

JACKSON—SMITH DEBATE

THE PLAN OF SALVATION

This Debate occurred during the year 1945. It was originally published by the American Baptist Publishing Co. The first 66 pages constituted the written debate. However, before it was published, the Baptist debater, Jackson, added 36 more pages to the published Baptist Edition of 1945. This 1992 Reprint is an exact reproduction of the 1945 Edition.

**THE CELTIC CROSS, INC.
Rte. #10, Box 2685
Lufkin, Texas 75901**

EXPLANATION

The Jackson-Smith Debate on the Plan of Salvation was originally published serially in the AMERICAN BAPTIST and the GOSPEL BROADCAST, the first installment appearing in the American Baptist, February 26, 1945.

This is the second published debate between Dr. Jackson and Evangelist Smith, the first being on the subject: "Depravity and Work of the Holy Spirit."

The discussions arose from a proposal (challenge) by Mr. Smith to debate with Mr. Jackson, saying he regarded Dr. Jackson as being the "ablest debater among Baptists."

As originally agreed upon the following propositions were to be discussed and published as one book:

Proposition No. 1. The Scriptures teach that man is inherently depraved, and in his conviction of sin and conversion to God, the Holy Spirit exercises a power distinct from the written or spoken word of God.

D. N. Jackson affirms;
Eugene S. Smith denies.

Proposition No. 2. The Scriptures teach that baptism in water, of the penitent believer, is for (in order to obtain) the remission of past sins.

Eugene S. Smith affirms;
D. N. Jackson denies.

After the disputants had finished discussing the first proposition, Mr. Smith proceeded to publish it in book form without waiting until the second had been discussed, as agreed upon before the debate was started.

Then after some delay, the debaters began discussing the second proposition with the agreement that each would have eight speeches (written) to be published in both papers; but after his sixth affirmative, Mr. Smith, evidently realizing that he was losing the battle, abruptly quit the discussion. Failing to induce him to finish the debate as agreed upon, Mr. Jackson proceeded to publish in the American Baptist a treatise designed to expose the theory of Baptismal Regeneration, and after some delay, and being urged by many readers of the American Baptist, Dr. Jackson decided to release the debate for publication in book form.

This book is sent forth with a prayerful desire that it be given a wide and impartial reading.

PUBLISHERS.

INDEX

	Page
PART I	
Smith's First Affirmative	5
Jackson's First Negative	10
Smith's Second Affirmative	15
Jackson's Second Negative	20
Smith's Third Affirmative	24
Jackson's Third Negative	29
Smith's Fourth Affirmative	34
Jackson's Fourth Negative	39
Smith's Fifth Affirmative	44
Jackson's Fifth Negative	49
Smith's Sixth Affirmative	54
Jackson's Sixth Negative	59
PART II	
Baptismal Regeneration Theory	67
PART III	
Origin of Baptismal Regeneration	75
PART IV	
A Definite Similarity	87
PART V	
Water, the Campbellite Mother	90
PART VI	
Unanswered Arguments	95

PROPOSITION

The Scriptures teach that baptism in water, of the penitent believer, is for (in order to obtain) the remission of past sins.

Eugene S. Smith Affirms

D. N. Jackson Denies

Smith's

First Affirmative

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

Eugene S. Smith affirms; D. N. Jackson denies.

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

After some unavoidable delay it is with appreciation of the opportunity that we take up this affirmative of the present proposition. This proposition is so clearly worded that very little need be said by way of definition for it is easily understood by all readers and can hardly be misconstrued by even Mr. Jackson. The issue is plainly set forth and the difference between Mr. Jackson and myself is a real difference, easily seen by all.

"The Scriptures" mean the "The Bible Old and New Testaments." By "teach" we mean "sets forth clearly, declares." By "baptism in water" we mean "the immersion of the physical body, by the authority of Jesus, in water." By the "penitent believer" we mean the individual who believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and truly repents of all his sins." By "for" we mean exactly what is set forth in the parenthetical phrase in the proposition, "in order to obtain." And finally, "by remission of past sins" we mean "the forgiveness, the blotting out, the washing away by the blood of Christ, of those sins committed in the past years by the individual." I am confident that this definition will be accepted in the whole by Mr. Jackson and that of this there need be no more said.

Now to discuss the proposition:

1. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by His words in Mark 16:15, 16, "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." These words are too plain to be misunderstood and the place of baptism in God's plan of salvation is too forcibly put to be denied. Baptism, as well as faith, is said to be the condition of our salvation.

2. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain remission of sins by the words of Christ in John 3:3-5, "Except one be born anew he cannot see the kingdom of God... Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the

kingdom of God." Now it is evident, according to all scriptures and reason, that to be born of water is to be baptized. Therefore, baptism is essential to our salvation. We will see whether Mr. Jackson will fly in the face of scripture, reason and the logical arguments of scholarly Baptists of past years on this passage.

3. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of the apostle Peter which he spoke "as the spirit gave. . . . utterance." In Acts 2:38 we read his response to the question, "What shall we do?" which came from the pricked hearts of those convicted, believing souls in Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. He said, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins."

In this inspired language we have set forth very plainly the affirmation of the proposition in nearly the same words as used in it. The phrase, "unto (for) the remission of sins" is not to be misunderstood. The same phrase is found in both English and Greek in Matt. 26:28 and surely no one can deny the shedding of the blood of Christ. His blood was poured out "unto (for) remission of sins" and baptism along with repentance is "unto (for) remission of sins." Christ shed His blood "in order to obtain" our forgiveness and we are baptized "in order to obtain" our forgiveness. Thus, we have the divine and the human part of our redemption.

4. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of Ananias, the gospel preacher, to Saul of Tarsus. In Acts 22:16 he said, according to Paul's own record of it, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name." The words of the scriptures are so clear, so easily understood that my comment is unnecessary for all can understand the meaning of these words.

5. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of Paul in Rom. 6:3. We read, "Or are ye ignorant that all who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?" Not even Mr. Jackson would deny that salvation is "in Christ" and by "His death." Therefore, since we are "baptized into" Christ and His death, baptism must be in order to obtain the blessings there and among these blessings is the forgiveness of sins.

6. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of Paul in Gal. 3:27. Here, again, we read, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did

put on Christ." This is a reiteration of the thought considered under No. 5.

7. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of Paul in Eph. 5:26. Here we read, "Having cleansed it (the church) by the washing of water with the word." "The washing of water" could refer to nothing but baptism and it is expressly stated that by this washing the church, those regenerated ones, had been cleansed.

8. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of Paul to Titus for we read, "He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Titus 3:5). "The washing of regeneration" has long been admitted by Baptist scholars, as well as others, to refer to baptism. It is by this that we are saved and therefore the proposition is true as affirmed.

9. The baptism which Christ authorized is shown to be in order to obtain the remission of sins by the words of Peter. We read, "Eight souls were saved through water; which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism" (1 Peter 3:20, 21). What further need of writing or of speaking, to overthrow the proposition. Mr. Jackson must overthrow the word of God. In the Word the proposition is so clearly and repeatedly set forth that the space allowed will not permit the examination of all texts at this time. However, we are sure that in these nine reasons for our affirmation of the proposition which we have set forth, every honest reader will see the scripturalness of our position.

Now, lest Mr. Jackson attempt to muddy the waters and confuse the issue, let us clearly say that we are not discussing the way of salvation before the Cross of Christ and the present age which began on the day of Pentecost following His resurrection. Before that time men lived and served God under a law different to that of today. We are concerned with God's requirements as commended by the Christ for men of these last days.

Neither let Mr. Jackson say that we would teach that we "earn or merit" salvation because of baptism. Christ said, "When ye shall have done all things that are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do." Salvation is by the grace of God and our obedience to Christ's commandments does not earn our salvation. We are still, in our obedience, unprofitable servants, and must be saved by and through the grace of God.

Obedience to the commands of God, as given through Christ,

is so clearly taught in the word of God that no one can deny its importance. This obedience is clearly set forth as the condition of our acceptance in the sight of God. Therefore, since baptism is one of God's commandments and part of the gospel of Christ every one can realize its essentiality in securing our salvation, our forgiveness from past sins.

Christ said, "Not every one that saith unto me. Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 7:21). Paul preached the "obedience of faith" (Rom. 1:5) and said: "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching hereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:17,18). And again, "To you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus." (II Thes. 1:7, 8). And with this Peter said, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obedience to the truth." (I Pet. 1:22).

Now in view of these scriptures, and as I said, realizing that baptism is a command of God and part of the gospel of Christ how can anyone think to be purified, enter the kingdom of God, be a servant of righteousness or escape the eternal punishment of God without baptism. Of course, we do not say that baptism alone will make us acceptable for our proposition has to do with the baptism of the "penitent believer" and therefore baptism without faith and repentance would be valueless. But as baptism without faith and repentance is invalid so faith and repentance without baptism are equally useless. Will Mr. Jackson deny that baptism is a command of God? Will he deny that it is a part of the gospel of Christ? If not, he cannot logically deny the proposition.

Finally, for this time, we must also anticipate Mr. Jackson and his arguments on "salvation by faith." We believe, without reservation, every passage of scripture which Mr. Jackson can produce on the subject of salvation by faith. He cannot find one that says salvation is by "faith alone" for that would contradict the apostle James who says, "not only by faith" (Jas. 2:24). We believe that salvation is by faith and without faith we cannot be saved but we are also confident that we are saved by "the obedience of faith" and in this obedience we find baptism. Therefore, apart from baptism the obedience of faith is not complete and cannot bring the blessings of God.

Jew and Gentile alike have been included before God in unbelief.

To be saved today either of them must believe that Christ is the Son of God and repenting of sins must confess the faith of their heart and be buried in baptism unto the remission, the forgiveness, in order to obtain the washing away of their sins by the blood of Christ which He shed in His death and into which the penitent believer is baptized if his baptism be that which was authorized by Christ the Son of God.

Remember that Christ "became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5:9).

Jackson's

First Negative

Mr. Smith and Readers:

It is an easy and pleasant task, under the dispensation of Providence, to expose a man-made doctrine as set forth by my opponent. Far from being proven by the Scriptures, its origin is found this side of the New Testament times and is priestly in nature, damning in hell forever all who do not go to the creek for the specific purpose of finding the blood of Christ in the act of baptism. No water, no salvation, a "be dipped or be damned theory," born of Catholicism as baptismal regeneration and revamped by Alexander Campbell and his associates in delusion. Yes, I shall prove these and other charges to be true as this discussion goes on.

It is "the gospel in water," so declares Alexander Campbell, founder of the church to which my opponent belongs and a modern exponent of his theory of the plan of salvation. Says Mr. Campbell:

"I am bold, therefore, to affirm, that everyone who, in the belief of what the Apostle spoke, was immersed, did, in the *very* instant in which he was put under water receive the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. If so, then who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water" (Christian Baptist, p. 417).

Mr. Smith, in defining the terms of his proposition, says: "By the 'penitent believer' we mean 'the individual who believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and truly repents of all his sins. '" And yet he says one who has done all this must go to hell unless he is baptized. Think of it. One who believes in Christ and "truly repents of all his sins" is punished in the flames of torment forever, according to Smith, unless he is baptized! Our dear boys, for instance, in the foxholes and on the firing lines of the awful global war, beneath the bursting bombs and roar of cannons, although they TRULY REPENT OF ALL THEIR SINS AND BELIEVE IN CHRIST, must perish in torment, says my opponent, unless he or some other man is present to put them under water for the specific purpose of obtaining remission of sins. Shades of Socrates, Aristotle and Kant! Who ever heard of a greater absurdity? No wonder the theory is styled by Smith's father Campbell as the "gospel in water." But Jesus teaches to the contrary, for all who believe in Him and truly repent of their sins: (1)

will not be cast out, Jno. 6:37; (2) are not condemned, Jno. 3:18; (3) are passed from death unto life and therefore have everlasting life, Jno. 5:24; (4) are justified and have peace with God, Rom. 5:1; (5) are born of God, I Jno. 5:1. Notice, if you please: (1) These blessings belong to the believer in Christ. (2) He believes before baptism. (3) Therefore the believer possesses the blessings before baptism. Beyond a question of a doubt, then, he is saved before baptism.

Again, in our debate on "Depravity and Work of the Holy Spirit," Mr. Smith argued from the viewpoint that the Spirit of God is in the spoken or written word. If so, one receives the Spirit before baptism, for "they that gladly received his word were baptized" (Acts 2:41). How can one receive the word without receiving the Spirit if the Spirit is in the word, unless the Spirit leaps out of the word just before the sinner receives it and cries: 'Til meet you in the creek, I'll meet you in the creek?" The Spirit in us before baptism, He testifies we are children of God before baptism (Rom, 8:16) and heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. (Rom. 8:17). What more do we need to say? I'm sure Smith would give all he possesses if he had not taken such a position. Did not know we would get so far in so short a time. Come over, friend Smith, and we'll baptize you, if you have been saved by the grace of God.

Now, let's examine his arguments (?) for his water-salvation theory, following him according to his numbering.

1. Mark 16:16 Mr. Smith does not believe the verse despite the fact he uses it to try to prove his doctrine. It says one SHALL BE SAVED, whereas he says he may be saved. Smith vs. the Bible. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Belief here is the key, not baptism, for the verse makes damnation depend upon a positive, personal disbelief, or rejection of Christ. For instance, "He that entereth an airplane and taketh a seat shall be delivered; but he that entereth not shall be killed." Taking a seat is an effect of entering the airplane, but is not a condition of deliverance. So baptism is an effect of faith or belief in Christ, not a condition of salvation.

Again I say the proponents of baptismal salvation do not believe the verse, as it positively declares one SHALL be saved, whereas they say he MAY be saved provided he keeps in the middle of the road and can outrun the devil from the creek to heaven.

Dr. Timothy Dwight, once president of Yale University, and who was not a Baptist, said of this verse:

"Of this passage (Mark 16:16) it is only necessary to observe, that

the concluding clause refutes the supposition, which the introductory one is employed to support. Here Christ declares, that he who believeth not, whether baptized or not, shall be damned. This could not be true, if baptism and regeneration were thus connected. "

2. John 3:5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Hold on Mr. Smith, this happened before Pentecost, before which time you say people were not saved as they are since then. Was Jesus fooling Nicodemus, telling him he must do something he could not then do? This verse puts both salvation and the kingdom before Pentecost. Thank you, my friend, He says "born of water" means baptism. If so, "born of the Spirit" means baptism of the Spirit, which Smith will deny one must have before he can be saved. But if he believes it, take him over, "Bro. Holiness," Jesus is not speaking of water baptism, but of the water of life, for immediately following He says: "Whosoever drinketh of the water I shall give him shall never thirst" (Jno. 4:14. See Jno. 7:37; Rev. 22:17; Isa. 55:1). Again, baptism in water is a burial, not a birth. Cannot my opponent distinguish between a burial and a birth? But such is his doctrine.

3. "For the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38) means "with reference to the remission of sins" one is baptized. Greek eis (for) is translated unto in Matt. 3:11: "I indeed baptize you with water unto (eis) repentance," not in order to obtain repentance but with reference to repentance already experienced, as John the Baptist demanded repentance before baptism, and so Peter required remission of sins before baptism. Eis is translated at in Matt. 12:41: "They repented at (eis) the preaching of Jonas," not in order to obtain his preaching. Mr. Smith's proposition reads that baptism is for (in order to obtain) the remission of sins. I challenge him to read it anywhere in the Bible. He cannot do it. Even Matt. 26:28, according to Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary, in loco, means "for (or, in reference to) the taking away of sins. "

4. In Acts 22:16 baptism is represented as washing away sins only as a symbol, as remarked once by Mr. Campbell:

"The water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins." (Campbell-McCalla Debate, p. 135).

Water or blood really washes away sins. Which one? If water, then the blood does not, and it becomes purely baptismal regeneration as taught by Roman Catholics. The blood does the cleansing (I Jno.

1:7) which is symbolized in water baptism. No wonder Campbell called the water theory "the gospel in water."

Again, we learn from Acts 9:17 that Saul was "filled with the Holy Ghost" before baptism, which shows he was saved before baptism.

5. Romans 6:3-5 teaches: (1) We are dead to sin; (2) being dead to sin, we are freed from sin, v. 7; (3) being dead and freed from sin, we are to be buried with Christ, not buried to find Him, in baptism; (4) baptism is a likeness or picture, and a likeness or picture never saves from sin except in a symbol; (5) but Paul (v. 23) says eternal life is a free gift, hence not by baptism or any other works. Come again, friend Smith.

6. Gal. 3:27 is far from the "gospel in water" as all other Scripture verses are. The ones baptized "into Christ" were first "children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" (v. 26), for the antecedent of the personal pronoun "you" in verse 27 is the children of God in verse 26. That's good Baptist doctrine. Bring on another one.

7. If water baptism is implied at all in Eph. 5:26, its function there is explained already in Nos. 5, 6 above, for soul purification and purgation comes by the blood through faith, and we reach the blood before water. (Acts 15:9; Heb. 9:14; Ex. 12:12, 13; I Cor. 10:1, 2).

8. "Washing of regeneration" (Titus 3:5) is baptism, says Smith, and he avers "Baptist scholars" admit this is true. Bring on the Baptist "scholars," friend Smith, if you please. How strange he would refer to "scholars" when in our first debate, he protests against the use of anything but the Scriptures. I am glad, however, for him to use anything he desires and can. Titus 3:5 says we are saved "not by works of righteousness." Therefore we are not saved by baptism.

9. I Peter 3:20, 21 explains that we are saved by water like the "eight souls were saved by water" in Noah's day. They entered the ark of safety before baptism which is an answer to a good conscience and does not procure it. A good conscience, therefore, is procured before baptism. Let Mr. Smith complete his argument by explaining what the ark typifies.

He says we are not discussing the plan of salvation before the cross. Why not, as Moses and the prophets did, who said remission of sins came by faith in Christ? (Acts 10:43). But more on that later.

Since baptism is a command of God, says my opponent, we must be baptized to be saved. If all commands are in order to obtain salvation, then we must "lay by in store on the first day of the week."

(I Cor. 16:2). He argues we must do the will of the Father (Matt. 7:21), but what is the Father's will in point of salvation? Jesus says it is that we believe on Him. (Jno. 6:40).

The "form of doctrine" (Rom. 6:17), says Smith, must be obeyed, but he makes no argument on it, merely quoting it. What is the form? Ah, he shies away from it, and I do not blame him for being afraid of it. If he means it is baptism, water salvation pure and simple follows as a result, for the ones baptized are servants of Satan up to baptism when he contends they are made free from sin, whereas he says one who "believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and truly repents of all his sins" should be baptized. Is that kind of person a servant of sin? But let him make his argument.

He maintains we must obey the gospel. (II Thes. 1:7, 8). Certainly, but what is the gospel? (Sec I Cor. 15:1-4). Baptism being a likeness is not the gospel of salvation. It is a picture. Our souls are purified in obeying the truth (I Pet. 1:22). Yes, the truth of the plan of salvation. (Jno. 14:6). By works one is justified before others (Jas. 2:24); by faith he is justified before God. (Rom. 5:11). He says he anticipates my arguments on faith for salvation. Already he is worrying about a place to fall. Get ready, my friend, for the fall will be quite severe.

Thus with all ease he has been answered in full, closing his efforts by merely quoting, with no argument, Heb. 5:9, Christ becoming "the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." Obedience unto salvation is expressed in repentance from sin and faith in Christ, and after salvation is had, we obey Him because we love Him as children, as we are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (Eph. 2:10). First, creation; or a new creature in Christ, then works. Even Mr. Smith should understand that. But he damns all except those who belong to the church of which he is a member.

Now let him answer three simple questions: (1) Is baptism a work? (2) Is the believer's faith made perfect in baptism? (3) Can one be saved without a perfect faith?

Finally, we expect him to try to make good the serious charge he made in our first debate that Baptists are prison inmates in consequence of their doctrine of depravity and security of the believer. Remember, my friend, your case will be taken care of in due order.

Smith's

Second Affirmative

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

Mr. Jackson might he profited as he undertakes his "easy" task to remember the words of Israel's king who said, "Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off" (I Kings 20:11).

He says my doctrine is "damning in hell forever," and thus confesses that it is from God. The word of man cannot damn or condemn, for Christ said, "The word that I spake, the same shall judge him" (John 12:48). Therefore, if that which I teach can damn men in hell, it must be of God.

As to "baptismal regeneration," I am free to say that there is a "washing of regeneration," and that, I affirm, is baptism. In the Old Testament there was a "water of purification" (Numbers 8:7) and without the sprinkling of that water there was no purification. In the New Covenant there is a "washing of regeneration," and without that washing there is no regeneration.

I am not attempting to prove Brother Campbell's statements true or false. Our proposition is based upon the teaching of the Bible, and Mr. Jackson will do well to base his arguments upon a "thus saith the Lord," rather than a "thus saith Campbell."

Neither need he to appeal to prejudice and popular opinion generated by the times in which we live. I have a boy in the foxholes, but his being there does not change the word of God. Let us conduct a discussion of the proposition that will bring truth to man, and not one in which we seek to arouse the sympathies and prejudices of man by an appeal to emotion. This I am confident Mr. Jackson will do if he can find Scriptural ground upon which he can attempt to stand. We must also say that he is to our mind, the first ranking debater among the Baptists, and if he cannot find such ground, it is evidence that such ground cannot be found.

John 6:37 speaks of the man who "cometh to me," and John 5:24 is the one who has "passed into life." Life is "in Christ" and we showed plainly by God's word in our first affirmative that one comes "into Christ" by baptism. Therefore, these must necessarily be the "baptized believer,"

John 3:18 and Romans 5:1 speak of our justification by faith, but they do not say by faith alone. Mr. Jackson tries to read this thought into the texts but it cannot be so. Paul preached "The obedience of faith" (Rom. 1:5) and thus by the texts he cites we must understand that the obedient believer is meant.

It is equally evident that the one begotten or born in I John 5:1 is an obedient believer, for John says they "love Him that begat," that is, they love God and further he says "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments" (I John 5:3). Therefore, these texts to which he refers, and others like them, invariably refer to the obedient believer.

Again Mr. Jackson's fallacious reasoning is seen as he reasons concerning the blessings of God. These blessings he agrees with me are "in Christ." Then since the word says we are "baptized into Christ" (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27) we do not receive these blessings before we are "baptized into Christ." The only believer who is blessed or ever has been blessed of God is the obedient believer.

Mr. Jackson now goes back to our former discussion, not being satisfied with the misrepresentation he attempted while it was in progress. My contention was then, and I am perfectly satisfied I sustained it, that the Word is the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17) and is, therefore, the instrument used by the Spirit in our conversion. Therefore, it does not follow that when our heart is cut by the word, that we have received the Spirit. In fact, the Bible plainly says that we are to receive the Spirit upon the condition of baptism and therefore not before baptism. Peter says, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). He further says: ". . . the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them 'that obey Him'" (Acts 5:32). Therefore those who hear the word do not receive the Spirit until they are baptized, for his gift is given the obedient believer.

Now we shall briefly refer to his mention of our arguments. MENTION is all that we can call it, for he has in no sense answered or overthrown them. Of course, they being the doctrine of God, the word of God, they can never be overthrown, and they each stand as presented, a bulwark of truth which cannot be overcome.

1. Mr. Jackson's attempt at comparison and illustration is fraught with error. In "He that entereth and taketh a seat," he makes the "entering" comparable to "believing." However, it is by baptism that we enter Christ (Rom. 6:3) and therefore, to be a true comparison, he

would have to say, "He that believeth in an airplane and entereth shall be delivered." Now you can see the absurdity of his position. Of course in this case, as in that of the believer in Christ, there are certain other considerations to a safe arrival at our destination, but these are not the subject of discussion at this time. If Mr. Jackson desires discussion on the apostasy question, he can have it, he knows; for I offered to discuss that question with him, and he declined the invitation.

Now belief in the airplane as a satisfactory means of transportation does not bring one to his desired destination. He must enter the plane that is going there. In like manner, "faith alone" in the Christ does not bring one to heaven, but the believer must "enter" the Christ and this is accomplished by baptism. Therefore Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Why? Because that believer who is baptized thus comes "into Christ" by baptism. (Rom. 6:3).

2. Concerning the teachings of Christ during His life, Mr. Jackson should full well know that these constitute His covenant, testament or will. Moreover, he should know that this covenant or testament did not become effective until His death. "For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him who made it. . . it doth never avail while he that made it liveth" (Heb. 9:16, 17). Moreover, anyone can see by reading John 3:3-5 that only one birth, one baptism, is mentioned. This is a birth of "water and the Spirit." Not a baptism in water and a baptism in Spirit; not a birth of water and a birth of Spirit, no indeed, but one birth, a birth of "water and the Spirit" and therefore according to the teaching of that Spirit (Acts 2:38) a baptism in water at the command of Christ, said command being made known by the Spirit.

Mr. Jackson says baptism is a burial, not a birth. Does he not know that being buried with Him in baptism, we are also raised, and that this is our birth from above to that newness of life? (Rom. 6:5)

3. Mr. Jackson's reasoning on Acts 2:38 concedes the proposition. He says that "eis" means "with reference to." Therefore, "baptize (eis) with reference to the remission of sins," whereas the Baptist position has always been that baptism has no reference to the remission of sins. Now the only question is, what is the reference to remission of sins to be found in baptism? I reply it is the same as that of the blood of Christ, since identical language is used of this in Matt. 26:28. Now it is evident to all that Christ poured out His blood "in order to obtain" the remission of our sins and this is the "reference to remission of sins" which is found in baptism.

4. On Acts 22:16 Mr. Jackson says the blood washes away sins. I agree with that, but inasmuch as Ananias said to Saul, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," it is evident that the blood of Christ is reached when we are "baptized into His death," and therefore we do not receive the remission or washing away of our sins before baptism.

5. According to Rom. 6:3-5, we are buried with Christ and raised with Him in a true likeness of His death, burial and resurrection. All that He did was to obtain the remission of our sins. So it is that Paul says, "raised for our justification." (Rom. 4:25). Had He not been raised from the dead He could not be our Saviour, and thus in our "obedience to that form of doctrine" we re-enact these events of His life, death, burial and resurrection. Thus, as His being raised was for our justification, we are not justified till we are raised with Him from the grave of baptism, that we may walk in newness of life.

6. In Gal.3:27, Mr. Jackson would do well to remember his grammar. There is such a thing as "tense" in verbs, and he would do well to remember that. Thus he would not fall into such grievous errors in argument. Paul says, "For ye are (present tense) all sons of God" . . . "For as many of you as were (past tense) baptized into Christ." Thus anyone who reads can understand that we and they are now sons of God by virtue of our having been baptized into Christ at some time in the past, and he who has not been baptized into Christ cannot lay claim to being the son of God as we and these are.

7. Water baptism is certainly mentioned in Eph. 5:26, and of course has to do with our justification, for it is the "washing away of regeneration," and without it we cannot be regenerated.

8. In Titus 3:5, 6, it was God's mercy that appeared. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done." However, when God had shown His mercy to the world by sending Christ, Paul says now that "He saved us through the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Then, since baptism is that "washing of regeneration," we are saved by it, as Peter also says in I Peter 3:21.

Mr. Jackson says "baptism is a work of righteousness," and in that concedes the proposition again, for Peter says, "He that . . . worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him." Therefore, baptism is that which makes us acceptable to God, as per Mr. Jackson, and must necessarily be "in order to obtain" the remission of sins.

9. Peter simply says we are saved by baptism and by this act procure a good conscience. Mr. Jackson says baptism does not save

and that a good conscience is procured before baptism. I prefer to take Peter rather than Mr. Jackson, for Peter is on my side in affirming the proposition which we now discuss. Eight were saved by water and in the ark, while we today are saved in baptism, a true figure.

It would be fine if God could give Mr. Jackson permission to write a new Bible. Then he could, as he desires, put into Jas. 2:24 "before others" and into Romans 5:1 he could insert "before God" and ever after he had thus written his Bible, he could prove his contention by his Bible.

In our first affirmative we asked Mr. Jackson two questions (1) IS baptism a command of God? (2) Is baptism part of the gospel? When he finds time to reply, we will be happy to show the same consideration for his questions.

Thus it is that our nine Scriptural affirmations of the proposition stand as given in the first affirmative, unshaken and unshakable. We have answered his quibbling and await with interest his future efforts as we stand upon the unmoving foundation of God's word, which clearly and forcibly teaches that the baptism of the penitent believer is for (in order to obtain) the remission of sins.

Jackson's Second Negative

Mr. Smith and Readers:

We regret Mr. Smith could not advance any new arguments in his second affirmative, neither did he attempt to answer my questions —(1) Is baptism a work? (2) Is the believer's faith made perfect in baptism? (3) Can one be saved without a perfect faith? Answers, please. Neither has he made good his scurrilous charge that Baptists become prison inmates as a consequence of their doctrine of security of the believer and depravity. Make it good, Mr. Smith, or apologize.

His doctrine must be of God, avers Mr. Smith, because I charged that his "gospel in water" damned in hell all who were not baptized, as he says Christ's word only can judge. Tut! Roman Catholics teach all must be Catholics or be damned in hell. I suppose, then, Smith would say because they damn in hell everybody but Catholics, their doctrine must be of God! No wonder Smith teaches everybody will perish in hell forever unless baptized into the church of which he is a member. His father Campbell borrowed that doctrine from the Catholics.

He says I seek to prejudice your minds by referring to the boys in the foxholes. Not so; I am telling the plain truth. His position would send to hell everybody in a foxhole, even though he prayed, repented, believed, confessed, wholeheartedly desired the love and mercy of God in salvation, yet he must die and go to hell, if Smith or some one were not present to baptize him with the specific purpose of obtaining salvation. Rotten? Yes, to the very core. That's the kind of doctrine that is easy and pleasant to expose. Although the thief on the cross (Luke 23:39-43) was heard by the Lord in his cry for mercy and was assured a place in paradise, yet our boys on the firing line must go to torment unless baptized. Such doctrine puts salvation in the hands of the preacher instead of Christ. Wake up, Smith, wake up; pull the veil of such Romish traditions from your eyes before it is too late. I challenge you, Mr. Smith, to answer: Will your son, who you say is in the foxholes, go to torment unless he has been baptized "in order to obtain" remission of sins, and can he be saved if he dies bearing arms for his country? Watch out. Mr. Smith is an able man, but he is not able to construct a good house of rotten material.

As to the thief on the cross, he was saved without baptism. But we are told he was under the law of Moses. What? Was it easier

to be saved under the law than under the grace? The thief came to Christ, not the law, for salvation.

He thinks "washing of regeneration" (Titus 3:5) is baptism and answers to the "water of purification" (Num. 8:9) under the law. Nonsense. We'll let Paul answer him: "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean,, sanctifieth to the PURIFYING OF THE FLESH, how much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." (Heb. 9:13, 14). Blood before water, my friend, is the Bible plan. The man-made scheme puts water before the blood, "The Gospel of Water." "Washing of regeneration" is baptism, says Smith. Without this washing there its no sonship, he thinks. I suppose when his son was born, he refused to own him as a son until he was washed! Shame on you, friend Smith.

The only reply he made to my argument based on Jno. 6:37; 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 5:1; I Jno. 5:1, was they speak of "obedient believers." Yes, indeed, but they truly believed BEFORE baptism, and had everlasting life, were passed from death unto life, and were assured they SHALL NOT COME INTO CONDEMNATION before baptism. Even Mr. Smith should understand so plain a language.

Great Caesar! Just listen, please. In my first negative, I proved by Acts 2:41 that people received the Spirit before baptism, and were therefore saved before baptism. If, as Mr. Smith's people teach, the Spirit is IN the word, one cannot receive the word of God without receiving the Spirit. The stroke addled him, and he comes back by saying the word is the sword of the Spirit which is used to "cut the heart" of the sinner. Yes, the word is the sword of the Spirit, not of the preacher, but Smith's idea seems to be the Spirit reaches his sword from one side of the creek to the sinner on the other side, cuts his heart and then points to the middle of the creek where he may obtain pardon. "I'll meet you in the creek, I'll meet you in the creek," cries the Spirit. You must wade into the creek, or wade into the flames of hell. "At the creek, at the creek, where I first saw the light, and the burden of my heart rolled away; it was there by water I received my sight, and now I go 'sputing' all the day." Ah, Mr. Smith, you are too talented a man to be blinded with such traditions of men. Peter lets us know that Cornelius received the Spirit before baptism. (Acts 10:47). The Spirit and Cornelius were together on the same side of the creek before baptism.

Now let's joyfully follow him in his ramblings according to his numbered paragraphs. Remember he is in the lead, however he made

no new argument in his second affirmative. As I answered every argument (?) in my first negative, I beg our readers' patience for Mr. Smith with the hope he may do better yet.

1. Mark 16:16. My illustration he fumbled: "He that entereth an airplane and taketh a seat shall be delivered; but he that entereth not shall be killed." Taking a seat is an effect of entering the plane, not a condition of deliverance. So baptism is an effect of faith, not a condition of salvation. Try again, Mr. Smith.

2. He says John 3:5 is the testament of the Testator which "did not become effective until His death." (Heb. 9:16, 17). Thank you kindly, for this forever knocks out your Pentecostal salvation theory, that is, there was no remission of sin until the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection, for here he lets us know the testament became effective at CHRIST'S DEATH. But the will of God in salvation was just as effective while Christ lived on earth as after His death. While on earth, He had personal supervision of His work, but on leaving He committed gospel preaching to His people with the Holy Spirit as administrator. Jesus told the woman of Sychar that the hour "now is" when people could worship the Father in spirit and in truth (Jno. 4:23). She did not have to wait until Christ died. While He yet was on earth, He said to the woman in Simon's house: "Thy sins are forgiven. . . . Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." She had (1) forgiveness of sin; (2) salvation; (3) peace, and all this BEFORE CHRIST'S death. Was that not His will? And so did Nicodemus. Jesus did not tell him how to be saved and then make him wait until Pentecost to be saved. Such nonsense! And if "born of water" means baptism, "born of the Spirit" means baptism of the Spirit. Again if born means baptism in verse 5, it also means baptism in the other connected verses. And so let's read it in this light: "Except a man be baptized again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. . . . Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be baptized? . . . Except a man be baptized of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is baptized of the flesh is flesh; and that which is baptized of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be baptized again." How ridiculous a position. How many baptisms does Smith want anyway?

3. "Baptist position has always been that baptism has no reference to the remission of sins," says Smith. Wrong as usual. Baptism, as taught by Baptists, relates to the remission of sins as declaring it, not procuring it. And this is the meaning of Acts 2:38. Try it again, Mr. Smith.

4. He says that he agrees with me that the blood of Christ washes away sins, but it takes place in the water. I told you he put water before the blood, but Peter put the blood before water. (Acts 10:47). Honestly, which one shall we believe, Peter or Smith? Well, I'll accept Peter. Smith's position is priestcraft pure and simple.

5. Rom. 6:3-5 represents a baptism as a likeness or picture of the burial and resurrection of Christ and also of our own, but no one can be saved by a picture. Being dead to sin, and therefore freed from sin (Rom. 6:7), one is buried WITH Christ, not in order to find Him.

6. Gal. 3:27 plainly shows that those who were first children of God by faith (verse 26) were baptized. The "grammar" here is very plain, for it shows the ones in verse 27 baptized were the ones saved through faith first. Thanks, as that is good Baptist doctrine.

Nos. 7-9 need no further comment, as my answers in my first negative are overlooked by Mr. Smith. But I call on him again to produce the Baptist "scholars" he says are with him on Titus 3:5. He says: "Peter simply says we are saved by baptism and by this act procure a good conscience." Peter says NOTHING OF THE KIND. Baptism saves in a "like figure"; the family of Noah entered the ark of safety, then the water was applied, and in baptism Peter says is an answer of a good conscience, not that a good conscience is procured by baptism. Yes, baptism is a good work, not for the sinner but for the person into whom salvation has been wrought, "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). So in "every nation he that feareth Him (God), and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to God," for God will accept the work of His children. Bring on another one.

No, Jackson does not need to write a new Bible to prove Baptist doctrine, for the reason the writers of the New Testament were members of the churches that were Baptist according to Mr. Smith's father Campbell.

Now his questions: (1) Yes, baptism is a command to the child of God, not the sinner. (2) Is baptism a part of the gospel? No part of the gospel of salvation, but a picture of it. Thank God for the opportunity of exposing this theory of man. Salvation is had at the point of faith as Paul explained to the Philippian jailer. (Acts 16:31). Thus salvation is by grace through faith, not of works (Eph.2:8-10).

Smith's Third Affirmative

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

Mr. Jackson deplores our inability to advance new arguments, but we are glad that none are needed. The nine arguments presented in our first affirmative are all that are needed, for he has not and cannot refute them.

As for his questions: (1) Baptism is the same kind of a work that faith is, a work of God to be performed by man to gain God's approval. (3) We are under no obligation to limit the grace of God. As for his challenge regarding matters introduced in the discussion of the first proposition we are satisfied to leave them where they are. We are completely satisfied with our part of that discussion and of course were confident that he was not satisfied with his. We do not intend to allow him to make the present discussion a rehash of the former one. He will do well to devote his time and space to the present proposition and agreements.

Mr. Jackson again says my doctrine "damned in hell" and thereby confesses that it is of God. Note, please, his vain effort to compare it with Catholicism. It is not that he says I say I will "damn in hell" those not accepting it. Now only the Word of God can do that so he confesses that my doctrine is the Word of God.

Now, Mr. Jackson would make a great "to do" about the foxholes and firing lines. The proposition is not settled upon the basis of our sympathies which he tries to arouse, but the basis of proof is "the Scriptures teach." He will do well to confine himself to that standard. However, for his information, please note John 1:11, 12. "As many as received Him, to them he gave the right (power) to become children of God, even to them that believe on His name." I have faith that anyone believing in Christ will have the opportunity of completing obedience to the will of God and that faith is such that I do not believe the Japanese, Germans or any one else can make a bomb or shell that can kill such a one till he has had the opportunity of doing God's will. When the opportunity comes he may not avail himself of it but he will have the opportunity and until such comes he is preserved by the power of Jehovah.

For Mr. Jackson's information, my boy was baptized before he went to the foxholes and while there has not been engaged in the

destruction of life but in ministering to the dying and wounded on the firing line. However, what he has done or is doing or will ever do will not affect the teaching of the word of God and that is the basis of proof in this discussion.

Mr. Jackson thinks that the "washing of regeneration" cannot be baptism and can have no place in the purification of the soul. Please note, Mr. Jackson, that our souls are "purified by obedience to the truth" (I Pet. 1:22) and that purification is "in Christ.". We are baptized "into His death" (Rom. 6:3). His blood was shed with the water in His death (John 19:34) and to reach the benefits of that death we must reach the blood in water by being baptized into His death. Therefore Heb. 9:13, 14 in no way excludes baptism for the remission of sins but rather demands it when we understand all of God's teachings. My son was a son before he was washed after being born but in being born a son of God we are "born of water and Spirit," and therefore the washing is part of the birth and not something which comes after the birth.

John 6:37; 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 5:1; I John 5:1 all have reference to the obedient believer, and to say that they were children of God and saved without obedience is contrary to God's word. Paul says: "Ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. 6:17, 18. "Being then," says Paul. When? When they obeyed they were made servants of righteousness and made free from sin. Therefore, it is an obedient faith that is commanded and that makes us free from sin and servants of righteousness. (Therefore, it is an obedient faith that is contemplated in the verse opening this paragraph).

Mr. Jackson is good at proving things by distorting and wresting what I say. He has had much experience with wresting and distorting the word of God to his own destruction and the destruction of those who hear him. (See II Pet. 3:16). This is a characteristic, says Peter, of the unlearned and unstable. He wrests my words, but I am not surprised since he also wrests the Master's words attempting to make me show that Acts 2:41 teaches the Spirit is received before baptism. I sincerely believe that the word is the "sword of the Spirit" (Eph. 6:17), but have never taught that the word is the Spirit in the sense he tries to make you believe I have said it. It is by the word that the Spirit operates in our hearts and it is God's plan that the word be preached by "earthen vessels." Mr. Jackson does not like God's plan, but I am content with it and all of his ridicule cannot affect me.

In the case of Cornelius the Spirit was not given to save, but as an evidence to the Jews that the Gentiles were subjects of the gospel. Cornelius and his household were saved by the words of Peter (Acts 11:14), and it is evident that the Spirit came upon them as Peter "began to speak" (Acts 11:15). Therefore, the Spirit came before they heard the words by which they were saved and had nothing to do with their salvation, but was for the purpose stated above and was so used by Peter in the eleventh Chapter of Acts. Cornelius and his household were saved just as everyone else is saved and that is in the "obedience of faith."

Mr. Jackson thinks he has answered (?) my arguments, but I am satisfied with those arguments for they are the word of God. He would like to lead me off of them for he knows he can do nothing with them. They are the word of God and when he has finished all his rantings and wrestings they are still there as when he began. They will be sufficient for this discussion and he need not look for new ones to be introduced, but he will have to look at these every installment of this discussion and he will never be able to overthrow them. When Mr. Jackson is dead and gone to judgment, they will still be the same and these very words of Christ will judge and condemn him in that day for he knows that in his teachings and practice as a Baptist he does not have respect for these words of Christ.

Again we list them and notice his attempts to wrest these Scriptures.

1. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). Who shall be saved? The man or woman who believes and is baptized. No amount of sophistry or illogical reasoning will change it. His illustration is not a parallel as I have shown before as he makes "entereth" parallel with "believeth," but we do not enter Christ by belief but by baptism. (See Rom. 6:3 and Gal. 3:27). Both of these passages say: "Baptized into Christ," and that is the only way of entering Him.

2. Except one be born anew he cannot see ... "Except one be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter" (John 3:1-5). This bothers Mr. Jackson and he spends much time on it. Christ had power while on earth to grant the forgiveness of sins, but this was only the promise of redemption when His blood was shed as it had been for the centuries before. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission and the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin. Therefore, Christ's blood had to be shed before sins were actually taken away.

However, this passage was included in his will and is the same as Mark 16:16. It is not two births or baptisms as Mr. Jackson well knows. It is "born of water and the Spirit" and is not "born of water and born of Spirit." One birth is all that is spoken of here and that is of "water and the Spirit." Taught by that Spirit and given faith by the hearing of His words we are in the obedience of that faith, "born of water and the Spirit" and enter the kingdom of heaven.

Mr. Jackson tries his hand on "now is" (John 4:23), but it that shows that Christ's will became effective before His death, then "now is" in John 5:25 places the resurrection during the personal ministry of Christ. Now, Mr. Jackson, you know too much to make such a blunder and ought not to repeat it.

3. "Repent ye and be baptized. . . unto the remission of your sins" (Acts 2:38). Here is my proposition set forth and declared in the words of the Holy Spirit and they stand forever. Mr. Jackson says, "Baptism, as taught by Baptists, relates to the remission of sins as declaring it, not procuring it. And this is the meaning of Acts 2:38." Now, Mr. Jackson, you know, and if you are honest you must admit, that the same phrase "unto remission of sins" is found in Matt. 26:28. Here it is spoken with reference to the blood of Christ, while in Acts 2:38 it is with reference to baptism. If you say that the meaning in Acts is "not procuring the remission of sins," then you must say it in Matt. 26:28 for the phrase is the same in the Greek and in the English. Therefore, you are saying with emphasis that the blood of Christ was not shed to procure the remission of our sins. Baptists, how long are you going to stand for that? Or is it possible that you will accept anything, no matter how putrid to escape believing that baptism is unto remission of sins?

4. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins" (Acts 22:16). To this he did not and cannot reply. This teaches the truth of the proposition I affirm.

5. "We who were baptized in Christ Jesus were baptized into His death" (Rom 6:3). To this he did not and cannot reply. To say that baptism is not essential to salvation is to say that salvation is outside of Christ. This is impossible for we read "in none other is there salvation" (Acts 4:12).

6. "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, did put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27). Mr. Jackson caring nothing for accuracy or truth but seeking victory, changes God's word to suit himself. He says: "Gal. 3:27 plainly shows that those who were first children of God by faith were baptized." Friends, that is not so. Verse 26 says: "We are all sons of God." Notice, please, it is "are" not "were," as

Mr. Jackson would have it. He must have it "were" to sustain his proposition so he readily changes it to suit his will. Paul's teaching is that those who "are" (present tense) children of God, "were" (past tense) baptized. This is correct for in this dispensation no one has ever become a child of God without being "baptized into Christ."

7. "Having cleansed it by the washing of water and with the word" (Eph. 5:26). No answer to this and how could there be. It simply states the way of cleansing and is contrary to Baptist doctrine and belief.

8. "He saved us by the washing of regeneration" (Tit. 3:5). This is baptism and I would like for Mr. Jackson to stake his scholarship (?) on it not being so. No one will go further than he in denying it and no one will fall harder than he when he docs fall.

9. "Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism." Peter says it saves you. Mr. Jackson says it docs not. If you want to trust Jackson you may do so, but I would rather trust the apostle whose words are bound in heaven (Matt. 16:19).

Mr. Jackson tries to say that all the writers of the Bible were members of the Baptist Church. Strange indeed when it was not established for more than fifteen hundred years after the last one of them died and not one of them ever made mention of it. Will Mr. Jackson please show, this side of Christ's death, where the Bible ever says a child of God was baptized.

Jackson's

Third Negative

Mr. Smith and Readers:

Mr. Smith not only fails to produce any arguments in addition to the ones in his first affirmative, BUT PROMISES NO MORE: As I have already exploded all that he has to offer in defense of his "gospel in water," I shall settle down to an expose of his "Campbellized" plan of salvation. Get ready for it.

He gives faltering answers to my questions. (1) Is baptism a work? His answer: "Baptism is the same kind of work that faith is (Jno. 6:29)." How¹ absurd. Jesus answered in Jno. 6:29 to offset the people's idea of WORKING to get salvation. Paul shows that faith and works are different when he says: "But to him that worketh not, BUT BELIEVETH" (Rom. 4:5). As he admits baptism is a work, salvation does not come by it, as Titus 3:5 says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done." (2) Is the believer's faith made perfect by baptism? His answer: "Baptism is one step in the perfecting of faith," then it is not the same work as faith, that faith is not a work, as he claims. (3) Can one be saved without a perfect faith? His answer: "We are under no obligation to limit the grace of God." What a dodge. Ah, he knows better than to tackle it. Answer, please.

Because I charge that his doctrine "damned in hell" everybody except members of his group, he said it must be the truth. Tut. As I said Smith damns in hell those who are not of his faith, I suppose, then, Smith must be Jesus Christ!

Mr. Smith is afraid of the "foxholes," for from there, according to his doctrine, all our boys in them must go to torment unless baptized "in order to obtain remission of sins." There is no hope of heaven for them outside of the water, he claims.

He says my argument is based on sympathy. Not so. The boys in the foxholes is a reality and their death is a reality and so is their meeting God a reality, but according to Smith they all must perish in hell unless baptized. Pity!

Astoundingly he says he believes all who have believed on Christ will have a chance of baptism, and the "Japanese, Germans, or any one else can not kill such a one till he has had an opportunity of doing God's will." Laughable. He believes in the security of the believer up

to the middle of the creek, but after baptism one may apostatize and go to hell even before he wades out of the creek. Great logic! No, sir, all torment, including the Japanese and Germans, cannot turn him from the creek. Thank God for that "noble confession." Why not come all the way with the Baptists and accept the "security of the believer" after baptism as well as before baptism? If Satan cannot prevent the believer reaching baptism, why can he prevent him reaching heaven? Great goodness! My friend, why not give up your man-made "gospel in water?" If I believed in baptism that strongly, I'd swim the Jordan till "doom's day." The thief on the cross became a believer high above the water mark, still we are sure he was not taken down for baptism. John 1:11-12 does not have one drop of water in it. It teaches one must accept Christ's deity before he can be saved.

Mr. Smith dodges my question by saying his son was baptized before he went to the "foxholes," and is not there for the destruction of life. The question is: Can one be saved who bears arms in defense of his country? Answer, please. He is on record as saying: 'The true spirit of Christ and the spirit of a warrior are two different spirits and cannot abide in the same heart' (The Smith-Jackson Debate on Depravity, p. 86).

His effort to evade my demand for proof of his false charge against Baptists by saying that belonged to the other debate will avail him nothing. He charged that Baptist doctrine of depravity and security of the believer made people criminals. I demanded the proof in our first debate, but he failed to produce it. If he does not, let him be man enough to say so and retract his ugly charge.

Mr. Smith thinks "washing of regeneration" (Titus 3:5) is baptism because I Peter 1:22 says the soul is purified by "obedience to the truth." Yes, the truth of the plan of salvation, but baptism is no part of the plan. If all truth is involved, then one's soul is not purified when he is baptized for the reason all of the divine commands are not reached in baptism. Try again. He thinks water is necessary because when Christ was crucified water came out of His body with blood. Nonsense. If that means anything, the blood being mentioned first and coming into contact with it first, we are saved before we reach the water. Fine. The Israelites came under the blood the night of the Passover before they reached the baptism in the Red Sea. (Ex. 12:12-13; I Cor. 10:1-2). We are baptized or buried WITH CHRIST (Rom. 6:4), not to find Him. We are really with Him as we go down into the water, and as we are dead before burial, we are freed from sin (Rom. 6:7), and if freed from sin we are saved before baptism. That settles it forever.

He quotes Rom. 6:17, 18 to prove the believer must be obedient. Who said he is not obedient? But what must he obey to be saved? If all the commands, then he is not saved when he is baptized, as other commands follow baptism. At the point of faith the "obedient one is saved" (Jno. 6:40), not after he reaches the water, not after he reaches the Lord's Supper, etc., as Paul says we are CREATED in Christ Jesus UNTO good works (Eph. 2:8-10). We reach Christ and are created or made a new creature BEFORE we take up the "good works." Even Mr. Smith should be able to see that. Notice, if you please; when one believes in Christ: (1) He is not condemned, Jno. 3:18; (2) has everlasting life and is passed from death unto life, Jno. 5:24; (3) has peace and is justified before God, Rom. 5:1; (4) knows God and has eternal life, Jno. 17:3; (5) has the witness of the Spirit that he is a child of God, I John 5:10; Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:16; (6) is horn of God, I Jno. 5:1; (7) his hunger and thirst are gone, Jno. 6:35; (8) his heart is purified, Acts 15:9. All these blessings come to the "obedient" one at the point of faith in Christ, and as he believes before baptism, he is saved before baptism. That should be enough to convince any man with sound reason. Mr. Smith's cry that it is the "obedient" believer who is saved gets him nowhere, for we find one is "obedient" at the point of faith. Why would the Lord save the "obedient" one for doing the work of baptism and not the work of the Lord's Supper! If any work is required, why not all works?

He says I wrest what he says about the Spirit in the word. That is his doctrine whether or not he will acknowledge it. He knows I have him tied. Answer this, Mr. Smith. Is the Spirit in the word? If so, in what sense? If He is in the word, as his people teach, then they that "gladly received the word" at Pentecost (Acts 2:41), received the Spirit also before baptism. Smith will never wiggle out of this. Watch and see.

Don't laugh too loud. He avers the Spirit came upon Cornelius before he heard the word, and in the same breath, says it was when Peter began to speak to them. Was Cornelius deaf at the first? Talk about wresting the Bible to one's destruction. Here is a plain case of twisting and dodging to keep from drowning. The Spirit was received by Cornelius and his household BEFORE they were baptized. They spoke with tongues and magnified God before baptism, (Acts 10:46). Then, notice. THEN (when?) after they spoke with tongues and MAGNIFIED GOD," Peter said: "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts 10:47). "Magnify" is from the Greek word "megaluno," meaning "extol, laud, praise highly." Were they doing this

before they were saved? If so, Mr. Smith will have to explain the secret of their joy before salvation.

No, Jackson did not blunder when he proved by John 4:23 that "now is" is applied to that very time Jesus spoke the words; and equally so "now is" in John 5:25 is applied to that very time too as well as our own day. Some people heard His voice and were raised spiritually. (See Col. 3:1). "TODAY if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts" (Heb. 3:7). Then the hour is coming when the dead in their graves will hear His voice and live. No, Jackson DID NOT BLUNDER.

Twice already I have answered his supposed arguments on Mark 16:16; Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27, Jno. 3:5; Acts 2:38; Matt. 26:28; Acts 22:16; Eph. 5:26; Titus 3:5; I Pet. 3:21. Why repeat the answers when he advances nothing new in his replies to my answers? Wake up, Mr. Smith, and defend your doctrine, if you can. Surely his people are expecting more of him than they are getting.

On John 3:5 he says there is but one birth. Yes, there is but one birth, but if born of water is baptism, there are two births, as the birth of the Spirit is also mentioned. "And" connecting water and Spirit is explicative, showing that the water of life is meant, therefore the spiritual birth at the point of faith is understood. (See Jno. 3:14-16; 4:10; 7:37; Rev. 22:17).

My opponent wants me to show where any child of God was baptized this side of Christ's death. Why this side of His death? Does he admit there were some before His death? Well, I'll just accommodate him. Acts 8:37. The eunuch confessed BEFORE baptism that he believed Jesus to be the Son of God. Hear I John 4:15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." The eunuch confessed this very thing before baptism. Therefore he dwelt in God and God dwelt in him BEFORE baptism. There you have it, Mr. Smith.

Yes, the writers of the New Testament were members of Baptist churches, according to Mr. Smith's own father Campbell. He asks for the proof. Here it is: "The Church at Jerusalem was a Baptist Church. . . . the Church at Samaria was a Baptist Church. .. From the apostolic age, to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists, and the practice of Baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced" (A. Campbell, The Campbell-McCalla Debate, pp 177-179). I now challenge him to quote one line of authentic history showing the existence of the so-called "Church of Christ," of which he is a member, before the days of Campbell. No one should expect it. HE CANNOT PRODUCE IT.

I object to my opponent's "gospel of water" because it had its origin not with the Lord, but with Rome. It became prevalent about the commencement of the 3rd century. Waddington, an Episcopal historian, says: "Hence a belief was gaining ground among the converts, and was inculcated among the heathen, that the act of baptism gave remission of all sins committed previously to it." (Church History, p. 37). Neander, in his Church History, testifies that the theory of baptismal salvation gained ground at the beginning of the third century, and from it was developed infant baptism. Dr. Timothy Dwight, former, president of Yale, said: "From the Church of Rome this scheme (regeneration inseparably connected with baptism) has spread, with some variations, through several Protestant Churches" (Theology, Vol. 2, p. 515).

Alexander Campbell took baptismal salvation, revamped it a little and set up baptism as a condition of salvation. He testified: "It was in this commonwealth (Kentucky) that this doctrine was first promulged in modern times" (Campbell-Rice Debate, p. 472). Thus Campbell, father of my friend's church, says he was the first in modern times to preach the very doctrine I am joyfully refuting in this debate. Campbell revamped it from the Roman Catholic Church. The doctrine is a tenet of priestcraft, not of Christianity.

May the Lord have mercy on all who are deluded by it.

Smith's

Fourth Affirmative

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

If this debate were to be decided by what can be found in the writings of Protestant and Catholic historians or even on the basis of utterances by one-time Baptist, Alexander Campbell, Mr. Jackson would do right well. However, it is not by these that this debate is to be settled and Mr. Jackson had as well cease and desist from such quotations. He is a great historian and would like to involve all who debate with him in the maze of conflicting claims by various authors. In such a field nothing can be proven and all is, therefore, a waste of time.

The basis of our discussion is "The Scriptures teach" and Mr. Jackson would do well to search the Scriptures for some basis for his denial of the proposition. Of course he does not do this because he cannot find any help there. We have clearly and repeatedly shown that the Scriptures teach our proposition and, therefore, he cannot find its denial there for the Scriptures are not contradictory. He asks for one line of authentic history showing existence of "The Church of Christ" before the days of Campbell. I give him "the churches of Christ salute you" (Rom. 16:16). This is a long time before Campbell and I consider it authentic. Of course Mr. Jackson will reject it for he does not and cannot accept the Bible and hope to sustain his position. Now wouldn't it be fine if Mr. Jackson could find one such line mentioning a Baptist church or Baptist churches then, but not one line of Bible can he find. According to the Bible there is but one church. The Church of Christ is mentioned in the Bible and therefore, there being but one, the Baptist church is never mentioned.

Likewise, he cannot refute the truth that baptism is for (unto) the remission of sins. He attempts to prejudice minds by citing quotations from historians and by this hopes to turn men away from the truth as set forth in God's word. The Bible says, "Be baptized . . . unto the remission of your sins" and Mr. Jackson can never do away with that. He may call it anything he wants to, but still the Bible says it and so long as God says it ever}' attempt he shall make to deny the proposition now under discussion is only a profession of his infidelity.

He goes to Acts 8 to show salvation before baptism. What a ludicrous attempt to distort the word of God. Mr. Jackson should

never have turned here for some of his Baptist brethren might be led to read the full account and forever know that it is in no way in agreement with their Baptist doctrine and ideas. Philip preached "Jesus", not Baptist doctrine, to the man. In preaching Jesus nothing that is peculiar to Baptist churches and doctrine can ever be preached for in all the words and history of Jesus neither is ever mentioned. The man hearing of Jesus did not confess that his sins had been forgiven, did not tell an experience of grace, did not ask for a vote of a church to permit him to be baptized and did not rejoice (shout) before his baptism. This case is entirely out of harmony with Baptist doctrine and practices. This only shows that the church of that day was not a Baptist church, the preaching of that day was not Baptist preaching and the practice of that day was not Baptist practice.

As for this man being converted before baptism, such is impossible. Jesus had said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). Salvation was "in Christ" and no way is revealed by the Scriptures for entering Christ save by being "baptized into Christ" (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27). So this man was not in Christ until he was baptized and any attempt to make some Scriptures seem to teach that he was is a wresting of the Scriptures which some men do to their own destruction and the destruction of those who hear them.

Yes, Jackson did blunder on "now is" in John 4:23. He now seeks to cover up his blunder by saying it means now as well as then, but in doing this he changes his original argument on the quotation and all that he hoped to sustain by his misuse of the Scripture is now entirely lost.

There is a vast difference between Mr. Jackson and the apostle Paul. Paul preached the "obedience of faith," that is, the obedience growing out of and produced by faith, but Mr. Jackson preaches that when one has faith he has already obeyed. He wants to classify baptism along with "good works" and teach that we are baptized as a "good work" after we are "in Christ." I know that we were "created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (Eph. 2:10), but as we have repeatedly shown we are not "in Christ" before baptism. "Faith if it have not works, is dead in itself" (Jas. 2:17). Therefore, faith alone is not the obedience that brings life for it is dead and cannot avail anything. The only faith that has ever wrought a blessing of God is the obedient faith, the faith that leads the believer to walk in obedience to God's commands and thus receive the blessings of faith.

Now, as for running back to the first discussion, I know why Mr. Jackson is not satisfied, but I am perfectly satisfied with that. We have the complete debate for sale at one dollar per copy. Mr. Jackson

will not sell this debate and I know the reason he will not. He is not satisfied with what he did in it and wants no further circulation of his feeble efforts than that which has already been given them. If you want to see why he continues to try to get back into a discussion of the issues there, order a copy of this book and read it. As for me, I am not going to be pulled off the present proposition and get into the discussion of another issue.

Now, Mr. Jackson has tried to class baptism with the "good works" of the Christian life so as to deceive the hearts of those who cannot see through his misapplication. I call your attention now to my first affirmative argument and an enlargement of the same to show the weakness and the absolute untruthfulness of any such interpretation as Mr. Jackson tries to make.

Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). Belief and baptism are equally made the conditions of salvation. Baptism without faith is valueless but equally so is faith without baptism. For any one to sever these and make one of greater significance than the other is to wrest the word of God.

In this passage the principal is: "He. . . shall be saved." Now what "he" is to be saved? It is that "he" which "believeth and is baptized." So far as the words of Jesus are concerned there is no other explanation.

Now to attempt to say that baptism is a "good work" is contrary to all reason. "Good works" are many in the Bible. They are such things as feeding the hungry, visiting the sick, visiting those in prison, caring for widows and orphans, etc. Now is baptism like unto these? Mr. Jackson knows full well that it is not. Here is the essential difference. Baptism is to be received one time and one alone while all "good works" which are to be done by a Christian continue to recur time after time so long as one is a Christian.

Again, Mr. Jackson would compare baptism to certain acts of worship such as the Lord's supper. Baptism is not like unto these for the worship of God is in His kingdom while baptism is the initiatory rite into the kingdom. Again, with these acts of worship as with the "good works" of the Christian life, there is a constant recurrence so long as we are Christians. We do not once partake of the Lord's supper and then forsake such remembrance of the Christ. We do not once pray and then cease from praying. We continue to do these things so long as we are in the world and attempting to live the Christian life. Baptism is different to these for once and only once are we "baptized into Christ."

In Mark 16:16 Jesus has written a check to man. The face value of this check is

eternal salvation. The one to whom this check is issued is to have salvation according to the word of Jesus. Now the question is, to whom is the check payable? The answer is: "He that believeth and is baptized." The man who does not believe cannot lay claim to this salvation. The check which Christ issued is not made payable to the one who "only believes." There must be more than that to secure salvation. There must be "the obedience of faith" so it is made to the one who "believeth and is baptized." No other one can cash this check and in the great judgment day when face value of the check from the Christ will be paid it is only the one who has "believed and been baptized" who shall be saved. Mr. Jackson wants to say that "belief is the key" in this verse because Jesus went on to say "he that believeth not shall be damned," but that in no way excludes baptism as a condition of salvation. "He that believeth not is condemned" (John 3:18). Therefore, it is not necessary to say "and not baptized." The absence of faith is enough to condemn, but the presence of faith is not enough to save. James said: "Faith apart from works is dead." Again he said: "We see that by works a man is justified and not only by faith" (James 2:24).

We might say, "He that eateth and digesteth his food shall grow strong." Now if we want to say the opposite of this it is only necessary to say, "He that eateth not shall weaken and die." It is not necessary to add "and digesteth it not." So it is that Jesus said the absence of faith would condemn, but faith and baptism are both essential to salvation and eternal life.

In attempting to evade the force of this text of Scripture, Mr. Jackson sets up a so-called parallel. He says, "He that entereth a plane and is seated shall be delivered." I have repeatedly shown that this is not parallel for we do not enter Christ by faith. Faith is not parallel with entering but baptism is. Faith in a plane as means of transportation will not get one to his destination until he enters the plane. Faith in Christ will not get one to heaven unless he enters Christ. Twice in the word of God we find the phrase "into Christ" and both times Paul says we are "baptized into Christ" (Rom. 6:3 and Gal. 3:27). Therefore, for the statement to be parallel Mr. Jackson would need to say, "He that believeth in a plane and entereth it shall be delivered." Then will he say that simply believing is enough and you will get to your destination whether you enter the means of transportation or not? You can see how desperate the man has become when he introduces such flimsy and illogical answers.

Likewise in the case of Cornelius he wrests the Scriptures and what I said about them. I said he was to be saved by the "words" (Acts 11:14). The Holy Spirit fell as he began to hear (Acts 11:15). Therefore, before he was saved since it was as he began to hear the thing that was to save him. Mr. Jackson knows the truth about this but only seeks to delude the readers to justify his unscriptural position. Likewise on the security of the believer. I know the believer is secure but think of the things that can happen to faith. What happens when the individual's faith is shipwrecked, fails or is denied?

Jackson's

Fourth Negative

Mr. Smith and Readers:

My opponent begs for mercy as he limply hangs onto the "ropes," but no mercy will be spared in exposing his man-made scheme of salvation. It deserves to be consigned to the dark pit from which it was born. And now watch it flee away.

Four noticeable failures Mr. Smith manifests: 1. He utterly fails to prove his proposition. 2. He fails to produce any new arguments (?) in addition to the ones of his first affirmative. 3. He woefully fails to answer my replies. We all hope his brethren will be patient with him, as he has four more chances. 4. He fails to answer my questions. Why? Ah, he knows why. Here they are: (1) Can one be saved without a perfect faith? (2) Is the Spirit in the word? If so, in what sense? (3) Can one go to heaven who dies bearing arms for his country, even if he has repented, believed, confessed and has been baptized "in order to obtain" the remission of sins? And I add the fourth question: Do you, Mr. Smith, baptize a child of God, or a child of the devil? Watch for his answers.

I have repeatedly asked him either to make good his charge that Baptist doctrine of depravity and security of the believer makes people criminals, or retract his ugly charge. He refuses even to notice it. So we shall set him down as a wilful falsifier. And with the fall of "champion" Smith, we break up the habit of two-by-four Campbellite preachers who trot over the country peddling this falsehood on Baptists.

Dodging my challenge that he quote one line of authentic history proving the existence of the so-called "Church of Christ," of which he is a member, before the days of Campbell, he quotes Rom. 16:16: "The churches of Christ salute you." Yes, Christ's churches, not Campbell's as Mr. Smith's father Campbell started his church 1767 years after Paul wrote the book of Romans. That was a Baptist church, friend Smith to which Paul wrote, like the Jerusalem church which your father said was Baptist also.

No, we are not trying to decide this debate by the "writings of Protestant or Catholic historians, or even on the basis of utterances by one-time Baptist, Alexander Campbell," but as Mr. Smith challenged me, I produced the historical evidence. Then he whimpers.

Take your medicine like a man, friend Smith. If you don't, I'll be obliged to hold your nose and pour it down your throat. It may taste bad now, but maybe it will help your system by purging out the Romish doctrine of baptismal salvation. Notice, he says "one-time Baptist, Alexander Campbell." I challenge him to show where Campbell ever retracted the quotation I gave from him even after the Baptists kicked him out of their fold!

Mr. Smith says I cannot refute the truth that baptism is for (unto) the remission of sins. Why does he say "unto" when the original proposition reads "in order to obtain?" In his paper, he changed the verbiage of the proposition by adding "unto" to it. Did he not know that I would catch up with him? He would like to get away from "in order to obtain," for he knows he has been driven to the wall on it. For argument sake, grant that "eis" is "unto", then we could say "unto a DECLARATION of remission", not "unto the receiving of remission." There you are. Try again. But "eis," in the connection involved, means "with reference to."

Yes, sir, Acts 8th Chapter, is good Baptist doctrine, as the eunuch confessed BEFORE baptism that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and I John 4:15 says whoever docs that, God dwells in him and he dwells in God. This mutual indwelling took place BEFORE baptism, therefore the eunuch was saved BEFORE baptism. Smith says the eunuch did not "rejoice (shout)" before baptism, as he says Baptists do. How docs he know he did not? If he believed with ALL his heart and confessed Jesus, do you not think he was happy? Just two chapters over, Cornelius and his household magnified or praised God BEFORE BAPTISM. Let my opponent tell us if the Spirit of God or the spirit of the devil caused them to praise God.

Let the reader turn to John 4:23 and 5:25 and decide for himself if D. N. Jackson blundered, as Smith charges, by saying both the spiritual resurrection, which takes place now, and the future bodily resurrection are spoken of. Any fair-minded Bible reader will say I am right.

I classify baptism with "good works," avers Mr. Smith. Yes, indeed; and Mr. Smith says it is a good work, even claiming faith is a good work. If baptism cannot be classified as "good works," as Mr. Smith now contradicts a former statement in saying, because it is not to be performed but once, why does he claim faith is a work, since he says it may be repeated as many times as one may "apostatize?" If baptism is the same kind of work as he says faith is, why is it, as he claims, a saved man may lose his faith and be lost again, and must

have faith the second, third or fourth time to be saved again, but still he is not to be baptized BUT ONCE? And of all contradictions, he quotes James to prove that WORKS are necessary to salvation. What works, if you please? Do all works end in baptism? If not, then one is not saved in baptism, according to his position.

He says "once and only once are we baptized into Christ." If one loses his salvation, as Smith teaches is possible, is he not out of Christ? And if baptism is the only way one can enter Christ, how can he get back into Christ without being baptized again? Answer, please.

But if one can get back into Christ without baptism, then as sure as you live baptism is not the only way to enter Christ. If one can-enter into Christ the second time by faith without baptism, when he is in even a worse state than at first, why cannot he enter the first time by faith without baptism?

Jackson is not satisfied with the first debate, says Smith, because he refers to it. Yes, thoroughly satisfied, and that makes me want to refer to it. If I were as ashamed of it as Smith is of his futile efforts, I would want to forget it too. He charges that I will not sell our first debate. I have sold the book, but as he forces me to say what I shall say, I have made no particular effort to sell the book for the reason he was unfair in his business dealings. While he proposed to publish the book himself, he REFUSED to let me read the proof before it went to press, and then only allowed me the magnificent (?) sum of TEN CENTS per book above the dealer's rate while I did half the work in preparing it. High-handed policy and hoggishness! Let him play fair with me and see what will be done. For the sake of Bible truth in the book, however, I am selling it, and shall continue doing so.

My opponent is evidently guided by a slogan similar to the one once seen over the door of a blacksmith shop—"All kinds of twisting and turning done in this house." One time he says the Spirit came upon Cornelius BEFORE he heard the word, and at another time he says it happened as the apostle BEGAN TO SPEAK. As the Bible does not contradict itself, the time element of "began" in Acts 11:15 is explained by 10:44: "WHILE Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which HEARD the word." It was during Peter's sermon that the Spirit came not before but after they heard. That's sufficient for all except blind guides. Anyway, the Spirit was received by them before baptism. As the world cannot receive the Spirit (John 14:17), they were not of the world, hence saved before baptism.

If it were not a serious matter, I would laugh heartily at my opponent's entanglement with regard to his position on the "security of the believer" up to the middle of the creek. He affirms that all hell, including the bombs of the Japanese and Germans, cannot keep the believer from being baptized. When I urged his acknowledgment of the "security of the believer" after baptism as well as before, he says he cannot for the reason the believer might lose his faith. Well, why cannot he lose his faith before baptism if he can after baptism? If God, despite all hell and torment, sees to it that the believer does not lose his faith before baptism, why docs He not also sec to it that he will not lose it after baptism? Friend Smith, you know you are tied hand and foot. Why is God better to the believer who you say is not saved than to the believer who is saved? Explain this, please. If God will guide him with unfaltering faith to the creek, why will He not also guide him with a like faith to heaven? Is the creek more precious than heaven? No wonder my opponent affirms there is no salvation out of the creek.

Now to his "sugar-stick" on Mark 16:16, and notice that he leaves his other "sugar sticks" off. He's learning. The answer to his quibble on this one is easy, as it is to all of them. His illustration: "He that eateth and digesteth his food shall grow strong; but he that eateth not shall weaken and die." What an illustration! Does he not know there is no parallel in it with Mark 16:16? One cannot digest his food without eating, but he can be baptized without believing. Goodbye, "Katy barred the door." My illustration holds good: "He that entereth an aeroplane and taketh a scat shall be delivered; but he that entereth not shall be killed." Smith says one cannot believe into a plane. I said nothing of the kind. I said he ENTERED the plane. Entering the plane represents entering Christ by faith, and then taking a seat represents being baptized. Taking a seat is an effect of entering the plane, not a condition of it. He affirms that the only way to center Christ is by baptism. We know he teaches such putrescible doctrine, but it is far from the truth. Such a teaching gives glory to the water, not to faith, not to repentance, not to blood, not to Christ. As explained twice already, Rom. 6:3 and Gal. 3:27 show that we are actually in Christ by faith and then enter Him symbolically by baptism. His illustration of Christ's check for salvation being good only if baptism is included is laughable. A water-soaked check! Strange the Lord offered a bogus check of salvation to the thief on the cross; to the woman at Jacob's well (John 4); to the prostitute woman (Luke 7:47-50); to Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10); and Paul offered it to the jailer (Acts 16:30-31). According to Smith the check was bogus because not one time was baptism mentioned as a condition of salvation. The

check was made "payable" to them without baptism being specified as a requirement for its genuineness.

In this connection notice that Paul says: "I have begotten you through the gospel" (I Cor. 4:15) and that he did without baptism. (Sec I Cor. 1:14-16). "Begotten" is from the Greek word "gennao," meaning "to bring to life." He brought them to life WITHOUT BAPTISM. There's a genuine "check" without baptism, if you please. Notice: (1) The believer is begotten, I John 5:1. We believe before baptism. Therefore we are begotten of God before baptism.

(2) The one begotten is freed from sin, I John 3:9. He is begotten before baptism. Therefore he is freed from sin before baptism.

(3) The begotten one overcomes the world. I John 5:4. He is begotten before baptism. Therefore he overcomes the world before baptism.

(4) The begotten one is out of Satan's reach to destroy, I John 5:18. He is begotten before baptism. Therefore he is out of Satan's reach to destroy before baptism. There's the genuine check, sir, while nut goes your "gospel in water."

It is a travesty on the word of God to teach his doctrine. The first one baptized "in order to obtain" the remission of sins, as set up by Campbell and his coadjutors, was Robert Amend, on November 18, 1827, by Walter Scott, which was done as an experiment (Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 209), and to this day preachers like Mr. Smith have been experimenting on the souls of the poor lost men. Not Peter, not John, not Paul, not the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, but ROBERT AMEND was the first ever to receive the kind of check my opponent hands out which is an imitation of the "check" which the old mother of Harlots has been writing since A. D. 251. There's your "check," Mr. Smith, take it.

Smith's

Fifth Affirmative

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

My doctrine is the Bible and Mr. Jackson, Satan, nor any other of his servants shall ever cause it to flee away. Jesus said: "My words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35). Therefore, regardless of boasting and crowing, Mr. Jackson makes no progress in his attempt to cause the word of God to flee away.

In his fourth negative, Mr. Jackson asserts that I have: (1) Utterly failed to prove the proposition. I will let the readers continue to be the judge of that, but have never felt the need to resort to such braggadocio. (2) He says I have failed to produce new arguments. Why should I when the nine presented in my first affirmative shall stand even when the earth and heavens shall pass away. (3) He says I have failed to answer his replies. Here again I let the readers judge and a careful examination will disprove his statement. (4) He says I fail to answer his questions. I deny his charge for I have answered all questions that pertain to our present discussion. I have no intention of making the present discussion a re-hash of the former one and Mr. Jackson will just have to be content. I am perfectly satisfied with the work done in that and if he is not with his part he will just have to arrange for another discussion on that proposition.

Now, Mr. Jackson is not satisfied with divine history. I wonder little at that for he must stay away from the Bible as much as possible. He asked for historical reference to the church and I gave him Rom. 16:16. He rejects this and demands something from man. The Baptist church is the creation of man, its doctrine is of man and it is governed by man. Little wonder then that Mr. Jackson would rather have the sayings of man than the sayings of God. I grant him that he can find much about the Baptist church in the histories of men for they love to write of their own creation. However, the word of God is silent as the tomb concerning the Baptist church and its doctrine so he does not like the Bible.

Mr. Jackson says that the church to which Paul wrote at Rome was a Baptist church like the one in Jerusalem. It is a shame, isn't it, that Paul was so short in his vocabulary that he couldn't say what he was trying to say. Or can it be that Mr. Jackson is endeavoring to wrest the word of God and make Paul say something which he never intended to say? I think the latter is the correct solution.

Mr. Jackson continues to quote and defend his "historians". He would like for this debate to be settled on the basis of historians but it can never be. The proposition is: "The Scriptures teach" and there he must stand or fall. I have not asked for the word of his historians, Mr. Jackson, I have asked for the Bible.

In wrestling with Acts 2:38 and wresting it to the destruction of his readers, as well as himself, he says it should be "unto a DECLARATION of remission" and not "unto the receiving of remission." Mr. Jackson, I am satisfied with it just like it is "unto the remission" and I do not need to add any word to it. Of course I know that it will not fit your doctrine unless you add to it but you should know the penalty for such additions. We read in Prov. 30:6, "Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Be careful, Mr. Jackson.

No, Mr. Jackson, Acts the eighth chapter is not good Baptist doctrine. In this chapter the preacher preached Christ, not Baptist doctrine. He received a confession of faith and not that God had pardoned sins. He baptized the man without a vote of the church. In none of these things was he following Baptist teaching or practice but was obeying Christ and teaching the commands of Christ.

Neither is the case of Cornelius of any help to Mr. Jackson for the Spirit fell on these Gentiles to show that they were subjects of the gospel. It fell on them as they BEGAN to hear (Acts 11:15) and therefore before they were saved. They were saved as were the Jews according to Peter in Acts 15:7-9 and, therefore, they were "baptized unto the remission of sins" just as the Jews were commanded to be in Acts 2:38.

Of the argument that I made in answer to Mr. Jackson's attempt to make baptism one of the works of the Christian life, he can say nothing. It is totally and entirely unlike any work commanded of a Christian. All these things recur over and over but baptism only once. The only answer is the truth that baptism is the initiatory rite into the kingdom of God and thus is commanded but once.

Now he has come to Mark 16:16 and what a fine job of wresting and twisting he does. He says one can be baptized without believing. I deny that he can within the Bible meaning of the word. The Bible meaning of the word cannot be met by any save the believers and, therefore my parallel statement holds good while he is shown entirely lacking.

He wants to make belief the means of entrance "into Christ" but the Bible will not sustain him. He cannot find one line in any

standard translation that will support his idea of believing "into Christ." He calls the doctrine that we are "baptized into Christ" a "putrescible doctrine" (whatever that is) but anyhow it is a Bible doctrine and so it is the Bible that Mr. Jackson calls "putrescible." He would do well to read Romans 6:3 and Gal. 3:27 and repent of his wickedness.

But now note Mr. Jackson's complete fall. In trying to do away with the idea of baptism for the remission of sins he cites several examples. Here they are: (1) The thief on the cross; (2) The woman at Jacob's well (John 4); (3) the prostitute woman (Luke 7:47-50); (4) Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10). Now note it closely, good friends; these all lived under the law and before the dispensation of grace in which we live. Jackson, in seeking to justify his teaching by their examples, is going back to the law. Now what is said of that in the word of God? Let us read, "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law; ye are fallen away from grace." (Gal. 5:4). If Mr. Jackson had ever been in Christ or in His grace, which I sincerely doubt, since he cannot enter Christ by his teaching, he is now both severed from Christ and fallen from grace.

But now to Mr. Jackson's final error in his fourth negative. If he would read his Bible more and history less he would not make such blunders. He reasons that the Corinthians were saved without baptism, apart from baptism. However, the Bible nowhere says this but we do read of Paul's work among these people in the 18th chapter of Acts. Here we read in the eighth verse, "Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized." Again Paul says, "We were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 5:11). Therefore, the Corinthians were justified and sanctified and washed by the commandment of Christ, and baptism or washing was a part of that cleansing or justification. Mr. Jackson, you would do well to seek other examples for the Christians at Corinth are not in harmony with your doctrine. For that matter, you will not find a favorable example to your doctrine and practice in the New Testament unless you go back under the law and cut loose from Christ.

He reasons that if baptism be a condition of salvation it makes the salvation of the soul depend upon a man and the poor boy in the foxhole cannot be saved. Well, Mr. Jackson, what if the boy in the foxhole is a Chinese or a Russian? How can he have faith without hearing? How can he hear without a preacher? Read Romans 10:13-17 and answer. It is evident that Mr. Jackson's doctrine makes salvation as dependent upon man as any other. The only way he can

escape that is go to the old "hardshell" position and give up his name "Missionary." Mr. Jackson reasons that when Christ says "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," he does not thereby make baptism a condition of salvation. Then examine this, Mr. Jackson. He that believeth and is voted on shall be baptized into the Baptist Church. Now, Mr. Jackson, is the voting essential to his baptism? Is he baptized and a member in full fellowship the moment he believes? Give this some consideration, Mr. Jackson.

But now we desire to give a little further attention to the text which sets forth our proposition in words of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Jackson was unable to change Mark 16:16 and he will be unable to do anything with Acts 2:38 also. It is the word of God and all his ranting, wresting and distorting will not change it. In Acts 2:38 we have this statement, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of his sins." Now the phrase "unto the remission of sins" is the bone of contention. The King James version says "for" instead of "unto" and Mr. Thayer in his famous Greek-English lexicon says of the Greek word "eis" from which we have "for" or "unto" in the English that it means "in order to obtain." Get that clear now good friends, Mr. Thayer, who is a greater scholar than any living Baptist, and that includes Mr. Jackson, says that "eis" in Acts 2:38 means "in order to obtain." Therefore, if it be translated "for" it means "in order to obtain" and if it be translated "unto" it means "in order to obtain." Baptism then in the words of the Holy Spirit is for the same thing repentance is for, namely, "to obtain the remission of sins."

Now the Bible bears this out for in Acts 26:28 we have identically the same phrase in both English and Greek. Here the Holy Spirit records through Matthew, Christ's statement concerning His blood. He says, "For this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." The Greek is the same as in Acts 2:38. The King James version says "for remission" as in Acts 2:38. The Revised Version says "unto remission" as in Acts 2:38. They are in every sense parallel. Now, if Mr. Jackson says that "eis" in Acts 2:38 should be translated "unto" and should read "unto the declaration of remission" then it must so read in Matt. 26:28. Therefore, Christ shed His blood to declare and not to obtain our remission. Again Mr. Jackson says that "eis" should be translated "with reference to" and we declare that baptism must have the same reference to the remission of our sins and we are baptized to obtain the remission of our sins and the proposition)5 established.

Now, one closing word with reference to Mr. Jackson's wild statement about the first book. This book is printed from the type that ran in our paper week after week. Mr. Jackson did see and read this and such corrections as he sent to us were made. He was in Dallas when the book was ready to go to press and invited to come and re-read the proof. He did not show up. The book was printed and we offered them to Mr. Jackson at one-half price. On each book which he takes at this price we make a very small profit while he doubles his money. That seems to me a fair and business-like proposition to make him and I am sure it is one that would appeal to Mr. Jackson if he wanted to circulate the book. Now, here is my proposition to the readers of Mr. Jackson's paper. I will mail, free of all cost, to each reader of the American Baptist, a copy of this book, if they will write for it. If Mr. Jackson does not care to distribute it among Baptists, I will try to get the job done. Please address your request to Eugene S. Smith, P. O. Box, No. 735, Des Moines, 3, Iowa.

Jackson's

Fifth Negative

Mr. Smith and Readers:

It is to be regretted that after five efforts my opponent is unable to make a better showing in the defense of his doctrine. I hope his brethren may be patient with him, as he has three more chances to say something worthwhile. The disgusting feature is, each of his affirmations after the first one has been a slavish rehashing. If he has any arguments, let him produce them. I stand ready to answer ANYTHING he offers. Come on, Smith, and grapple with the issue like a man. This is not boasting on my part, as he charges, but a plain declaration of facts. I crave something to do in the negative.

He claims his doctrine is the word of God. If so, the word of God was lost to the world for hundreds of years prior to Campbell's day, as Mr. Campbell declared it was in the nineteenth century in the state of Kentucky, that the doctrine now preached by Mr. Smith and his people "was first publicly promulgated in modern times" (Campbell-Rice Debate, p. 472). And, sir, the first one ever baptized in this new order "in order to obtain" the remission of sins was Robert Amend, whom Walter Scott baptized as an experiment, on November 18, 1827. Then to speak of that being the word of God is no more correct than the brood of lies Satan has put over on mankind since the first sin of Adam.

He says that he answered all my questions that "pertain to our present discussion." He knew he did not tell the truth when he said that, just like he did when he charged the Baptist doctrine making criminals. I asked him: (1) Do you baptize a child of God or a child of the devil? (2) Can one be saved without a perfect faith? (3) Is the Spirit in the word? If so, what sense? Do not these questions "pertain to our present discussion?" But to add to his agony, I offer more questions. (4) Does Acts 2:38 reveal the complete plan of salvation? (5) Did the Israelites come under the blood of the lamb before they reached the Red Sea, or in the sea? (6) Is the sinner begotten of God before baptism, or in the act of baptism? (7) Should one be baptized with a dead faith or a live faith? (8) What makes faith alive? (9) What becomes of the soul of the man with a live faith in God, should he die before baptism? (10) Is the one Scripturally buried in baptism completely dead? (11) If one has heard the word, repented of his sins, believed on Christ and is baptized, "in

order to be saved," "into the Christian Church," is he saved? (12) Can one be saved unless he is a member of the church to which you belong? I insist, Mr. Smith, that you answer these questions, but, readers, notice if he docs.

Can not Mr. Smith tell the truth one time? He says he did not ask for history? Did he not ask me to give history for Baptist Churches? I gave him his father Campbell's own words, then he cries like a baby about my leaving the Bible and going to historians. I like both the Bible and history because both of them are on the side of the Baptists. Baptist churches are identified with the New Testament churches because of the elements of their faith being similar to the faith of the original churches, but Campbell and his coadjutors came along in the NINETEENTH CENTURY and "hatched up" a church after being kicked out of the fellowship of Baptists, and now Mr. Smith calls Campbell's baby "The Church of Christ." In like manner we could prove every goat living is a sheep, by merely calling it so. Just read in the Bible about the Lord's sheep, and then declare: "See, I can prove by the word of God that my animal is a sheep," but still he remains a hardheaded GOAT. That's EXACTLY how he proves by Rom. 16:16 that Campbell's church is "The Church of Christ," still that verse docs not use that phraseology, but "churches of Christ," meaning churches that belong to Christ, not denoting any name at all. There are church groups calling themselves "The Church of Christ," and try to prove their name by the same Scripture verse as used by my opponent, still they are not the same church as Smith's. I challenge him to say they are "The Church of Christ," but they "prove" it by the same method used by him.

He tries to evade the force of my argument on Acts 8:35-38 by babyishly saying Philip did not preach Baptist doctrine and no one voted on the eunuch's reception into a church. Suppose that is so, still such a quibble is far from even an attempt to answer my argument. Verse 37 says the eunuch CONFESSED Christ, which took place BEFORE baptism. I John 4:15 says: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." Therefore God was in the eunuch and the eunuch was in God BEFORE baptism. That's the argument. Answer it, if you can.-

Poor, feeble dodge of the sacred word. He actually said that the Spirit fell on the "Gentiles (Acts 10:47) to show that they were the subjects of the gospel." Give us the "chapter and verse," please. Of course they became "subjects of the gospel," and the Spirit coming to Cornelius was an indication that God had granted to the Gentiles the like precious blessings, but remember these facts: (1) The Spirit,

which came to Cornelius WHILE Peter was preaching (Acts 10:44), witnessed that he WAS a child of God. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6), not merely to let people know they are "subjects of the gospel." (2) The Spirit was received BEFORE BAPTISM, Acts 10:47: "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which HAVE RECEIVED THE HOLY GHOST AS WELL AS WE?" If Smith had been present, he would have cried out, "Hold on, Peter, not so: they MUST WAIT UNTIL AFTER BAPTISM TO RECEIVE THE SPIRIT."

Yes, baptism is a work of the Christian life, as Paul says we are "created in Jesus Christ unto good works." (Eph. 2:8-10). First, creation and therefore a new creature (2 Cor. 5:17); second, good works including baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc. Mr. Smith puts the new creation in the creek, not in Christ, as he says we reach the water before the blood.

Of all wild rantings Smith takes the cake when he says I point out as proof of salvation by grace examples of persons who were under the law and sought to be justified by the law. (1) The woman at Jacob's well, whom the Lord blessed. (2) The thief on the cross. (3) The prostitute woman, Luke 7th chapter. (4) Zacchaeus. Does not he know all of them came to CHRIST, not the law, for salvation? I challenge him to show ONE THING they did in an effort to keep the law of Moses, on this occasion, for salvation. Show it, Smith. If they were under the law, how about Nicodemus (Jno. 3:1-6)? How about John the Baptist who baptized? Was baptism a law institution? The thief on the cross was up a pole and above high water mark, and could not be baptized; neither could he observe the works of the law. We shall expect Mr. Smith to explain how he could possibly be saved by the law of Moses.

And he says baptism is not in the class of Christian works, being the initiatory rite into the church and therefore it is to be performed but once. Now as he says no one can be baptized in the true meaning of the word without faith, he puts faith on equal terms with baptism, still he says one may lose faith and be lost again, and if saved again, he must believe again, yet he will not have to be baptized again. If faith and baptism are equal, why not be baptized again,, if he must believe again?

He says the Corinthians were not saved apart from baptism. Paul testifies he begot them through the gospel, yet he baptized none of them except Cripus, Gaius and the household of Stephanas. Yes, they were baptized but not by Paul except the ones named, still Paul says

he begot them, not some one else who did the baptizing. Smith could -sec that if he were not so blind by his Campbellite heresy. I Cor. 6:11 (not 5:11, as he says) mentions the fact the Corinthians were "washed," but not one word about their being baptized in order to be saved. That's his proposition, although he has changed the wording of his proposition since the debate was agreed on.

Mr. Smith tries to prove that *eis* in Acts 2:38 means "in order to obtain." He quotes Mr. Thayer who he says is a greater scholar than any living Baptist, including D. N. Jackson. Why did he not also include the whole school of Campbellite preachers with us? Thayer, an Episcopalian prejudiced in favor of Smith's Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration, turns commentator when he says that, but when he defines "*eis*," he says it means, when denoting relation, "with respect to, in reference to; as regards." As we know relation is expressed in Acts 2:38. Mr. Thayer is forced by his own definition to say "*eis*" means "in reference to." There's your great scholar, Mr. Smith. He didn't help you out much, did he? If he wants a scholarly commentator, we shall let the great Methodist commentator and scholar, Dr. Adam Clarke, speak on Acts 2:38, as follows:

"FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS. *Eis apheisin hamartion*. In reference to the remission or removal of sins: baptism pointing out the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit; and in reference to that purification that it is administered, and should in consideration be separated from it. For baptism itself purifies not the conscience; it only points out the grace by which this is to be done" (Commentary, *in loco*).

If he wants to match commentators, let him come on with them; if he wants to stay with the lexicons, all right with me, but I refuse to allow him to name the only ones to use. Dr. Clarke also points out that *EIS APHESIN HAMARTION* (Matt. 26:28) means "for (or, in reference to) the taking away of sins." The same rendering he also puts on Mark 1:4: "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." He says they "were to repent, and be baptized in reference to the remission of sins. Repentance prepared the soul for it, and baptism was the type or pledge of it." There you are.

But why does he not give attention to my explanation of "*eis*" as used in Matt. 3:11 and 12:41? In neither of these passages can "*eis*" mean "in order to obtain," and Mr. Smith knows I am right. Hence he makes no attempt to answer.

Time and again I have answered and exposed his pretended argument on Mark 16:16. He blew the fuse in trying to give an illustration. Yes, one can be baptized without believing although it is not Scriptural baptism, neither is it Scriptural to immerse a man blinded with the Romish doctrine that he is to find Christ in the creek.

Truly, truly, his "putrescible" doctrine makes the salvation of the sinner's soul depend on the will of man. I know God has commanded us to carry the gospel that sinners might be saved, but after a poor lost man has heard the word, repented, believed and desires to be baptized, he must find some man willing to baptize him, else he will die and go to hell, according to Smith's doctrine. The sinner is willing, God is willing, but even then if MAN refuses to baptize him, he cannot be saved! That makes man wholly in control of his eternal doom. That's priestcraft pure and simple. Away with such rot! Yes, he damned the poor boy in the foxhole and left him not a ray of hope.

Smith tells a plain falsehood when he says I was invited to read the proof of our first book in Dallas or elsewhere. What's wrong with you, anyway? I did my best to get him to correct some errors, but NOT ONE OF THEM DID HE CORRECT, so far as I detected. HE REFUSED TO LET ME READ THE PROOF, then proposed to allow me only TEN CENTS per book above the dealers' rate for my part of the discussion and I did half of the work. I do hope many people on both sides will order the book, for in it they will find a Biblical defense of the truth and an expose of his untenable doctrine.

Remember, in conclusion, that Smith's "plan of salvation" is a grandchild of Roman Catholicism.

Smith's

Sixth Affirmative

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

It is evident that the fire of God's words is burning, the hammer of God's word is smiting and the sword of God's word is cutting. Mr. Jackson, is it not hard for thee to kick against the goad? The nine arguments presented in the beginning of this discussion are the word of God and it would be well for all to accept them since they cannot be overturned.

Mr. Jackson desires to get into history and turn the debate to a discussion of the relative merits of histories and historians. This he should not do when he cannot even get history straight. He continues to talk of Robert Amend and the history of this man when he has before this time been corrected on that matter by others in debate with him. He is so careless of the truth that he will not correct his notes once he has been proven wrong and forced to admit his error. The man of whom he speaks is William Amend, not Robert, and this has been called to Mr. Jackson's attention before this debate as he well knows. He cannot get either Bible or history straight but so far as this name or event is concerned it matters little here for this discussion is to be settled on the basis of Scripture, not history. In this department, the Bible, Mr. Jackson, is notably weak for his church and doctrine are nowhere mentioned or taught in the word of God while my position in this discussion is infallibly proven by the nine original arguments and many other passages which we do not need to introduce at this time.

I have heretofore answered Mr. Jackson's questions but lest he continue to pervert the truth by saying we do not, we do so again. These are answered by number as he has them listed in his fifth negative. (1) I baptize a penitent believer. (2) God is the judge of that degree of perfection to be attained by man. (3) The Word is the sword of the Spirit. (4) Certainly not. (5) The Israelites were saved the day they passed through the sea (Exo. 12:30). (6) One is born of water in baptism. (7) One can do nothing through a dead faith. (8) Obedience. (9) Such a one does not die. (10) He is dead in sin, and dead to sin. (11) Baptism is "into Christ" not "into Christian Church." (12) One cannot be saved outside the body of Christ which is His Church. Now, Mr. Jackson, you have the answers to your ques-

tions. Of course you may not like the answers, but that is your worry and not mine.

I would like to call to Mr. Jackson's attention about calling a sheep a goat, but surely a sheep ought to be called a sheep. I believe the church of which I am a member is the same church of which Paul, Peter and the other apostles were members. Therefore I call it by the same name. Mr. Jackson shows that he belongs to a different church than did the apostles by calling his by a name they never mentioned or used in connection with a church. Mr. Jackson, if the Baptist church is the same one you read of in the New Testament, why can you not find a name in the New Testament that will fit it? Name alone is not sufficient identification, but it is one point and without the name you cannot be the same. Therefore having the name, the doctrine, the organization and worship which the church of the first century had "The Church of Christ" today is the same church.

Mr. Jackson, why say "suppose that is so" when you refer to my charge that Phillip did not preach Baptist doctrine or follow Baptist practice? Why not be man enough to come right out and say "that is right?" You know that it is right so you had as well admit it. Now, so far as Christ dwelling in the eunuch at the time of his confession in Acts 8:37, Mr. Jackson has gone too far. He supposes that by the word "confess" it meant merely a confession of the tongue. However in Rom. 14:11 and again in Phil. 2:11 we have a different Greek word translated confess than that we have in 1 John 4:15. In the first two instances where a confession by the tongue is meant the word EXOMOLOGEO while in the latter verse the word is HOMOLOGEO. By the first is contemplated a mere confession with the tongue, by the latter a confession in life. Adam Clarke, whom Mr. Jackson has introduced as a great commentator, says of 1 John 4:15: "This confession implied also such a belief in Christ as put them in possession of His pardoning mercy and indwelling Spirit." Now since "pardoning mercy" is found "in Christ" (Eph. 1:7) and since the Spirit is given to "them that obey Him" (Acts 5:32) and to those that are baptized (Acts 2:38), Mr. Clarke is saying that this confession of 1 John 4:15 embraces all of this obedience and therefore Mr. Jackson is wrong.

I would also call to his attention two men who did confess that Christ was the Son of God and did this under the direction and guidance of demons. Did this indicate a saving faith within these two Mr. Jackson? (See Matt. 8:28, 29). If Mr. Jackson's theory were correct it would prove the salvation of demons and devils and therefore it proves nothing, for it proves too much for even him.

However we should say that Mr. Jackson is in a measure improving. Heretofore he has argued that one is saved at faith alone. Now he has concluded confession and since one cannot confess faith before he has it, this must be something in addition to faith. He is one step nearer the truth and some day the word may break his stubborn heart as it has others like his and he may confess his faith in Christ by submitting to the will of Christ. We hope and pray that this may come to pass.

Now in the case of Cornelius I know that the Holy Spirit fell on him and his household to show that they were subjects of the gospel because Peter so used the incident in talking with the Jews in Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-15). This was the thing that convinced the Jews that the Gentiles were to have the Gospel and so it is by the use made of the matter by an inspired man that I know its purpose.

The Spirit was received before baptism but also before they heard the "words whereby they would be saved" for it fell on them as Peter "began to speak" (Acts 11:14). Therefore if this is to prove too that they were saved without baptism and before baptism it proves too that they were saved without the word and before the hearing of the word. Therefore Mr. Jackson's brethren had as well quit paying him to preach to sinners for they can be saved without the word. What proves too much proves nothing and therefore Mr. Jackson is wrong again in his application of this Scripture.

All that Mr. Jackson could do with my proof that he was going back under the law for his examples was call my argument "wild ranting." That is an easy way to deceive those who are blinded by your false doctrine, Mr. Jackson, but it will never suffice as an answer to those who sincerely seek for truth. Christ's will had not yet come into effect (Heb. 9:15-17) and He had not yet been given "all authority" (Matt. 28:18). Why not look for a case this side of Pentecost, Mr. Jackson, where one is said to be saved without baptism? You know full well there is not a case of conversion this side of the cross of Christ but that baptism is prominently mentioned in it. Now admit it, Mr. Jackson.

In one breath he wants to take Thayer and Adam Clarke and in the next he wants to disparage and cast them out. Mr. Jackson, you can cast these out and a thousand more but still Acts 2:38 will say: "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins," and thus prove the Scriptural-ness of my proposition.

But now as space will allow let us move on in our strengthening of our original arguments. No new ones will be introduced, Mr. Jackson, but you will just have to deal with these and they will stand to plague you when you have finished all your efforts to overthrow them because they are the word of God and cannot be moved. In Acts 22:16 Paul is speaking of his own conversion. Here he says that Ananias, a man sent by God, himself, said, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." This man, sent from God, knew that in spite of Paul's faith, confessed on the Damascus road as he said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do," and his penitence shown by three days of fasting and prayer, that Saul was yet in his sins. Ananias, being a man sent from God, said that salvation and the remission of sins was found in Christ and that Saul would have to be baptized "into Christ," since there was no other way of entering Him. Therefore he gave the commandment, and if Mr. Jackson was the same kind of preacher that this man was he would give the same commandment to sinners today. The fact that he does not so preach shows that he is not the same kind of a preacher, that he is not one sent of God as Ananias was.

Paul later refers to this same incident as he writes to the church in Rome. In Romans 6:3 he says: "Know ye not, that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?" Will you please note, Mr. Jackson, that Paul uses the pronoun "we." He includes himself in this number who were "baptized into Christ."

Only one other time do we find the phrase "into Christ" in the New Testament. This is in Galatians 3:27. Here again Paul says we are "baptized into Christ." Now since all the promises of God are "in Christ" (II Cor. 1:20). Since "every spiritual blessing" is "in Christ" (Eph. 1:3). Since redemption and forgiveness are "in Christ" (Eph. 1:7). Since eternal life is "in Him" (I John 5:11) and since salvation is "in no other" (Acts 4:12) we can clearly see that outside of Christ there is no hope.

Now Paul says that we are "baptized into Christ" (Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3), and therefore he says that before and without baptism we are separated from the promises of God, unable to enjoy the spiritual blessings of God, are not redeemed, have no forgiveness, do not have eternal life, in short we are not saved until we are "baptized into Christ." Surely then the Scriptures prove abundantly, regardless of all of Mr. Jackson's wresting and distorting, that baptism is "unto, in order to obtain" the remission of sins.

Now, Mr. Jackson, you can call me a liar about saying you were invited to read proof on the first hook while you were in Dallas, but you know in your heart that I did not lie. If you would like I will see if I cannot publish, to refresh your memory, a photostatic copy of my letter to you and yours to me that you would be in Dallas on that date and then later your letter in which you gave some poor excuse for not coming to read the proof while there. Would you like to **see** those, Mr. Jackson? Well then just look in your file on the matter for I am sure you have them there the same as I have them. Let us then stay with the truth altogether although that may be a little hard for Mr. Jackson, and to your readers of the American Baptist who desire that debate just write me and get a FREE copy since Mr. Jackson does not wish to sell it to you at one hundred percent on his investment. The address is Eugene S. Smith, P. O. Box 735, Des Moines 3, Iowa.

Jackson's

Sixth Negative

Mr. Smith and Readers:

Yes, the fire of God's word is burning red hot—the carcass of Campbellism already has been burned to a charred mass. We bored a hole in its heel, let all the water out (that is the life of Campbellism), and then set fire to the dried remains. That's the end of poor Mr. Smith.

He accuses me of attempting to change from a Biblical to an historical discussion. Oh, no, but as both the Bible and history are on the side of Baptists, I love both. Neither the Bible nor history is for Smith's position, his own feeble efforts being witness. I challenge him again to quote one line of authentic secular history proving the existence of the church to which he belongs before the days of the Campbells. If he has it, let him produce it. If he does not, then let him be the man to confess his modern origin. His denomination is scarcely old enough to have a mustache. What a travesty on truth and honor for a coxcomb to have enough of monumental brass to call such a man-made society THE CHURCH OF CHRIST!

As to the Bible, he cannot find more than NINE flimsy, frail, fluffy, foolish, futile, fragmentary, fluvial arguments from it for his "Gospel in Water." If he had more, he would use them'; but even then they would be worth no more to his cause than the ones he has employed. His cause has sunk in his hands, not because of the weakness of the man but because of the weakness of his doctrine.

Funny. Mr. Smith says I should have said "William" Amend, instead of "Robert" Amend, who was the first one in modern times baptized "in order to obtain" salvation. While some say "Robert," the given name is immaterial, as the fact remains that Amend was the first one who became a victim to this new experiment.

He says he has answered my questions. Let's take the time and see if he told the truth. He knows that he did not. Here they are with his dodges: »

1. Do you baptize a child of God, or a child of the devil? His answer: "I baptize a penitent believer." Dodge No. 1. Mr. Smith, is a penitent believer a child of God or a child of the devil? Watch him squirm.

2. Can one be saved without a perfect faith? His answer: "God is the judge of that degree of perfection to be attained by man." Dodge No. 2. Ah, my friends, he dares not answer, for if he should he would be forced to say that God saves without a perfect faith, else faith is made perfect in baptism; and if so, one would not have to obey all the commandments to be saved. Answer, Smith, if you please, and your rotten doctrine will be pulled apart.

3. Is the Spirit in the word? If so, in what sense? His answer: "The word is the sword of the Spirit." Dodge No. 3. He runs from the position of the founders and early proponents of his church, namely, A. Campbell, Moses E. Lard, Briney, Sweeny, et al., of their days and Inter. They said the Spirit resides in the word. If so, as the people at Pentecost (Acts 2:41) received the word before baptism, they necessarily received the Spirit before baptism; and if so, they were saved before baptism, as the world cannot receive the Spirit. (John 14:17). No wonder Mr. Smith dodges like a woodpecker's head.

4. Does Acts 2:38 reveal the complete plan of salvation? His answer: "Certainly not." Thank God for that "noble confession." Then Campbellite preachers must change their text, for it seems that is the only verse in that chapter they know. Pardon me, I believe Mr. Smith knows eight more, making his "nine original arguments." Great stuff! 5. Did the Israelites come under the blood of the lamb before they reached the Red Sea, or in the sea? His answer: "The Israelites were saved the day they passed through the sea" (Ex. 12:30). Dodge No. 4. Mr. Smith, the question: When did they come under the blood? He knows better than to answer. He knows they came under the blood BEFORE they reached the water. Then, according to his position, the blood is not sufficient for salvation—it takes the water. It is "be dipped or be damned;" "go to the creek, or go to hell."

6. Is the sinner begotten of God before baptism, or in the act of baptism? His answer: "One is born of water in baptism." Then the creek becomes his mother, and if he is baptized in Red River, he'll have a red mother; in Black River, a black mother; in White River, a white mother, etc. He should know baptism is a burial, not a birth.

7. Should one be baptized with a dead faith or a live faith? His answer: "One can do nothing through a dead faith." So, then, one must have a live faith to be baptized. If a live faith before baptism, therefore: (1) he has the presence of Him who made it alive—the Spirit quickens (Eph. 2:1); (2) being quickened or made alive be-

fore baptism, one has life in God before baptism, and if he has life in God, he is a child of God before baptism. There you are, my friend. Sec what questions will do?

8. What makes faith alive? His answer: "Obedience." Dodge No. 5. But since one is alive before baptism, it was obeying the command to believe on Christ (John 6:40; Mark 1:15), not the command to be baptized. Thank you, dear friend.

9. What becomes of the soul of the man with a live faith in God should he die before baptism? His answer: "Such a one docs not die." Great logic! He believes in the security of the believer up to the middle of the creek, then as soon as he comes up out of the water, the poor fellow sets out on a foot race with the devil "from the creek to eternity." "At the creek, at the creek, where I first saw the light, and the burden of my heart rolled away; it was there by water I received my sight, and now I outrun the devil all the way."

10. Is the one to be Scripturally buried in baptism completely dead? Smith's answer: "He is dead in sin and dead to sin." Don't laugh at the poor, fellow's dodge. Paul says: "He that is dead is freed from sin" (Rom. 6:7). Then, how can one be dead IN sin and dead TO sin at the same time? He must be both saved and lost, belonging both to God and the devil. Pshaw! But such is the vagary of Campbellism. 11. If one has heard the word, repented of his sins, believed on Jesus Christ and is baptized, "in order to be saved," in the "Christian Church," is he saved? Smith's answer: "Baptism is 'into Christ' not into the 'Christian Church'." Dodge No. 7. He knew not to answer the question, but let him clarify with another question: Mr. Smith, can one be baptized "into Christ" and be a member of the "Christian Church" at the same time? Watch him squirm. He wiggles to keep alive, but Smith is a whipped man.

12. Can one be saved unless he is a member of the church to which you belong? Smith's answer: "One cannot be saved outside the body of Christ which is His church." And with that answer says all must go to hell unless they become members of his little group and then outrun the devil to eternity. Matters not how much you repent, how sincerely you believe on Christ, how ardently you call upon His name for salvation, how desirous you may be to escape hell and you may even be baptized "in order to obtain" salvation, HELL IS YOUR PORTION unless you become a member of the small "Church of Christ" Campbellite group, numbering less than half a million souls. How few there will be in heaven! Then since you must be a member

of this particular group, and no one but their own ministers baptize "in order to obtain" salvation that you may become members of his group, you CANNOT BE SAVED OUT OF THE ARMS OF SMITH OR MINISTERS OF HIS BRAND. Away with such doctrine and commandments of men. After all, friend Smith, your little dodging did not do you much good. Caught you are and caught you shall remain. This time I have used to give him the "thumping" he needs.

He claims he belongs to the "same church of which Paul, Peter and the other apostles were members." Far from it, as his church originated in the nineteenth century, a little older than some old gray mules. Baptist churches originated in the days of Christ on earth, as both the New Testament and history proclaim. Did not Christ use people baptized by a preacher whom God called Baptist in the founding of His church? And such was a Baptist church. Smith knows this.

Yes, Philip preached Baptist doctrine for the reason he preached Christ as the Saviour, not the water, and after the eunuch had truly confessed BEFORE baptism, Philip immersed him. No, the confession did not save him, but he made his confession of faith in Christ. It showed Philip that he was saved. That's Baptist doctrine. Not one time did he tell the eunuch to be baptized "in order to obtain" salvation. Show it, Smith, and I'll quit the debate. IT IS NOT THERE.

He builds up a beginner's straw-man argument on the word confess as applied to the eunuch. Not one time is the word confess used in the story of the eunuch's baptism. He says Jackson "supposes that by word 'confess' it meant a mere confession of the tongue." Wrong, Jackson supposed nothing of the kind. The eunuch's confession was from the heart, as told in 1 Cor. 12:3: ".No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by me Holy Ghost." Therefore the eunuch possessed the Spirit before baptism. His play upon the Greek word in Rom. 14:11 and Phil. 2:11 hurts him. This is a judgment confession, not one that pertains to the believer's life. Smith is so confused he thinks judgment comes at baptism. 1 John 4:15 is our confession in this life, like the one the eunuch made. His quotation from Dr. Adam Clarke ruins him. It says: "This confession implied also such a belief in Christ as put them in possession of his pardoning mercy and indwelling Spirit."

Thank God for that. The eunuch had such a belief in Christ BEFORE BAPTISM as put him into possession of God's "pardoning mercy and indwelling Spirit." I challenge you to quote Dr. Clarke again.

Jackson does not add confession to faith in order to be saved. The

confession comes as an effect of saving faith in Christ, as in the eunuch's case.

In his desperation, Mr. Smith refers to the confession of the demons in Matt. 8:28, 29, and wants to know if they were saved. Certainly not, but tell us, my friend, if your confession, when you came to baptism, was of the same nature as the confession of the devils? Now, don't overlook this question. What a pity any man will strain his honesty for a point in debate. Smith should see the difference. The demons, in their confession, acknowledged Christ's being and power, but we who believe confess Him as our personal Saviour.

No, Jackson is no nearer the truth now than when the debate started, for I started out with the truth and have remained with it, and will keep on with it—exposing Smith's heresy as I go. But he says, without giving new arguments, that he is going to strengthen his "original arguments." Frankly, they need strengthening, as their only foundation is water. Baptist arguments are founded on the Rock, and need no strengthening. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace," says Paul contrary to Smith who says: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be works (baptism)." Paul vs. Smith.

Time and again have I answered his supposed arguments concerning Cornelius and Christ's will (Heb. 9:15-17). Christ had power to forgive sins while on earth, so He did not have to wait until His death to save sinners. (See Luke 7:47-50). The law or no law, Christ Himself did the job. Contrary to Smith's position, all things (power and authority included) 'had been given to Christ during His ministry. See Jno. 3:35; 13:3.

As to the thief on the cross and others before Pentecost, they came to Christ, not the law of Moses, for salvation, Smith's quibble to the contrary. They were saved by Christ, not the law.

If Paul were baptized by Ananias in order to obtain salvation, why did he forget to tell the Philippian jailer thus to be baptized? (Acts 16:30, 31). Water symbolically washes away sins, while the blood of Christ actually washes away sins. In this way and in this sense only are we said to be "baptized in Christ," as we are in Christ Jesus by FAITH. (Gal. 3:26). Yes, redemption is "in Christ," which we reach • when we believe on him. (Eph. 1:7). Eternal life is in Christ, says Smith. That's right, and why does not the one who gets "into Christ," have eternal life when he enters Him? Watch out, Smith. If salvation is found "in Christ" at baptism, why is not eternal life found also?

But Paul was not a Campbellite in belief, as he prayed before he was baptized. (Acts 9:11). This is Baptist teaching.

Now to his illustration which he thinks is a parallel to Mark 16:16. It is: "He that believeth and is voted on shall be baptized into the Baptist Church."

Not being able to refute my illustrations, he attempts one of his own, but it does him no good, for a man may believe and be voted on and still not be baptized. Sec the difference?

Again, Mr. Smith says "eis" in Acts 2:38 is "unto" remission of sins, but he translates the same word (eis) in Rom 6:3 and Gal. 3:27 "into." If it is "unto" in one place, why not that we are "baptized unto Christ" in the other places? The same Greek word "eis" is in I Cor. 10:2: "Were all baptized EIS Moses." Were the Israelites baptized "into" Moses, or "unto" Moses? Were they not already following him before their baptism? Explain the difference, please. Ah, watch him twist to get out of trouble.

Mr. Smith asks for a translation saying we believe "into" Christ. John 3:16 is a verse which Wilson's Emphatic Diaglott renders "believing into" Christ. Here it is, Mr. Smith. And Young's Analytical Concordance also defines EIS "into" in John 3:16.

No, I am not calling Mr. Smith a liar about refusing to give me a fair chance to read the proof sheets of our first debate book. He makes himself one. All his twiddle about my coming to Dallas to read the proofs is a smoke screen. Does not Uncle Sam do business by mail? Yes, go ahead and publish photostatic copy of any letter you desire to, but the fact remains the same, Mr. Smith played the hog with me in the publication of the book. If he wants an uncovering of the facts, I'm ready for it. He's hurting because he is getting the spanking he needs in this discussion.

ACTS 2:38 EXPLAINED

"Then said Peter 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."

"Ye," understood, is the subject of "repent" and "one" is the subject of "be baptized." In this verse, the verbs "repent" and "be baptized" are not joined together to procure the same results.

"Ye" is second person, plural number. "Repent" is active voice, first aorist, imperative, second person plural, to agree with its subject "ye" understood.

"One" is the third person, singular number. "Be baptized" is pas-

sive voice, first aorist, imperative, third person, singular number, to agree with its subject "one."

As in English, Latin and Hebrew, a verb in the Greek agrees with its subject in person and number.

Bullions' Greek Grammar, page 202, paragraph 138, Rule IV., says:

"A verb agrees with its nominative in number and person." Goodwin's Greek Grammar, page 198, paragraph 899, 1, says: "A verb agrees with its subject nominative in number and person."

There is one exception to this rule. A neuter plural subject regularly takes a singular verb, but this does not apply in this verse.

The parsing of the sentence shows conclusively that the verbs "repent" and "be baptized" are not joined together to obtain the same results. This is further seen from the fact that repentance is for one purpose and baptism is for another.

Is "for remission of sins" (eis aphasin hamartion) connected with "be baptized?" If so, it can only be declarative, not procurative. "Eis" is the preposition in this phrase that is translated "for." If connected with baptism, being declarative, it means "with reference to," in the light of "because of." This is shown in the following scripture verses:

Matt. 3:11: "I indeed baptize you with water unto (eis) repentance," says John the Baptist. As he demanded repentance first, he did not baptize unto, that is "in order to obtain" repentance, but "with reference to," or "because of" repentance.

Matt. 12:41: The Ninevites "repented at (eis) the preaching of Jonas." "Eis" here cannot mean "in order to obtain," as the wicked inhabitants of that city were moved to repentance because of the preaching of the prophet.

Rom. 6:4: "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into (eis) death." A burial being because of death, "eis" here cannot mean, therefore, "in order to obtain" it.

I Cor. 10:2: "And were all baptized unto (eis) Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Surely no one will affirm that the Israelites were baptized in the Red Sea "in order to obtain" Moses but with reference to or because of Moses' deliverance and leadership.

Equally so in Acts 2:38, for (eis) remission of sins, that is, with reference to, or because of remission of sins one should be baptized.

As explained by Dr. A. T. Robertson, eis in Acts 2:38 does not of itself express design. "When the grammarian has finished," says he, "the theologian steps in, and sometimes before the grammarian is through" (A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 389).

Dr. Robertson, one of the greatest Greek scholars of his day, translates Acts 2:38 as follows:

"Turn ye, and let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ on the basis of forgiveness of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Epochs in the Life of Simon Peter, p. 187).

Then explaining the way of salvation in the light of the experience of Cornelius (Acts 10:47), Dr. Robertson goes on to say:

"It was also clear that they (Cornelius and his household) were already converted before the gift of the Holy Spirit came upon them, though regeneration itself is the work of the Holy Spirit also. And this new birth had come without and before baptism, a fact that seems to escape the notice of those that hold that baptism is a means of securing the forgiveness of sins. That theological conception is inconsistent with the facts recorded here at Caesarea. Clearly then the interpretation of Peter's language in Acts 2:38 is wrong if it makes baptism for the purpose of securing remission of sins, because here we have Peter proposing baptism because these Gentiles have already received the Holy Spirit and hence are already converted and saved" (Epochs in the Life of Simon Peter, p. 233).

With this array of explanatory truth, who would dare interpret Acts 2:38 to mean one must be baptized in order to be saved? Baptism, as plainly taught in the verse, is for a child of God only.

PART II

Baptismal Regeneration Theory

(At this point Mr. Smith abruptly quit the discussion, evidently not being able to stand up under the bombardment of truth and reason at the hands of his opponent who proceeds to uproot the Romish doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration).

Mr. Eugene S. Smith, who challenged me for a written debate through our respective papers, lasted five and one-half rounds in the second discussion before quitting. After considerable effort to induce him to continue, which he fails to do, I have decided to continue to expose the "gospel in water" theory. At this point, let us read again what Alexander Campbell, father of the Campbellite Church, said:

"I am bold, therefore, to affirm, that everyone who, in the belief of what the Apostle spoke, was immersed, did, in the very instant in which he was put under the water receive the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. If so, then who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water?" (Christian Baptist, p. 417).

That is the Campbellite "plan of salvation" in a nutshell. Notice an analysis of it:

INDICTMENTS AGAINST THE THEORY

1. "In the very instant in which he is put under water receive the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit." Not one minute, not one inch, before one is "put under the water," can he receive the forgiveness of sins. It matters not how sincerely one repents of his sins, believes in Christ, or begs for mercy and pardon, he can find no forgiveness or pardon out of the water.

(1) It gives God the Father the lie. "(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succored thee: behold, now is the day of salvation.)" According to the "gospel in water," the only time that could be said is while the sinner is standing in the water with a Campbellite preacher ready to baptize him, but God says NOW is the time of salvation, water or no water.

(2) The "gospel in water" gives Christ Jesus the lie. "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." (John 5:24). At the point of faith, says Jesus, one is passed from death unto life. "No, no," cry Campbell's children; "you must be dipped or be damned."

(3) It gives the Holy Spirit the lie. "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." (Rom. 8:16) This witness of the Spirit belongs to the believer in Christ: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself" (I John 5:10). He believes before baptism. Therefore he has the witness of the Spirit BEFORE BAPTISM that he is a child of God.

(4) It gives the inspired prophets the lie. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:43). But the "gospel in water" theorist says there is no salvation except in the instant one goes under the water.

(5) It substitutes water for the blood of Christ. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin" (I John 1:7). If in the very "instant" in which one is put under the water, his sins are forgiven, water comes before the blood, but the Israelites reached the blood of the paschal lamb (type of Christ's blood) before they reached the baptism at the Red Sea. (See Ex. 12:1-17; I Cor. 10:1-2).

(6) It nullifies the efficacy of the grace of God. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace: otherwise work is no more work" (Rom. 11:6). As salvation is obtained with either grace or works alone, one must be left out of the plan of redemption, else neither is of any effect. As baptism is a work, the efficacy of the grace of God is nullified, if one is saved only the "instant" he is put under water. Contrary to the "gospel in water" theory, the apostle Paul magnifies the grace of God and omits works for salvation, as follows: "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 Ghost" (Titus 3:5).

(7) The theory glorifies self instead of Christ in procuring salvation. "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" (Eph. 2:8-10). "For if Abraham were justified by works, he

hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. 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" (Rom. 4:2-5).

(8) It makes the poor lost sinner's salvation depend upon the will of man instead of the will of God. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:40). God's will is that all who believe should be saved. The Campbellites will that one be saved, not when he believes, but the "instant he is put under the water. "It is God versus the "gospel in water."

Now notice: (1) God is willing to save the sinner. (2) The sinner himself wants to be saved, has actually repented of his sins and believed in Christ, has confessed his faith in Christ, and desires to follow Him. (3) But he cannot be saved until some MAN IS FOUND WILLING TO BAPTIZE HIM. That puts his eternal destiny in the hands of a man even after he has come to God in true repentance and trust. This means that no man can be saved out of the arms of a preacher. Poor "thief on the cross;" we wonder who climbed the pole to immerse him. Away with such theory! It is priestcraft pure and simple: conceived in the second century of the Christian era, brought forth in the third and headed up in the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

(9) It keeps the Spirit of God from entering the heart of man until the penitent believer wades into the water. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6). If one is not a son of God until he is baptized, he does not possess the Spirit until the "instant he is put under the water." If this is true, he is the devil's possession up to the "instant he is put under the water," for Paul says: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His" (Rom 8:9). No, "NONE OF HIS," so the poor man must belong wholly to the devil before the creek is reached, despite the fact he has repented, believed, confessed his sins and DESIRES TO FOLLOW CHRIST. Away with such rot!

Question: Is the man led to baptism by the Spirit of God, or the spirit of the devil? If led by the devil to be saved, then we must praise old Satan for his work of evangelism. If led by the Spirit of God, then man is saved before he reaches the water, for "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (Rom. 8:

14). Which horn of the dilemma will proponents of the "gospel in water" by hold of?

(10) It is founded upon the theory of the Catholic doctrine of "baptismal regeneration." As proof of their doctrine, Campbellites quote Rom. 6:17, 18: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." They claim that the "form of doctrine" is baptism. If so, notice: (a) One is a servant of sin up to the "instant he is put under water." (b) The very "instant he is put under the water," he is made free from sin. (c) Being NONE OF CHRIST'S before that instant, he wholly belonged to the devil. Therefore he was in Satan's kingdom, in bondage to Satan, and belonged to Satan, but the "instant he was put under the water," he was made free from Satan, and became a child of God. Now, according to this theory, was not the whole change of the sinner effected in the water? There's the Catholic "baptismal regeneration" theory, if you please.

Notice how much the Campbellite theory is like the Catholic doctrine. "The very instant he is put under the water," one receives forgiveness of sins, declares "Father" Campbell. And to the same effect "Father" James Cardinal Gibbons, former Archbishop of Baltimore, testifies, as follows:

"We must all submit to a new birth, or regeneration, before we can enter the kingdom of heaven. Water is the appropriate instrument of this new birth, as it indicates the interior cleansing of the soul" (The Faith of Our Fathers, p. 268).

Again. "Rev." W. Faerber writes: "Why is baptism the most necessary sacrament? "Baptism is the most necessary sacrament "(a) Because without it no one can be saved," (b) Because without baptism, no other sacrament can be received.

"What takes place in the soul of the person baptized?

"The soul of the person baptized is cleansed from all sin and sanctified by the grace of God" (Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools, p. 31).

Choose, if you please, one member of the family, the Romish mother, or the Campbellite baby.

(11) The "gospel in water" theory makes salvation depend upon a symbol instead of the real substance symbolized. "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 should also walk in the newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). Here baptism is said to be a likeness, a picture or symbol, if you please. The real must exist before the picture or symbol can be effective. The gospel is the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. (I Cor. 15:1-4). Baptism being a picture, it is no part of the gospel of salvation, as a picture, for instance, of my mother is no part of my mother. As the picture memorializes her hut cannot bring her to me, so baptism memorializes my redemption but cannot procure redemption.

(12) The theory rejects the divine order of cleansing. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess" (Matt. 23:25). This shows that the cleansing must be from within to without, starting with the purifying of the heart by faith (Acts 15:9), and then the outward which declares but does not procure the inward cleansing. The removal of poison in a well, for instance, is effected from within, not by whitewashing the curbing.

(13) The "gospel in water" theory guarantees no eternal blessing to the sinner who penitently comes to Christ. He may come to Christ as did the Samaritan woman (John 4:15), or the fallen character of Luke 7:44-50, but unless he finds the creek, he gets no eternal blessing from the Master. Take that Godless, Christless, Spiritless theory if you please, but deliver me from it.

(14) It tends to make the procuring of salvation seasonable. A baptizing may be put off and thus delay or ultimately fail to obtain salvation because of weather conditions, or one may be in an arid country where rainfall is insufficient for a baptizing. Very few people will brave a storm or go to a frozen stream of water to be baptized. In this event, their salvation must of necessity be put off, and maybe never obtained, if the theory is correct.

(15) My fifteenth indictment against the "gospel in water" • theory is the fact it makes God a respecter of persons. For example, two airplanes bearing passengers of unsaved people with a minister in each take off for distant points. One lands in India where rainfall is plentiful; the other is forced down in the Sahara Desert where nothing is seen but the burning, shifting sand. The minister with the group in India preaches, the passengers give heed, repent, believe

in Christ, confess their faith in Him, and if baptism is essential to salvation, they all could be saved, as water is plentiful.

On the other hand, the minister with the group in the Sahara, while he may preach the same doctrine, and the passengers seeing death staring them in the face, meekly submit to all instructions given by the minister, but when they are told to be baptized, what will they do? Not a drop of water in sight. This shows that God's plan of salvation would make it easy for one group to be saved and escape hell forever, while it would destroy in hell the other group who may be just as eager to be saved as people could be. All because they could find no water. They were willing to be saved, God was ready to save them, but HE DID NOT PROVIDE WATER IN THAT PART OF THE WORLD FOR THEIR SALVATION.

But as Baptists teach, the conditions of salvation being repentance and faith, the unfortunate group in the Sahara could be saved as quickly as the one in India. Salvation is by the grace of God, through repentance and faith, minus nothing and plus nothing.

2. "The gospel in water." That the issue might be kept in mind, we again quote "Father" Campbell's own declaration of faith, as follows:

"I am bold therefore, to affirm, that anyone who, in the belief of what the Apostle spoke, was immersed, did, in the very instant in which he was put under the water receive the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. If so, then who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water" (Christian Baptist, p. 417).

In my foregoing analysis of this declaration, I offered fifteen counts in an indictment against the first part of it. I shall now proceed to dissect the second part, the SUMMUM BONUM of Campbellism—"the gospel in water" theory. It means, if it means anything—

(1) No water, no gospel. "The gospel in water" signifies there is no gospel apart from water. It is a "watery" gospel, contrary to the Pauline doctrine, as follows:

"For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel" (I Cor. 4:15).

Now read what Paul says again:

"I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I baptized in mine own name. And I baptized

also the household of Stephenas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other" (I Cor. 1:14-16).

Paul affirms that although he had begotten the Corinthians through the gospel, he had baptized none of them except Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephenas. Begotten means "to bring into life" (Thayer). Paul brought the Corinthians into life through the gospel, AND YET HE DID NOT BAPTIZE THEM, except the ones he named. This shows three things: (a) There was gospel independent of and before water, (b) Through the gospel sinners had been brought into life independent of and before water, (c) That water (baptism) is no part of the gospel. Therefore it is not "the gospel in water," but the gospel BEFORE water.

The nail of logic is further clinched by Paul in verse 17: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

Again, we know that the gospel of salvation is independent of and before water, as Paul testified before King Agrippa, that he had preached "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles" (Acts 26:22, 23).

Paul preached none other thing for the soul's salvation than what Moses and the prophets preached. In Acts 10:43 we find that the prophets preached remission of sins to those who believe on Christ, not saying one word about baptism. If Paul preached the same gospel, which he says he' did, evidently he did not preach "the gospel in water."

(2) No water, no gospel, no blood. This means water before blood. "The gospel in water" theory sets up this order, centering the gospel and blood in water (baptism). If Moses had believed this doctrine, and the Lord had inspired him to write as he believed, instead of the phrase, "When I see the blood, I will pass over you," it would have been said: "When I see the WATER, I will pass over you." But as the Israelites came under the blood before they came to the Red Sea, the death angel passed over them, and therefore they were delivered from Egyptian bondage before the water. The Word of God just does not sustain Campbellism.

(3) No water, no gospel, no blood, no salvation. This is "the gospel in water" order. The gospel, the blood and salvation are all buried in the creek. Apart from water, there is no gospel, no blood, no SALVATION. LOST! LOST! LOST! FOREVER LOST, unless the poor

sinner can locate the creek. But the Bible does not speak in that "Bethany dialect," as we read in Romans 3:24-26:

"Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: 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."

(4) No water, no gospel, no blood, no salvation, no HEAVEN. What an awful doctrine to swing the creek between the penitent, trembling, believing soul and heaven, that is, as an absolute requirement in order to get to heaven. "The gospel in water" puts the gospel, the blood, salvation, and the way to get to heaven in the water. Campbell's followers should not sing, "By the way of the cross leads home," but "By the way of the creek leads home." The only place, according to their theory, that the sinner can find the Cross of Calvary is in the CREEK.

There is a fountain filled with water
Drawn from Campbell's veins;
And sinners plunged beneath the waves
Lose all their guilty stains.

The dying thief rejoiced to see
The water in his day,
And there may I, though vile as he,
Wash all my sins away.

That rendition suits "the gospel in water" theory, but it is far from the truth, for the fountain of eternal blessings is filled with blood drawn from Immanuel's veins.

The theory closes the doors of heaven against every person unless he is not only immersed but immersed in order to obtain salvation. Men, like the "thief on the cross," calling on God in the closing hours of their earthly existence, earnestly desiring forgiveness of all their sins, must spend an eternity in the flames of hell because there is no creek available, or if there is, it might be impossible to enter it. A poor savage man, found by a missionary in the closing hours of life on earth, can be given no hope of heaven, although he is told by the missionary to repent of his sins, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, as no creek is within reach. That is the doctrine intelligent men are asked to believe, and the doctrine I take supreme delight in exposing in the light of the Word of God.

PART III

Origin of Baptismal Regeneration

In our expose of the "Gospel in Water" theory, we now come to consider its origin. As plainly shown, it did not originate with the Lord or His apostles. Therefore we must look outside of the Divine Writ to discover where it had a beginning. It came out of the Catholic theory of baptismal regeneration.

Although the theory finds no support in the Divine Word, its roots are traced back to the soil of the "mystery of iniquity," which had begun its lethal work even during the time of the ministry of the apostle Paul; and scarcely had the bones of the apostles become cold in their graves until "baptismal regeneration" (the "gospel in water") sprang up even to the disrupting of churches. That God's faithful might not be taken by surprise, forewarnings were given by Christ and His apostles that false christs and false prophets would arise and that grievous wolves would appear among the flock.

As a consequence of the mistake of some historians in quoting certain "fathers" who lived fairly close to the apostolic days and putting their word on authoritative level with that of the inspired writers, the Christian world has been inundated with Romish superstitions, as back in those days was laid the foundation of the Catholic sacraments.

In Catholic theology baptism is a sacrament indispensable to the salvation of the sinner. This we have proven already by competent Roman Catholic witnesses, but at this juncture let us clinch the nail by introducing two more Catholic witnesses.

First, CHARLES ALFRED MARTIN, once a member of the "Cleveland Apostolate," in his book, "Catholic Religion," pp. 173-177, says:

"Through baptism we are born again; born into the family of the second Adam. Through this laver of regeneration, the Redeemer restores us to the supernatural state lost by sin. . . . Through baptism, sin that kills the soul ... is destroyed. Through baptism men are born into the family of the Christian Church and into the spiritual life. . . The Church has always held that baptism is not merely a symbol of the supernatural life, but the channel that conveys it to

the soul. In baptism we receive sanctifying grace. . . The sacrament of baptism is the ordinary channel of spiritual life, and for those who know it and can receive it, it is a necessary means of salvation. For those who have not been able to receive the baptism of water, and indeed perhaps never heard of it, the Christian sacrament may be supplied by the baptism of blood or of desire . . . No salvation outside the church. Baptism of desire does not make one a member of the body of the Church nor capable of receiving the other sacraments, until sacramental baptism has been administered. It unites one with the soul of the Church . . . Outside of the Church there is no salvation."

Second, CANONS AND DECREES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, issued by the Catholic Council authorized by Pope Paul III, and "opened in the Austrian City of Trent, December 13, 1545," and lasted, with interruptions, until December 4, 1563, and "celebrated under the Sovereign Pontiffs, Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV:"

"Canon I. — If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or, that they are more, or less, than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema . . .

"Canon IV. — If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous and that, without them, or without the desire thereof, men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification; — though all (the sacraments) are not indeed necessary for every individual; let him be anathema." (Quotations from the CANONS AND DECREES are found on pp. 54, 56, of translation by "The Rev. J. Waterworth").

Turning to page 56, *ibid.*, we read the Canons on Baptism:

"Canon J. — If any one saith, that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ; let him be anathema."

"Canon III. — If any one saith, that in the Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all churches, there is not the true doctrine concerning the sacrament of baptism, let him be anathema.

"Canon V. — If any one saith, that baptism is free (*liberum*, optional), that is, not necessary unto salvation; let him be anathema."

Thus we have shown by the highest Catholic authorities the following facts to be true:

1. Catholics hold baptism to be a sacrament.

2. That the sacrament of baptism is essential to salvation.

3. That through water baptism we are born of God. This reminds us of a statement made by our erring and taking-to-his-heels friend, Mr. Eugene S. Smith, who said in a form letter dated June 16, 1942: "Dear Friend: Today is the anniversary of my baptism; my birth into Christ." How similar is the Campbellite baby to the Romish mother! They are so much alike that even the casual observer can not escape noticing one is the mother of the other.

4. That the sin that kills the soul is destroyed through baptism. That Catholic doctrine Campbellites attempt to prove when they quote Romans 6:17, 18, saying baptism is the "form of doctrine," which, when obeyed, THEN the sinner is made free from sin. The similarity is so perfect we know one is the mother of the other.

5. No salvation outside the church. So say both the Romish mother and the Campbellite baby. "You MUST belong to our church," or go to torment, both brazenly proclaim. But, pitifully, the Campbellite baby damns its Romish mother because she does not now dip or immerse. However for a long time after the mother herself was born, she did practice immersion.

6. The "mother" makes an exception in case of the ignorance of baptism on the part of the poor sinner dying. In this case the "sacrament may be supplied by the baptism of blood or of desire." Maybe that is what softened the theology of "father" Campbell when he said concerning his second son, Wickliff E. Campbell, who was drowned without baptism, that "the Lord has taken him home." Now if "father" Campbell's son got to heaven without baptism, why cannot other men's sons get to heaven without baptism also?

7. The Council of Trent thunders forth an anathema (curse) upon any one who says that the "baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ." How Campbellistic that does sound! But, lo and behold, if John's baptism were not Christian, then the Head and Founder of the church and the first members did not have Christian baptism! If baptism is essential to salvation, what degree of difference was there between John's baptism and baptism administered after John's death? If both were administered in order to save, in what respect did they differ? If John's baptism were not to obtain salvation, but baptism administered after him was, then the first members were in the church without salvation, as they never were baptized again.

8. A curse (anathema) is pronounced by the Council of Trent against those who say baptism is not essential to salvation. Has not the

doctrine of "be dipped or be damned" been proclaimed by Campbellites since the days of Alexander Campbell?

POST-APOSTOLIC ORIGIN

The heresy of baptismal regeneration, or the "Gospel in Water," did not become prevalent until about the beginning of the third century, and by the middle and the end of the century, the error had penetrated into the thinking of quite a few people, especially in Africa.

To establish this point, we shall use some historians as witnesses. I. NEANDER, noted Lutheran historian:

"But when, on the one hand, the doctrine of the hereditary corruption and guilt of human nature, the consequence of the first transgression, was reduced to a more precise and systematic form; and when, on the other, from the want of a due distinction between the outward sign and inward grace of baptism (the baptism by water and the baptism by the Spirit), the error became more and more firmly established that without external baptism no one soever could be delivered from that inherent guilt, could be saved from the everlasting punishment that threatened him, or raised to eternal life; and when the notion of the magical effects of the mere administration of the sacraments gained ground continually,—the theory was finally evolved of the unconditional necessity of infant baptism. About the middle of the third century this theory was already generally admitted in the North African church" (Vol 1, p. 433, London Edition of 1853).

Neander's testimony is significant along these lines:

(1) A failure to make due distinction between inward grace and outward sign finally grew into the error that "without external baptism no one soever could he delivered from that inherent guilt."

(2) "The notion of the magical effects of the mere administration of sacraments gained ground continually." According to Neander's statement, the Christians originally considered baptism as an "outward sign," or symbol, of an inward grace (Vol. 1, p. 421), therefore, the error of baptismal regeneration, according to him, did not originate with the Lord or His apostles.

(3) The theory of baptismal regeneration gave rise to the theory of infant baptism, that is, as generally held then, immersion. Sprinkling and pouring did not come into general practice until some centuries later. The baptism of infants gradually became a doctrine of

necessity because of the teaching that no one can be saved unless he is baptized.

(4) By the middle of the third century this theory had already been established in North Africa. This shows how soon the early churches had begun to fall away from the true faith. These churches in Africa had followed Cornelius in his departure from the faith and the rupture of the church at Rome, in A. D. 251. Then is when Catholic-ism took on organic form, and later evolved into a universal Papacy.

Thus we see that neither baptismal regeneration nor infant baptism was taught or practiced by the New Testament churches, as Neander further testifies:

"Baptism was originally administered by immersion and many of the comparisons of St. Paul allude to this form of its administration: the immersion is a symbol of death, of being buried with Christ: the coming forth from the water is a symbol of resurrection with Christ: and both taken together, represent the second birth, the death of the old man and a resurrection to a new life."

The belief and practice of the primitive churches, that is, the immersion of believers, continued almost universally for thirteen hundred years. While affusion for baptism only began to be practiced near the close of the third century, in the case of clinics, that is, sick persons, its general use among the apostate churches was reserved to a later period.

The significant fact learned from Neander is that baptismal salvation, the "gospel in water," gained ground in the early part of the third century, and about the middle of the century it had already been admitted into many churches especially in North Africa, and as a result of this error infant baptism arose.

2. WADDINGTON, well known Episcopal historian, whose testimony shows that about the commencement of the third century baptismal regeneration began to be prevalent. He says:

"The original simplicity of the office of baptism had already undergone some corruption. The symbol had been gradually exalted at the expense of the thing signified, and the spirit of the ceremony was beginning to be lost in its form. Hence a belief was gaining ground among the converts, and was inculcated among the heathen, that the act of baptism gave remission of all sins committed previously to it. It was not fit, then, that so important a rite should be hastily performed or inconsiderately received" (Church History, p. 53).

According to this witness, the "office of baptism" had undergone corruption, the symbol had been emphasized above the spirit or thing symbolized. That is exactly what happens when one preaches that baptism is in order to obtain salvation. That is the corruption of the design of baptism as instituted by divine authority. As secular testimony touching the original, design of baptism, Josephus, noted Jewish historian who was born A. D. 37, is quoted as follows:

"Herod slew him (John the Baptist), who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness" (Antiquities of the Jews, Boob; 18, Ch. 5, Sec. 2).

3. DR. THOMAS ARMITAGE, Baptist historian, speaking of the errors that had sprung up by the commencement of the third century, says:

"The most destructive error which crept in, was that of making baptism the channel of regeneration. Before this, it was generally spoken of as 'regeneration,' meaning, as the Scriptures teach, that the regenerated man, by baptism, put himself visibly under the new obligations which regeneration imposed. Now, they began to make it a 'seal,' which bound the man to Christ with the effect of an oath; and they called it an 'illumination,' confounding it with the light of the truth which it followed, and which sprang only from the Holy Spirit. This germ grew, and in time came to overshadow the work of the Spirit on the heart, and threw the doctrine of a superhuman regeneration of the soul into the background" (History of the Baptists, p. 160).

In opposition to the corruptions of the day, Tertullian, who had been converted to the Christian faith, spoke out in no uncertain terms in defense of the doctrine of salvation by grace. He said:

"We are not washed that we may cease to sin, but because we have ceased: since we have already been bathed in heart."

When the Campbellite Theory Arose

As it is superfluous to use other witnesses as to the time of the introduction of the corruption of baptismal regeneration into the Christian world, we shall proceed to show how and when the Campbellite doctrine of the "gospel in water" arose peculiar to that sect. It did not arise independent of the old Catholic baptismal regeneration super-

stitution, but grew out of it. Bear in mind that we speak of the Campbellite "plan of salvation" growing out of baptismal regeneration, not the Campbellite society as such.

Baptismal regeneration arose as a doctrinal perversion of the original New Testament design of baptism, and as it grew and became popular, it was seized upon by the Catholic clergy as an instrument to further their claim of having power over the eternal destiny of the souls of men, for, as it is clear to all reasonable thinking, if "no one can be saved unless he is baptized, the man who baptizes has the power to prevent the sinner's salvation. Therefore the doctrine is priestcraft.

This cunning devise of Satanic impulse having taken root and gradually assumed vast proportions in the popular Catholic religio-political system and soon being backed by military power and authority through the uniting of the Catholic Church and the state by Constantine, in the year A. D. 321, it was imposed on Christian professors under the threat of the penalty of death for preaching or practicing to the contrary. This ghastly rule was enforced by the Catholics during the long and dreary Dark Ages, until the sunlight of a new day burst upon the world and freed people from the murderous thralldom of superstition and ignorance. All along, from the time of the origin of the priestcraft until the religio-political power was overthrown, there were true witnesses to the primitive doctrine of salvation by grace. Although millions of them suffered martyrdom for their boldness for Christ, they succeeded in projecting the torchlight of truth along the pathway of the centuries. These witnesses lived in different countries and were dubbed by their enemies by different names, such as Novatians, Montanists, Waldenses, Anabaptists, etc., etc. They were true Missionary Baptists whose faithfulness to the truth finally was rewarded by the political power of persecution being taken from their old enemies, the Roman Catholics.

Consequently, a new day at last dawned. Men like Martin Luther, Erasmus, John Knox, and others, who did not in full represent the original New Testament faith for which millions of Baptists had lost their lives, but who did defy the political power and moral corruption of the Papal regime, and helped to overthrow it. When done, Baptists stepped out free of Papal political control, and soon began to spread the old story of God's redeeming grace in many lands.

Among the "Reformers" was John Calvin who gave being to the Presbyterian Church. This doctrine was made quite popular in Scotland by the labors of John Knox. Thomas Campbell and his son,

Alexander, were born in Scotland and reared in the Presbyterian Church.

Alexander Campbell, who received part of his education in the University of Glasgow, left Scotland in August, 1809, for America, settling in Pennsylvania, and later moving to Virginia, and doing work in various states.

Becoming dissatisfied with the doctrine of sprinkling for baptism and certain other teachings of the Presbyterian Church, of which he was a member still, Campbell at first sought to reform this church, but failing he promoted a sort of independent reformation movement which he designed to be influential in bringing all Christians into one compact. He likely withdrew from the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, in which he had formerly been a minister, to prevent excision.

Thomas Campbell, who preceded his son to America some two years before, and who also was obliged to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church, launched a movement which was named "Christian Association." It was composed of both professors and non-professors of salvation. Seeing the folly of his efforts to unite all Christians under the banner of "Christian Union," he made an effort to have his society received into the Old School Presbyterian Church, but was rejected by the Synod. (Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 1, p. 327).

The Christian Association being rejected by all denominations, Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander, began to think seriously about organizing their movement into a separate and independent church. (M. of C. Vol. 1, p. 348). This they did on May 4, 1811. (M. of C, Vol. 1, pp. 362-369). But finding the new "Brush Run" church without baptism, and some of them were not even professed Christians, Alexander Campbell soon sought baptism at the hands of Matthias Luce, a Baptist minister. Others of the church soon followed his example, including his father. Dr. Richardson, the accepted historian of the movement, says:

"From the moment that Thomas Campbell concluded to follow the example of his son in relation to baptism, he conceded to him in effect the guidance of the whole religious movement" (M. of C., Vol. 1, p. 401).

Following the immersion of Campbell and the members of the Brush Run church by Luce, the church was received into the Redstone Baptist Association, but soon much dissatisfaction arose over the fact it seemed Campbell came under the Baptist banner in an effort

to popularize his personal views. In the midst of a fight, a move was set afoot to exclude the Brush Run church from the Redstone Association, which met in August, 1823, but Campbell escaped being expelled from that association by forming and uniting with a church at Wellsburg, and going into the Mahoning Association. The fight waxed hotter, so that by 1827, Baptist churches generally had withdrawn fellowship from the Campbellite movement, and kicked Campbell and his followers out of the fellowship. Campbell himself admitted:

"The Baptists had, in the year 1827, declared non-fellowship with the brethren of the Reformation. Thus by constraint, not of choice, they were obliged to form societies out of those communities that split upon the ground of adherence to the apostles' doctrine" (Ency. of Religious Knowledge, p. 463).

In the midst of the theological melee, Alexander Campbell came up with the "restoration gospel," the "gospel in water," the necessity of being baptized in order to be saved. He did not fully avow the old Catholic doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," but seeking to strip it of its odium, he accepted its principle and dignified it to the rank of a "condition" of salvation. In promulgating this theory, he snatched it from the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church, as the churches -before his day that taught baptism being essential to salvation were Catholic, or those that had brought this piece of grave clothes from the Catholics.

Campbell's "startling" discovery of the "gospel in water" was made in 1823, according to his own testimony, and also the testimony of Dr. Richardson. Says Campbell, speaking of his own work:

"It was not until the year 1823 that a restoration of the original gospel and order of things began to be plead in a periodical edited by Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia, entitled 'The Christian Baptist.'" (Religious Ency., p. 463).

Thus Campbell claims to be the first in modern time to plead the primitive gospel and "order of things," but as he was baptized by a Baptist, and was never baptized again, it is pertinent to ask if the father of the Campbellite church carried with him to his death a robe obtained according to the "original gospel and order of things?"

If so, evidently the Baptist channel was genuine. If not, then "father" Campbell went through life without being clothed in the robe of the "original gospel and order of things."

In Lexington, Ky., in 1843, Mr. Campbell held a debate with Dr. N. L. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church. In that discussion he said:

"Some twenty years ago, when preparing for a debate with Mr. McCalla, I put myself under the special instruction of four Evangelists, and one Paul, of distinguished apostolic rank and dignity. I had for sometime before that discussion, been often impressed with such passages as Acts 2:38; and that providential call to discuss the subject with Mr. McCalla, compelled me to decide the matter to my entire satisfaction. Believe me, sir, then I had forgotten my earlier readings upon the subject; and upon the simple testimony of the Book itself, I came to the conclusion alleged in that debate, and proved only by the Bible, which now appears, from a thousand sources, to have been the catholic and truly ancient and primitive faith of the whole church. It was in this commonwealth that this doctrine was first promulged in modern times; and, sir, it has now spread over this continent, and with singular success, it is now returning to Europe, and the land of our fathers" (Campbell-Rice Debate, p. 472).

Campbell boldly affirms that it was in the State of Kentucky, in the year 1823, that his plan of salvation was first preached in modern times. But it is well to keep in mind the fact that his "gospel in water" is in every essential element like the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration. To this end hear Mr. Campbell's own explanation of his doctrine:

"In my debate with Mr. McCalla, in Kentucky, 1823, on this topic, I contended that it was a divine institution designed for putting the legitimate subject of it in actual possession of the remission of his sins; that to every believing subject it did formally and in fact convey to him the forgiveness of sins. It was with much hesitation I presented this view of the subject at that time, because of its perfect novelty" (Christian Baptist, Vol. 5, p. 401).

The "novelty" of his teaching, says Campbell, caused him to hesitate to take a stand for a doctrine that made baptism put one baptized into possession of the forgiveness of sins. So the Campbellite doctrine of the plan of salvation was a NOVELTY in the year 1823, says the father of the society. While the peculiar arrangement of the doctrine might have been a novelty at that time, and was, still in essence it was the old Mother of Harlot's trickery to gain control of the destiny of poor lost sinners.

But, according to Campbell's own testimony, neither he nor anyone else began to "practice" the doctrine until sometimes later. Says he:

"We can sympathize with those who have this doctrine in their own creeds unregarded and unheeded in its import and utility; for

we exhibited it fully in our debate with Mr. McCalla in 1823, without feeling its great importance and without beginning to practice upon its tendencies for sometime afterwards" (Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 217).

While Campbell says he preached the doctrine but did not practice it, who was the first to put it into effect? Dr. Richardson, Campbell's biographer, tells us:

"Thus, in 1823, the design of baptism was fully understood and publicly asserted. It was, however, reserved for Walter Scott, a few years later, to make direct and practical application of the doctrine, and to secure for it the conspicuous place it has since occupied' among the chief points urged in the Reformation" (Mem. of C., Vol. 2, p. 84).

The first one baptized in order to obtain remission of sins, in line with the "novel" doctrine, was Wm. Amend (some say Robert Amend), on November 18, 1827, by Walter Scott. It was fifteen years, five months and six days after Campbell was baptized by Luce. So if he were the first one thus baptized, Campbell, the father of the Campbellite Church, was not baptized "in order to obtain" remission of sins, and if he were saved without being baptized with this purpose in mind, why cannot others? We are told that the "legs of the lame are not equal." Walter Scott baptized Amend purely as an experiment, and ever since that time Campbell's followers have been experimenting with the souls of men with their priestly doctrine.

As Campbell was baptized by a Baptist minister long before the first person was baptized by one of this new order with a view of obtaining salvation, he puts himself in a dreadful dilemma when he says:

"Remission of sins cannot be enjoyed by any person before immersion . . . Without knowing and believing this, immersion is a blasted nut—the shell is there, but the kernel is wanting" (Christian Baptism, p. 531).

As Campbell did not discover that the "novel" gospel put baptism in order to obtain salvation until AFTER he was baptized, therefore he could not have known and believed it then, and evidently his baptism was a "blasted nut"—a shell without the kernel!

However, Mr. L. L. BRIGANCE, modern exponent of the "gospel in water," crying out for "honor to whom honor is due," gives Walter Scott, not the Campbells, the honor of discovering the plan of salvation. He says:

"While the Campbells gave a correct diagnosis of the ills of the religious world, it was left to Walter Scott to apply the remedy . . . It was accepted by the Campbells at once and has been accepted by all faithful Christians ever since ... It has stood the acid test for a hundred and fifteen years, and is as impregnable today as the New Testament. So to Walter Scott belongs the glory of discovering 'the gospel plan of salvation' and restoring it upon the earth" (Gospel Advocate, March 26, 1942).

1. According to Mr. BRIGANCE, Walter Scott laid the egg and Campbell hatched it. He says the glory must go to Scott for DISCOVERING THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION' AND RE-STOKING IT UPON THE EARTH."

2. This doctrine Mr. Scott discovered and restored, says BRIGANCE, "has stood the acid test for a hundred and fifteen years." This he said in 1942, making the doctrine originate in 1827, as to its practical application, the first time anyone was ever baptized "in order to obtain" remission of sins, under the so-called "restoration gospel" of the Campbells.

PART IV

A Definite Similarity

Having traced baptismal regeneration, as a tenet of the Catholic faith, from its early stages down to modern times, and having shown the time and manner of the origin of the Campbellite doctrine of the "gospel in water," we now come to show the similarity between the two. So close is the similarity until no one can escape seeing that they are closely akin—the older, the Romish mother; the younger, the Campbellite baby.

MR. CAMPBELL'S POSITION

1. Mr. Campbell made immersion equivalent to regeneration. In his "Christian System," he says:

"For if immersion be equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration be of the same import with being born again, then being born again and being immersed are the same thing."

No wonder, then, that he characterized this doctrine: "If so, then who will not concur with me in saying that Christian immersion is the gospel in water." If immersion is equivalent to regeneration and being born again, and is the "gospel in water," pray explain the difference between it and baptismal regeneration of the Catholics.

This doctrine was not held by Campbell only, but it has been the teaching of his followers ever since his day. Dr. Lucas, in his debate with Dr. D. B. Ray, said: "We are baptized into the death of Christ, where we meet the blood, and then we become new creatures" (Ray-Lucas Debate, p. 101). Moses E. Lard, the giant of Campbellism of his day, said: "Baptism doth also save us, because therein our sins are remitted." He also said: "Then (when baptized), therefore, do we cease to be the children of Satan and become the children of God" (What Baptism is For, No. 8, pp. 5, 6). Similar statements are made by Campbell's followers in our day as can be verified by reading their literature, hearing them preach and meeting them in debates. The proposition which Mr. Smith signed and began to defend, but quit for obvious reasons, states that baptism is for (in order to obtain) the remission of sins.

2. Mr. Campbell taught being born again is the same as immersion. He said:

"In a sense, a person *is* born of his father, but not until he is first born of his mother; so in every place where water and the Spirit or water and the Word are spoken of, the water stands first."

As plainly seen, the theory puts water before the blood, water before the Spirit, water before Christ, water before GOD.

3. Therefore Mr. Campbell taught that children of God had two figurative parents—the Holy Spirit, as the Father, and the water as the mother. Says Campbell:

"They have two figurative parents for one figurative birth, because we do and must have two natural parents for one natural birth . . . In the figurative generation there are the Word, the Spirit, and the sinner, and in the figurative birth there are the water and the Spirit" (Millennial Harbinger, 4th Series, Vol. 4, p. 605).

4. Mr. Campbell taught that one is begotten of the Spirit and born of water into the kingdom of Christ. Hear him in his own words:

"Down into the water you were led. Then the name of the Holy One upon your faith and upon your person was pronounced. You were then buried in the water under that name. It closed itself upon you. In its womb you were concealed. Into the Lord, as into the water, you were immersed. But in the water you continued not. Of it you were born, and from it you came forth, raised with Jesus, and rising in His strength. There your consciences were released, for there your old sins were washed away" (Christianity Restored, p. 243).

5. Mr. Campbell went so far as to say that Christ was born again in baptism. Says he:

"The Holy Spirit made the literal body of Jesus by its influences, and afterward filled it. But it was not until he was born again in the Jordan that the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove, descended upon Him," etc. (Christianity Restored, p. 373).

6. Mr. Campbell frankly admitted that his view of the purpose of baptism introduced infant baptism back in the early centuries of the Christian era. He states:

"It was the view of baptism misapplied that originated infant baptism. The first errorists on this subject argued that if baptism was so necessary for the remission of sins, it should be administered to infants, whom they represented as in great need of it on account of their original sin" (Campbell-McCalla Debate, p. 136).

7. Mr. Campbell taught that no unbaptized person could Scripturally pray, sing or do any act of devotion, as we read:

"No prayers, songs of praise, no acts of devotion in the new economy, are enjoined on the unbaptized" (Christian Baptist, p. 439).

In the foregoing, the following facts have been proven:

1. That baptismal regeneration is a Romish doctrine which the Catholics developed.

2. That it was conceived in the second century and brought forth in full blossom in the third. While Catholicism did not exist organically when the doctrine was conceived, it found growth in the same kind of soil in which Catholicism prospers, but when the Catholic system was organized, baptismal regeneration received support and promulgation by it.

3. Out of baptismal regeneration infant baptism sprang.

4. That Alexander Campbell and his coadjutors gave being to a new sect which advocates a plan of salvation which is essentially Romish.

5. That Mr. Campbell's theory of the "gospel in water" has every essential earmark, save one, of the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The one exception is the fact Campbellites require baptism of believers only. But as Campbell taught, the water to the believer meant his new birth, his regeneration, his freedom from sin, his change from Satan's kingdom into the kingdom of Christ, and that up to baptism, one is wholly a child of Satan and doomed to an eternal hell, not even permitted to pray, or to enjoy the privilege of singing praises to God, or to do any act of devotion to God. If that is not essentially the Romish doctrine, then what could be?

PART V

Water, The Campbellite Mother

Having shown by authentic testimony the affinity of Campbell's "Gospel in Water" with the Romish doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," let us note the view of what Campbellites consider to be their mother in the spiritual sense. Baptism being the SUMMA SUMMARUM (sum total) of blessings to the child of God, as considered by the followers of Campbell, we propose to set forth the proof of their position along this line.

THE CAMPBELLITE POSITION

1. Mr Campbell taught, as do his followers today, that being born again and baptism are the same thing. Said he:

"As regeneration is taught to be equivalent to 'being born again,' and understood to be of the same import with a new birth, we shall examine it under this metaphor; for if immersion be equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration be of the same import with being born again, then being born again and being immersed are the same thing, for this plain reason, that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another" (Christian System, old edition, p. 200).

Here, as it is seen, Campbellite theology contradicts both the Bible and common reason. The Bible declares that children of God are to "put on Christ" in baptism (Gal. 3:26, 27), not to find Him in the birth of water, and that we are "buried with Him by baptism" (Rom. 6:4).

The theory reduces itself to a ridiculous position, as it makes the symbol of a burial and resurrection the actual means of salvation. The submerging of the body in water being the burial, the raising of the body out of the water is the resurrection. We know that all who are in their graves will some day come forth at the trumpet call of God, but what would happen to the man who should be submerged "in order to obtain" the remission of sins, but for any reason fail to be raised from the liquid grave? Would the burial alone produce life? But keep in mind the fact that the followers of Campbell make being born again and baptism the same thing.

2. The Campbellite theory puts water first in the spiritual birth. Again we quote Mr. Campbell.

"In one sense, a person is born of his father, but not until he is first born of his mother; so, in every place where water and the Spirit or water and the Word are spoken of, THE WATER STANDS FIRST. Every child is born of its father when it is born of its mother; hence the Saviour put the mother first, and the Apostles follow him. No other reason can be assigned for placing the water first" (Christian System, old edition, p. 201).

Mr. Campbell then proceeds to quote the words of the Master in conversation with Nicodemus—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But the trouble with the theory is, it is here based upon false assumption, that "born of water" means baptism. To the argument we reply as follows:

(1) True to Campbellism, water is always put first—before Christ, His blood and the Holy Spirit. But in 1 John 5:8 we see this order somewhat reversed. It says: "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one." Now since they agree in one, and the Spirit's witness comes to the believer (1 John 5:10), and one believes before baptism, the water must agree that one has the presence of the Spirit BEFORE baptism.

(2) If "born of water" means water baptism, "born of the Spirit" means Spirit baptism. Even the Campbellites themselves will not accept Spirit baptism. As the old saying goes, "A thing that proves too much proves nothing."

(3) If "born of water" means baptism, then the word "born" in the whole conversation between Christ and Nicodemus also means baptism, else Christ would be guilty of a shift of meaning of a word without any logical reason given for it. As things that are "equal to the same thing are equal to each other," if "born of water" means baptism, we can with propriety substitute "baptism" for "born" all the way through the conversation. After this order, let us read:

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be BAPTIZED again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto Him, how can a man be BAPTIZED when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be BAPTIZED? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be BAPTIZED of the water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is BAPTIZED of the flesh is flesh; and that which is BAPTIZED of the Spirit is

spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be BAPTIZED again" (John 3:3-7).

How many times do Campbellites desire to be baptized anyway? Even a casual reading should show one the folly of such a position.

(4) The true explanation of John 3:5 is, Christ explains by the use of the Spirit that He means by water the water of life, or spiritual water, as in John 4:10 and 7:37-39, where Christ makes literal water symbolize the "water of life," or living water. The conjunction "and" connecting water and Spirit is explicative, that is, serving to explain, as in Gal. 1:4: "According to the will of God AND our Father." Here "and" is used to explain God in the light of our Father, not that there are two, God different to and in addition to the Father, there being but one and the selfsame person—God. So "water and Spirit," as Jesus used the term in His conversation with the Samaritan woman. Surely no one is so foolish as to maintain that the water in rivers, creeks or baptistries is "living water." It only symbolizes "living water," as the seven candlesticks of Rev. 1:20 symbolize the seven churches. As John said the seven candlesticks are the seven churches, we know he meant the one symbolized the other. So when Christ used water when speaking of salvation, we know He meant the water of life.

(5) Conclusively, for argument sake, grant that the Campbellites are right in their interpretation of John 3:5, even then they hang themselves on the horns of a dreadful dilemma, for in maintaining their interpretation, they prove too much for their own good, for they admit: first, people were saved before the death of Christ and the first Pentecost after His resurrection, which they constantly disclaim; second, that there actually existed a kingdom before Pentecost, if people were baptized into it, as you cannot baptize people into something that does not exist. Which horn of the dilemma will they cling to, to maintain their position and knock out their Pentecostal theory, or give it up and hold on to the Pentecostal theory?

3. The Campbellite theory makes water the mother of all the saved people. Mr. Campbell thus set forth his "gospel in water" because he attempted to literalize the new birth by finding "something in it to correspond to every part of natural generation and birth." Said he:

"How much more sensible the fisherman of Galilee than our theological doctors of the nineteenth century. They have two figurative parents for one figurative birth, because we do have and must have two natural parents for one natural birth. Every living man among us had, if he have not now, a father and a mother. Did any one ever

see a human being that had not two parents? There is not a child of God in the Church Militant that has not had two parents. Hence, in the figurative generation here are the Word, the Spirit, and the sinner, and in the figurative birth there are the water and the Spirit. A man dead in trespasses and in sin is quickened, through the Word, and he is born of the water and the Spirit after he has died to sin, and been buried in the water of baptism by Christ" (Millennial Harbinger, 4th Series, Vol. 4, p. 605).

Because Campbellites consider water their mother is the reason they put so much stress upon baptism, as it is natural for one to love his mother even above all others. As there can now be no human being born into the family of men without a mother, so, according to their theory, there can be no one born into God's family without the water mother. No mother, no son; no water, no child of God. Christ said: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." So if we are born of water, we could read with equal propriety: "That which is born of water is water" as it is an inexorable law in both the spiritual and physical realm that like shall produce like.

We know every child of God does have a mother, but Mr. Campbell and his followers have inverted the divine order by placing the mother on earth, while the Apostle Paul puts our mother above the earth. He says: "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal. 4:26). This new Jerusalem is free from the bondage of men, the sins and pollutions of the world and the wiles of Satan. Our mother is above, is heavenly, while the mother of Campbellites is in rivers, creeks, pools and baptistries, and may be evaporated and dried up in a dry season. Their mother, therefore, is subject to weather conditions, while our mother is far above all earthly limitations.

With all the foregone reasoning of Mr. Campbell, he puts himself and all his followers into an inextricable dilemma, for says he:

"I received a letter from Mason County, Kentucky, from one of my earliest friends and acquaintances in the State, a gentleman who heard with extraordinary attention my whole debate on baptism in 1823, when its true meaning and design were for the first time promulgated in America" (Millennial Harbinger, New Series, Vol. 2, p. 86).

What an important discovery, but it came several years too late to do the founder of the Campbellite Church any good, as he was baptized by a Baptist minister, June 12, 1812, eleven years before he

said it was first promulgated in modern times. His biographer, Dr. Richardson, says: "Thus, in 1823, the design of baptism was fully understood and publicly asserted. It was, however, reserved for Walter Scott, a few years later, to make a direct and practical application of the doctrine, and to secure for it the conspicuous place it has since occupied among the chief points urged in the Reformation" (Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 84). Scott's application, as referred to above, was made on November 18, 1827, when a Mr. Amend was baptized by him "in order to obtain the remission of sins." This happened fifteen years, five months, and six days after Campbell was baptized by Mr. Luce, a Baptist minister.

As Mr. Campbell said that "remission of sins cannot be enjoyed by any person before immersion... without knowing and believing this, immersion is a blasted nut—the shell is there, but the kernel is wanting." evidently his own baptism was a "blasted nut," a mere shell without the kernel, and as he never received baptism at the hands of any other person and went on to found the Campbellite Society with his Baptist "robe" on, how can he justify his church's stand in the light of his pretended discovery? Campbell was either a lost man when he founded his church, or he was saved without believing baptism was administered "in order to obtain" remission of sins. If he were a lost man, his church was launched by the hands of a man on his road to hell; but, on the other hand, if he were saved, down goes the claim one must be baptized "in order to obtain remission," and if he were saved without knowing that, why cannot people now be saved in like manner? Which horn of the dilemma will Campbellites choose?

PART VI

Unanswered Arguments

We deem it fitting, before this book is finished, to give the readers a few unanswerable arguments, tersely stated, which Dr. Jackson has successfully used in debates from the platform, over the radio and through the printed page, in favor of salvation by grace through faith. They are unanswerable, to state the case very mildly. These arguments would have been presented negatively in the debate, if Mr. Smith had not quit. But now they are presented in this order.

Proposition: The Scriptures Teach that the Sinner is Saved by Grace, Through Faith, Before Water Baptism.

Argument I. The fact that the Holy Spirit is received by believers before water baptism proves one is saved before baptism.

This is true in the case of Cornelius and his household. "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts 10:47).

1. Cornelius and his household demonstrated the presence of the Holy Spirit before baptism. "For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God," v. 46.

2. Sinners cannot receive the Spirit. "Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" (John 14:17).

3. Sonship is proved by the indwelling of the Spirit. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6). See also Rom. 8:14.

4. We are shown to be children of God by the indwelling Spirit. "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16).

5. Then "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:17). See also 2 Cor. 3:17; Luke 4:18.

Argument II. The testimony of the prophets proves that salvation is obtained before baptism.

"To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:43).

"Shall receive remission of sins" is used in connection with belief, and is nowhere found in the Scriptures in connection with baptism.

1. The prophets said nothing about baptism for (in order to obtain) the remission of sins.

2. As the apostle Paul preached nothing for salvation but what the prophets preached, baptism is not a New Testament requirement in order to be saved.

3. Whoever, or every one, that believes in Christ, said the prophets, SHALL receive the remission of sins. This cannot be true, if baptism is necessary, because there were some who believed who were never baptized so far as the divine record goes.

4. Belief in Christ means deliverance; a rejection means condemnation. (Jno. 3:18).

Argument III. The fact that we are created or made anew in Christ Jesus unto good works proves we are saved before baptism, as baptism is a good work.

Read Eph. 2:8-10.

1. Positively, we are created in Christ Jesus "unto good works."

2. Negatively, the new creation is not made by the works we do. "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 Ghost" (Titus 3:5).

"Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began"¹ (2 Tim. 1:9).

3. Neither can one combine his works with grace and obtain salvation. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace: otherwise work is no more work" (Rom. 11:6).

Rom. 4:16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace." It does not say that salvation is of works that it might be by grace.

Argument IV. Salvation is obtained before baptism for the reason we are freed from condemnation before baptism.

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. 10:4). "For the law of the Spirit of life in

Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2).

If baptism stands between the law and Christ, and one is saved when he is baptized, then baptism, not Christ, becomes the end of the law. But John 3:18 says: "He that believeth on Him is not condemned."

Argument V. Salvation is before baptism for the reason one comes under the blood before baptism.

It is BLOOD BEFORE WATER. This is shown typically in the example of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage. The Israelites came under the blood of the paschal lamb (Ex. 12:12, 13) before they came to the baptism at the Red Sea. (1 Cor. 10:1,2).

As the lamb is a type of Christ, the blood on the houses is a type of Christ's blood of redemption. "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5:7).

"When I see the blood," not the Red Sea, "I will pass over you." This shows the Lord was looking at the blood, not the water, for their redemption.

Coming, therefore, to the blood before water, here are some benefits one obtains before baptism:

(1) Peace, Col. 1:20. (2) Redemption and forgiveness, Col. 1:14; Eph. 1:7. (3) Justification and salvation, Rom. 5:9. (4) Propitiation, Rom. 4:25a. (5) Cleansing, 1 Jno. 1:7. (6) Washing from sins, Rev. 1:5. (8) A purging from dead works, Heb. 9:14.

With all these blessings before baptism, who can deny one is saved before baptism?

The Israelites came under the blood the night of the Passover in Egypt, not at the Red Sea. "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's pass-over, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses" (Ex. 12:27).

The Passover event was memorialized and observed by the Israelites in after years, not their baptism at the Red Sea. See Ex. 12:41-43.

The deliverance effected at the Red Sea (Ex. 14:30) was not from bondage, but from the pursuing Egyptians. From the night of the Passover, the Israelites were never in bondage to the Egyptians one moment of time. Therefore they went from the Passover to the Red Sea a delivered, free people. While they were bodily still in Egypt,

they were not of Egypt. This is like the Lord's people who, while they were in the world, were not of the world. See John 18:15,16.

Thus two different groups went to the Red Sea, one under the blood and the other without the blood. Only those under the blood were protected at the sea. Believers go to baptism under the blood of Christ, and therefore have all the benefits named before they reach the water.

Argument VI. The fact that a true confession, which is made before baptism, signifies the presence of God in the confessor, shows that salvation is obtained before baptism.

"And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (Acts 8:37).

1. This shows the indwelling of the Spirit before baptism. "No one can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. 12:3b).

2. It reveals, therefore, that the eunuch was a son of God before baptism. Rom. 8:14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

3. It also reveals the indwelling of God in the eunuch before baptism. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God."

Argument VII. The fact that the Apostle Paul testifies that *be* begot (brought into life) people without baptism administered by himself shows that salvation does not depend on the act of Baptism.

Paul says: "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel" (1 Cor. 4:15). "Begotten" is from the Greek word "gennaō," which means "to bring into life."

Again Paul said: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius... And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other" (1 Cor. 1:14,16.)

Therefore, Paul brought the Corinthians into life without baptism. And having been brought into life without or before baptism, here are some blessings they received before baptism.

(1) The believer is begotten or brought into life. 1 John 5:1. This is done before baptism, as one believes before baptism.

(2) The one begotten (brought into life) is freed from sin. I John 3:9. He is freed from sin before baptism, as he is begotten before baptism.

(3) He overcomes the world. 1 John 5:4. This is done before baptism.

(4) He is out of Satan's control before baptism. 1 John 5:18.

Argument VIII. The fact that John the Baptist demanded fruit meet for repentance before baptism shows that salvation comes before baptism.

"Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" (Matt. 3:8) But to bear fruit for Christ, one must be in Christ. "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself . . . I am the vine, ye are the branches" (John 15:4,5).

Therefore one must be in Christ before he is baptized.

Argument IX. The fact that there are New Testament eases of people being saved apart from baptism shows that baptism is not essential to salvation.

1. The woman in Simon's house.

Christ said unto her: "Thy sins are forgiven . . . And He said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace" (Luke 7:48,50).

(1) Her sins were forgiven, or remitted. "Aphesis" (Greek) same word as employed in Acts 2:38; Mark 2:5; Eph. 1:7; Acts 13:38.

(2) She obtained salvation. (3) She had peace.

It avails nothing to say she was "under the law of Moses." It matters not if she were or not; the fact is, SHE CAME TO CHRIST, not the law, for the blessing.

2. The thief on the cross. Luke 23:42, 43.

3. The woman at Jacob's well. John 4:10, 15.

4. Zacchaeus, Luke 19:9.

5. The blind man. Luke 18:42.

Argument X. The fact that one believes on, into (eis). Christ shows he enters Christ before baptism, as belief precedes baptism.

Paul says the one IN Christ Jesus is to be baptized. Gal. 3:26,27. He actually believes into Christ, and then is symbolically baptized into Him. Being in Christ by faith, one shows it forth outwardly by baptism. Note these verses of Scripture:

John 3:16: "Believe in (eis, into) Him." John 3:18: "Believeth on (eis, into) Him."

John 6:40: ". . . believeth on (eis, into) Him." And the same is true also of verses John 6:47; 11:25, 26.

According to Young's Analytical Concordance, "eis" in the above passages means "into." And so does Wilson's Emphatic Diaglott use "eis" in this way.

Argument XI. The fact that the Divine assurance of the time of salvation is now shows that the salvation of the soul is not delayed until baptism.

"Behold now is the accepted time; behold now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2b). This could have been well spoken to the "thief on the cross" and others in a similar condition and situation, but not so of the doctrine requiring baptism in order to be saved. It would be needless for those who require baptism in order to be saved to preach their doctrine to anyone not in position to be baptized. Why tell a man to do something he cannot possibly do?

Argument XII. The fact that the believer is in possession of blessings that belong only to the children of God proves that -he is saved before baptism, inasmuch as he believes before baptism.

1. He is passed from death unto life. "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" (Jno. 5:24). (1) He hears the word, present tense. (2) He believes, present tense. (3) He has everlasting life, present tense. (See John 6:47; 3:14, 15). (4) He shall not come into condemnation. (5) He is passed from death unto life. This alone should be sufficient to convince anyone.

2. The believer is not condemned. John 3:18.

3. He is justified and has peace with God. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1).

(1) The believer is justified before God. To justify (dikaioo, Gr.) means "to pronounce righteous, to make or declare right." "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: ... To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he must be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus" (Rom. 3:24, 26).

(2) The believer has peace with God. "In me ye might have peace" (Jno. 16:33). What kind of peace? "And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:7).

(3) The justification is through redemption in Christ and the peace is in Christ. Therefore the believer is justified by the grace of God and has peace in Christ, and as he believes before baptism, blessings come to him before baptism. He is redeemed, justified and has peace.

A. The believer has a pure heart in the sight of God. Acts 15:9: "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." Katharizo (Gr.) means "to make clean, to cleanse, to purify." This taking place before baptism, the believer then has the promise: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8).

5. The believer has the witness of the Spirit. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself" (1 John 5:10).

(1) The witness testifies that the believer IS, not will be in baptism, a child of God. "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16).

(2) Then, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:17).

(3) The witness testifies that the believer is sealed. 2 Cor. 1:22: "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

6. The believer rejoices in God. 1 Peter 1:8. And Luke 10:20 says one should rejoice because his name is written in heaven. As he believes before baptism, his name is written in heaven before baptism.

7. The believer has both his hunger and thirst satisfied. Believing before baptism, this blessing is his before baptism. See John 6:35.

Who, then, can doubt that a penitent believer is saved before water baptism?

Argument XIII. The fact that salvation is a free gift of God proves that it is obtained apart from baptism, for the reason baptism is a work.

Rom. 6:23: ". . . the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord," Charisma (Greek), gift means "free gift," or "gift"

of grace." The "free gift" is eternal life, or salvation.

Read: "For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. 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" (Rom. 4:3-5).

Salvation becomes a debt God owes one, if it is obtained by our works. But it is "not of works, lest any man should boast," declares Paul.

Argument XIV. The fact that the saved are added to the church proves salvation comes before baptism.

The "Living Oracles," a New Testament translation accepted and approved by Mr. Alexander Campbell, renders the closing part of Acts 2:47 as follows:

"And the Lord daily added the saved to the congregation."

They were not added to save them, as they were already saved before being added. "Those that were saved" were added, is the way the Amer. Standard Version puts it.

Again, Jesus commands that our "light" be put on a candlestick (Matt. 5:15), and the candlestick represents the church. Rev. 1:20. But we have no light until Jesus, the true light, enters into us. John 1:8, 9. After Jesus, the true light, comes into us, then we are to put our light on the candlestick, or the church, but no one can put the light in the church until he first possesses it. First have the light, and then become a member of the church. This shows that salvation comes before baptism and church membership.