2:38 that Mr. Rogers' interpretation of it could not possibly be right. For the reason that subjects and predicates must agree in person and number, and they do not agree in the verse. So repentance and baptism cannot be for the same thing. The children of God by faith are the ones who are to be baptized.

He goes to my chart and says that every one of the people over here under the heading, "God," are baptized folks. Ladies and gentlemen, that is adding to the Word of God. He has to thrust in baptism into every one of those scriptures, and God pronounces a curse upon the individual who adds to or takes from the Word of God. So God's curse is on him, over his head

right now for having done it. I read him these many scriptures that teach we are saved by faith in Christ, and yet he thrusts baptism into every one of them. By that same token, if you are permitted to do that, you can thrust in paying of money, taking care of widows and orphans, and greeting your brethren with a holy kiss, and you can thrust in every thing under God's shining stars, and make all of them conditions of salvation. And so that is the way this man (Rogers) handles the Word of God. He adds to my scriptures, and I gave you what God said but he must add to what God said to make it fit his doctrine.

In Acts 10:47, Jesus said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Here were men who received the Holy Ghost, spake in tongues, and magnified God, (and the world cannot receive the Holy Ghost) and they were baptized afterwards. So certainly my friend's proposition is disproved.

Now, he said, "Mr. Barr, if you can't understand, do not worry, as you will get to heaven anyway." Mr. Rogers, if you cannot understand that all of these scriptures over here, that put salvation at the point of faith, do not have baptism in them, then I am going to quit worrying about you, as you will make, it all right anyway. Yes, you will make it. You see that I can pay him back in the same manner, but there is not a thing to such as that. I prefer not to do that kind of stuff, but just to debate the proposition. But I fed him out of his own spoon, and I only did it to feed him out of his own spoon. Such really does not become debating, but as far as that is concerned, we have had a good debate. However with that kind of stuff left off the debate would be even a better one.

Now, he preached a good sermon, and listen, Bill, let me congratulate you on that sermon. You preached a good sermon through most of it, nearly all of your sermon was good. When he talked about God's giving His Son, Christ's shedding His blood, being raised from the dead, and all; that part was good. That is the way Baptists preach. He went on in his sermon and preached that one must obey the gospel, and Baptists preach that. He refers to the Scripture that says, "He is come to offer eternal life to all who obey Him." But Rogers teaches, to all who obey Him in baptism. The one act, and that is all, and that is the difference between God and Rogers. Now listen,

Rogers believes that obeying the gospel means to be baptized. And so the Book teaches us to obey the gospel, but Rogers teaches to obey baptism, as that is the only way you can be saved according to my opponent.

He says that he has been baptized like the Bible teaches. Ala, he has not done any such thing. No, you have not done any such thing. Did you receive the Holy Ghost before you were baptized? Did you magnify God like Cornelius before baptism? Why of course not, and he has not been baptized like people in the Bible, and he knows he has not. He has not even been baptized like Jesus Christ, nor like the apostles, and he would not even claim that he has. The Bible does not say anywhere that you are baptized in order to obtain remission of sins. Rogers says he baptizes or buries his candidate for baptism. to kill him to sin, so, now brother, there it is, "your water baptism, plan of salvation." He buries him, he baptizes him, in order to kill him to sin. So, God did not kill him to sin. The blood did not kill him to sin, but Rogers killed him to sin. So, beloved, it is the truth before God, that it is the water and their preacher, their administrator of baptism, that kills one to sin. God has nothing to do with it, because according to my opponent's own admission he did not even have Jesus before baptism.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to remember some of the affirmative arguments I gave at the beginning of this debate. I hope you will listen carefully to them, and I hope you will put them down and go home and read them.

In John 3:14, 15, Jesus said, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." This verse teaches exactly what Baptists believe, and what my side of this proposition teaches, that 6 that every believer in Jesus Christ has eternal life. But my opponent will affirm to the contrary, as he thrusts in baptism as a condition. But this scripture will not allow it.

I also argued from Ephesians 2:8, 9, "For by grace are ye saved through faith and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast; For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." And so I showed that according to this scripture salvation is

a gift of God, and it is not of works. Not of works, lest any man should boast. And Rogers would have to say it is by or through baptism. But the Bible nowhere makes such a statement.

In John 3:36 I called to your attention that Jesus said, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." This text affirms what my side of the proposition affirms and what Baptists teach, but the position of my friend does not so affirm. His proposition contradicts the text, unless you thrust in baptism after believeth. People should be very careful about adding to the Word of God. Do not follow blind leaders, ladies and gentlemen, or you will fall in the ditch with them. But look to Jesus Christ for salvation.

I made an argument from John 5:24 where Jesus said, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." And that fits Baptist doctrine, and that is what I teach, but he must thrust baptism in to make the text fit his belief. He will have to say to the lord, "No, Jesus, that is not right. You have to be baptized before you can have everlasting life, before you can come out from under condemnation."

I made an argument on Philippians 3:9 where Paul said, ". . . And be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Baptists believe this text just like God wrote it through Paul. Baptists believe the righteousness of the text is the kind that every believing sinner has. But my friend must take the position, that there is no such righteousness, because he teaches that the righteousness of God is by faith and baptism, the text to the contrary.

I brought up 1 Corinthians 1:21, where we are taught that it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. The text fits Pay side of the proposition, and it is what Baptists preach. But Rogers must say, "Hold on, Paul, you are all wrong, it pleases God by, the foolishness of preaching and baptism to save them that believe." So he has to add to thousands of verses of scripture to make them fit his side of this debate.

Then in Romans 3:25, 26, "Who God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; To declare I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Note that it says, "which BELIEVETH IN JESUS." These verses set forth both the ground and the final condition of our justification or salvation. It is set forth here that Jesus Christ is the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Where, in the Bible, does it say that Jesus is the justifier of him that is baptized? Such is the doctrine of my friend, Mr. Rogers. The ground of our justification is the blood of Jesus, and this is our propitiation, our redemption. The condition of remission of sins, or justification before God, is faith in His blood. And it is not through faith and baptism as my friend teaches. There is not a word in the text about justification by or through an act of faith, or by an act resulting from faith, but it is justification or remission of sins through faith in His blood. This ought to settle the question forever in all thoughtful minds, who are not blinded by prejudice.

<b>ROGERS</b>	<b>VERSUS</b>	<b>GOD</b>
<b>Child of Devil</b>		<b>Child of God, Gal. 3:26</b>
<b>Impure Heart</b>		<b>Pure Heart, Acts 15:9</b>
<b>Filthy Soul</b>		<b>Clean Soul, Acts 15:9</b>
<b>Condemned</b>		<b>Not Condemned, John 3:18</b>
<b>No Peace With God</b>		<b>Peace With God, Rom. 5:1</b>
<b>Loves God in a Sense</b>		<b>Born of God, I John 4:7</b>
<b>Baptism Saves</b>		<b>Jesus Saves, Acts 16:31</b>
<b>Saved by Works</b>		<b>Not by Works, Rom. 4:4-5</b>
<b>Without Christ</b>		<b>Hath Christ, I John 5:12</b>
<b>Faith Working by Love</b>		<b>God and Rogers say Such Faith Saves</b>
<b>Born of Corruptible Seed (Water)</b>		<b>Born of Incorruptible Seed 1 Peter 1:23</b>
<b>Begotten of God but Child of Devil</b>		<b>Begotten and Born of God 1 John 5:1</b>

**WHICH WOULD YOU BAPTIZE?  
HOW WERE YOU BAPTIZED?**

I want to go to the chart. Now, ladies and gentlemen, in these last five minutes I will deal with the chart. I still con-

tend that this debate is Rogers versus God. I have shown you that Barr and God are on the same side of Mr. Rogers' chart. I have also shown you that Rogers and somebody else is on the other side of his chart. The only way he has tried to do away with the force of the argument on my chart, is to seek to thrust baptism in every one of these Scriptures under the heading, "God." And baptism is not in one of the verses, not a single solitary one. Now please notice the chart and see that this debate from beginning to end has been a contest between Rogers and God. Rogers says he baptizes a child of the Devil. He is a child of the Devil until his baptism is completed, until he puts him under the water, and gets him all the way out of the water., But God said in Galatians 3:26, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." So, listen, you have faith in Christ Jesus before baptism, so you become a child of God before baptism. This is contrary to what Mr. Rogers tells you. Rogers must say, "No, God, you are wrong; no, Paul, you are wrong, you are not children of God by faith, but you are children of God by faith And baptism." And that is the doctrine of Mr. Rogers.

Rogers says that the candidate for baptism, which he baptizes, has an impure heart But in Acts 15:9 it is said their hearts were purified by faith. Since you come to faith before you come to baptism, then, you have a pure heart before baptism. But Mr. Rogers has to thrust in baptism, and he must say, "No, no, hold on, God. It is by faith and baptism that you have a pure heart." That is what he is arguing and everybody can see it. And I am emphasizing it because I want you to see it. And I want you to remember it long after this debate is over.

Mr. Rogers says that a believer in Christ has a filthy soul; the man who is on his way to the baptismal waters. My opponent is the man that buries a believer who has a filthy soul. But Acts 15:9 teaches he is purified by faith in Jesus, his heart is purified. I tell you friends, he, (Rogers), flies in the face of God. This doctrine this man stands for, flies in the face of God, and slaps God in the face. It slaps God Almighty down out of heaven, and says, "Get in that water, you must stay there because the soul must be saved there, and you must get there and stay there, or you will make bars out of us, " Ah,

listen friend, it is God versus Rogers, and it has been all the way through this debate.

Rogers says the believer in Christ is condemned until he is baptized. But Jesus said, "He that believeth on Him is not condemned." But Rogers must say, "Oh, hold on, Jesus, he is condemned until he is baptized." He is fighting with Jesus Christ. He is squared off like a boxer in the ring and he is saying, "Jesus, you are not speaking the truth when you say, 'He that believeth is not condemned'." But I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, we had better believe Jesus Christ and not Bill Rogers. Jesus Christ said, "He that believeth on Him is not condemned. -

And then I want you to notice that my opponent said that the believer in Christ has no peace with God. That is what he said, "Has no peace with God." Baptism makes him to be at peace with God. Yet, note Romans 5:1, "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" And Rogers must jump in the face of God, and say, "Hold on, God, that is not so, for no man can be justified or be at peace with God until he is baptized." But God Almighty says he is at peace with God when he comes to the point of faith.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to also notice that he says a believer loves God in a sense. In 1 John 4:7, "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." So listen, if he loves before he comes to the baptismal waters, then, he is born of God and knoweth God. Even Mr. Rogers sometimes gets on the side of truth accidentally. But he said he just loved in a sense.

I want you also to notice that my opponent said that baptism saves, but the Book says that Jesus saves. In Jonah 2:9, it says, "Salvation is of the Lord." My friend said it took baptism to save, and, so, it is a fight against God from beginning to end.

I want you to notice also, if you will, that he said you are saved by works, but God says that it is not by works.

Note also, please, that he, (Rogers), said that his candidate for baptism was without Christ; and, so, the water and the preacher made a child of God out of him, and Jesus did not have anything to do with it.

He says, "The faith that saves is the faith that works by

love," and I say so too. And so God and Rogers both teach a faith that works by love is a faith that saves. Rogers' faith is working by love while he is on his way to the baptismal waters.

He has taken the position that one is born of corruptible seed –water; but the Book says "incorruptible seed," begotten of God. And begotten and born of God is the same thing.

I read him a verse (1 John 5:1, R.S.V.) the first night of the debate where it is said, that every one that believeth that Jesus is the Christ is a child of God. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this man Rogers is just trying to pervert the scriptures. Thank you very kindly. (Time called.)

## GENERAL INDEX

- Amazing water, 218.
- Arithmetic, 212, 213, 218.
- Barr, Vernon L., affirmative speeches, 11, 36, 66, 93.
- Barr, Vernon L. negative speeches, 131, 157, 184, 212.
- Barr-Smith debate, 116.
- Ballard-Barr booklet, 136, 137, 154.
- Barr, objections, 186, 187.
- Barr-O'Dowd debate, 198.
- Campbell, Thomas, statement, 69.
- Causey, Dr. Leo A. 77.
- Charts, 141, 148, 169, 195, 206, 21, 224.
- Convention, southern Baptist, 7, 9, 170.
- Douay version, 70.
- Davis, grammar, 174.  
67, 98, 99, 114, 115.
- His, not in order to obtain, 189.
- Folk-McQuiddy debate, 187.
- Garner, Albert, 56, 57.
- Goodspeed, 125, 138, 154.
- Graves, J. R., 201, 202, 219.
- Green, 187.
- Hardeman-Bogard debate, 124.
- Huddleston, grammar, 174.
- Leavell, Roland, 148.
- Mormon Bible, 168, 182, 194.
- McKinney, Dr. Marry E., 188.
- Malady, horrible, 208, 209.
- Olive Pell, Bible, 182, 183.
- Rogers, Bill L., negative speeches, 23, 51, 79, 107.
- Rogers, Bill L., affirmative speeches, 120, 144, 172, 198.
- Summers, Dr. Ray, 76.
- Rogers, Dr. E. E., 76, 77.
- Robertson, A. T., 148, 162.
- Sectarian, 104, 105, 118, 119.
- Son, always a, 152.
- Staggs, Dr. Frank, 188, 189.
- Tri-Cities, daily, 7, 8, 9, 13, 66,
- Thayer, 25, 60, 70, 124, 136, 137, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 172, 173, 174, 190, 191.
- Wycliffe, translation, 43, 70.
- Williams, 125, 137, 138, 154.
- Warren-Ballard, debate, 148, 203.
- Water, nose out, 199, 200, 217.