

Smith Jackson Debate

1945

PROPOSITION

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

Jackson's First Affirmative.

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

I am glad to be able, through the smiles of Providence, to respond favorably to Mr. Smith's proposal to debate with me. As he has worked himself to the top as a debater for his people. I am happy at the thought he will leave no stone unturned in an effort to refute my arguments, and to defend his positions. While I shall conduct my part of this discussion in a Christian spirit, I propose, to the best of ability, to do as a character in Shakespeare did--"Lay on McDuffe."

The proposition which I most heartily affirm and Mr. Smith denies is: "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."

The proposition is twofold: (1) Depravity; (2) the work of the Holy Spirit in the conviction and conversion of a sinner. Being essentially related, they are put together in the proposition.

Definition of terms: By the "Scriptures" I mean the Old and New Testaments—the Bible. By "teach" I mean "to impart instruction," or to give information. "Man" denotes a human being, or generically, Mankind. This use of the term is found many times in the Bible, for example, "Let us make man (Heb. Adam) in our image, after our likeness" (Gen. 1:26); "And God saw that the wickedness of man (Heb. adam) was great in the earth" (Gen. 6:5); "Man (Gr. anthropos) shall not live by bread alone" (Matt. 4:4); "Death passed upon all men" (Gr., pi., anthropous), Rom. 5:12.

While Jesus is said to be the "son of man" (Mk. 2:28), he did not inherit man's moral imbecility for the reason he was more than man, God being His Father, (Lk. 1:35); indeed one with God (Jno. 10:30) and was God manifest in human form (Jno. 1:1-2, 14). By "inherently" I mean, innate, inborn, by nature, the word used as an adverb. "Depraved," a verb, denoting moral weakness, and used in the proposition in the light of Paul's declaration in Eph. 2:3: "Were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." "Conviction," a legal term, means to convince; "sin" means missing the mark, transgression, etc. The latter word is applied to the acts of men when their rebellion against God is considered, or to a state or condition of man. "Conversion to God" means a change from a state of condemnation to God, spiritual liberty from the bondage of sin being obtained in God (2 Cor. 3:17). The Holy Spirit is a personage in the triune Godhead. "Exercise" means to exert or to employ; "power" means energy, force, influence, which I affirm God uses in the conversion of a sinner "distinct from the written or spoken word of God." I define "distinct" in this usage to mean clear, plain, unconfused.

In conviction and conversion, the Holy Spirit moves upon a sinner's heart, which power or energy is exerted distinct from the word, that is, in a clear, plain and unconfused way. Distinct from the word does not necessarily mean without the word, as we affirm the use of the word as means. While the Holy Spirit employs the word as means, His personal contact with the sinner's heart is unconfused with the word. Article VII in the New Hampshire Confession declares that regeneration "is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the Holy Spirit, in connection with divine truth." Thus the Lord opened Lydia's heart, that "she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul" (Acts 16:14). No need of charging that God is a respecter of person unless He opens all sinners' hearts. He is ready and eager to open every one's heart, and the reason He does not is the fact some reject the wooing of the Spirit. This is seen in Acts 7:51 where sinners are said to "resist the Holy Ghost," or Spirit, under the preaching of Stephen.

My opponent's position, if he has not departed from the

established teaching of his people, is that the Spirit operates upon a sinner in the way a man's spirit moves upon another in a written letter. He believes no more in the personal operation of the Spirit of God than he does in a dead man's spirit operating through a letter which he wrote while living. That virtually reduces the operation of the Spirit to nothing. Of course he will tell us he believes in the operation of the Spirit, but when reduced to its final analysis, his position is the "word only" theory. At this juncture we will let some of the earlier leaders of the "Reformation Movement" speak.

Mr. Alexander Campbell: "All the moral power of God or of man is exhibited in the truth which they propose. Therefore, we say, that if the light or the truth contain all the moral power of God, then the truth alone is all that is necessary to the conversion of men" (Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 2, p. 297).

"The truth alone is all that is necessary to the conversion of men," declares Mr. Campbell. No wonder Mr. Smith and his people cast aside the personal work of the Spirit in conversion. So far as their theology is concerned, the Spirit might as well stay in another world. They do not need the Spirit, as they say all the power of conversion resides in the word only. But hear Mr. Campbell again:

"When we think of the power of the Spirit of God exerted upon minds, or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine that that power can consist in anything else but words, or arguments" (Mil. Harb., Vol. 1, p. 294).

Yes, it is the "word and argument" theory of conversion with the Spirit of God driven away. Mr. Briney, in his debate with Dr. J. B. Moody, of the Baptist Gleaner, said: "The personal power of the Spirit is not present with the word, in the conversion of the sinner" (Nashville Debate, p. 411).

Mr. Briney says in effect that he denies there is any personal work of the Spirit upon the sinner in conversion. Similar quotations could be made from other men of Mr. Smith's faith, but

it is not necessary, as the ones already given will serve my purpose in this first installment to survey the field of battle and to establish the lines of difference between my opponent and me, so far as the work of the Spirit in conversion is concerned. I maintain that the Spirit, in connection with the word, exerts a personal power upon the sinner's heart in conviction of sin and conversion to God. Mr. Smith denies this. My position harmonizes with every Scripture reference bearing upon this question, such verses coming in this category as Rom. 1:16—the gospel being God's power unto salvation; 1 Cor. 1:21, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe"; 1 Pet. 1:22-23; Heb. 4:12; also John 6:63, "The words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," showing the words Christ had spoken concerning eating His flesh imply spiritual food, not His literal body, and the life promised by His words is spiritual, not physical.

Now, the position I affirm with regard to the Spirit's work is vitally connected with the teaching of inherent depravity, and I shall proceed to survey the field of battle over the question of depravity also. Very little is accomplished in debate unless the positions of the disputants are unmistakably set forth.

Baptists believe man is born into the world with a nature inclined to do wrong; Mr. Smith and his people believe that he is born as pure as Adam in the creation, unless some of them differ from their usual position. Will my opponent take the position that God creates a soul immediately for each child born into the world, or will he say that the soul is inherited from the parents? Let him declare himself. If God immediately creates the soul in conception or at birth, then He immediately creates every faculty of the soul. The mind is a faculty, and hence God would be responsible for creating the weakness of minds.

Depravity is the destitution of holiness. Alexander Campbell, who sometimes blundered upon the truth, said: "Man, by his fall or apostasy from God, lost three things—union with God, original righteousness, and original holiness" (Campbell-Rice Debate, p. 615). These being lost in Adam, who stood as the federal head of

the human race, cannot be inherited by his posterity. For this reason Christ, the second Adam, appears, offering God's image through His blood which man lost in the fall. Through Christ we obtain the divine image (Rom. 8:29), which cannot be inherited in a natural sense, as we read in Jno. 1:13: "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Holiness is not inherited from man; it must be obtained of God. The whole human race went down in and with Adam, the head, and the lifting up comes through Christ, who cares for all in their death who are not subject to gospel address and saves all who are subject to gospel address when they come to Him by faith. It is all done through the blood of Christ, otherwise some will be in Heaven from Adam's fallen race not redeemed by the blood, which is far from divine truth that any one can enter heaven apart from the personal work of Christ.

Depravity is both negative and positive. Negatively, it comprehends the state, the natural state, of mankind into which we are born of our parents. Positively, it includes all transgressors. The first is seen in Eph. 2:3, "Were by nature children of wrath"; the second, "Dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1). "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. 5:14). That pictures both states—(1) the reigning of sin over those who were not capable of openly transgressing God's will; (2) those who did so. Then, all who are born into the world are sinners by state, and when they get old enough they become sinners by voluntary transgression. So Paul says: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12). No need of arguing this means physical death alone, for the verse says all have sinned, and over them (Gr. pantas anthropous, all men) death has come. Why would any one, whether infant or adult, die unless the seed of death should spring up? "The sting of death is sin" (1 Cor. 15:56). I challenge my opponent to explain how the seed of death enters an infant, who tastes the sting of death in infancy, except by the process of natural birth. If infants were born as pure as Adam in

creation, there would be no infant mortality. The fact that infants die shows there is the seed of death, or sin, in their constitution. And if so, the doctrine of inherent depravity is Scriptural.

As man's entire constitution is affected by sin, he is totally depraved. His soul, mind and body are affected. "Man that is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble" (Job 14:1). Total depravity does not mean that man is incapable of aggravating sin in his life, that he is as bad as he can be, but that all his being is affected by sin; for example, Paul says: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor. 5:6). A small pinch of leaven will affect every molecule of a huge loaf of bread, still more leaven could be used.

And so, my friends, there is the issue clearly stated, and we have a right to expect Mr. Smith to grapple with it in the light of the best he has to offer.

Smith's First Negative

Proposition: 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.

Mr. Jackson and Readers:

I am happy that in the kindness of God this opportunity for discussion is granted. No better way is found of teaching God's word than through such discussions. I anticipate a debate of the highest order for Mr. Jackson is of high reputation among his people. He further proposes that he shall "Lay on McDuffe" and that is as it should be. I shall reply in kind, yet there shall be only the kindest of personal feeling for him.

Mr. Jackson has correctly stated the proposition is two-fold, yet related. Thus we see the propriety of debating them together.

I concur with Mr. Jackson in his definition of terms, (save for the reference to Christ in Mk. 2:28) up to the word "depraved." At this point I must call upon him for a better definition. He so weakens the force of this word that it is hardly recognizable. Webster says of "depraved," characterized by debasement, corruption, or degeneration, especially with reference to morals; perverted, vitiated, corrupt. Synonyms of the word are, evil, immoral, vicious, vile, wicked.

You can therefore readily see that Mr. Jackson in defining "depraved" as "a verb denoting moral

weakness" has failed utterly to indicate the true meaning. He indicates by his definition an absence of good but Webster says, it indicates the presence of evil. We must not lose this true meaning, for to do so changes the proposition entirely.

It would be to Mr. Jackson's advantage to thus weaken the word

early in the discussion for he does not want to affirm all that the word means and all that Baptists have affirmed of it in the past. Let us note what good Baptist authorities have had to say concerning this inherent depravity.

"From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." (Philadelphia Confession of Faith, Article 6, Sec. 4). If he rejects this Confession note what is in one to which he refers in his opening argument? "Being by nature utterly void of that holiness required by the law of God, wholly given to the gratification of the world, of Satan and of their own sinful passions, therefore under just condemnation to eternal ruin, without defense or excuse" (New Hampshire Confession of Faith, Article III).

We have now given Webster's definition and the Baptist definition, as set forth in their Confessions of Faith. Surely Mr. Jackson will accept one of them and thus must recognize the weakness of his definition of "depraved." If he rejects these Confessions let him now say so and we will no longer charge him with their teaching. We are set to convert him and all Baptists from their error and the renunciation of these man-made Confessions of Faith would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Jackson can find no justification for his proposition in Eph. '2:3 for we note that Paul says "they walked" not "were born" in this. Further Mr. Thayer says of this "nature" that it is acquired by use and, therefore is not necessarily inherited. Of course he would like to weaken the word "depraved" as much as possible, for there will be plenty of trouble soon for him in trying to keep dying infants out of hell, since according to his own Confession of Faith they are born "utterly devoid of holiness... therefore under just condemnation to eternal ruin, without defense or excuse." That is the Baptist doctrine on "inherently depraved" and Mr. Jackson should defend it or renounce it and that right early.

Mr. Jackson's further definition of terms can be generally accepted, but he no sooner finishes defining than he begins to

contradict his definition. The proposition is that "in conviction and conversion to God, the Holy Spirit exercises a power distinct from the written or spoken word of God." Note carefully "distinct from" and yet Mr. Jackson immediately begins to argue that this power is exercised "in connection with." Which is he going to teach? In saying "in connection with" he has given up his proposition which says, "distinct from." Is Mr. Jackson going to deny Baptist doctrine in this as well as the matter of depravity? It may be that in his many debates he has finally learned the truth on the question and if so let him state it. We will accede his conversion and move on to another proposition on which there is difference between us.

Mr. Jackson says in paragraph 10, "I maintain that the Spirit, in connection with the word, exerts a personal power upon the sinners' heart in conviction and conversion to God. Mr. Smith denies this." Now Mr. Jackson, you are wrong. I do not deny that statement. On the contrary I believe that statement and if you believe it we had as well end this part of the debate. I deny that the Spirit operates upon the sinner in some manner "distinct from" the written or spoken word and that is the thing you obligated yourself to prove to the readers of this discussion. Either come to the point or admit your defeat.

He refers to Lydia and her conversion, (Acts 16:14). But note carefully dear reader, that it was when she "heard us" that the Lord opened her heart. Grant this is the Spirit's work, it was accomplished by the word she heard. "The openings of thy word giveth light" (Psa. 119:130). Thus it was in David's day, so it was in Paul's day and it continues to be so in our day. I preach the gospel for it is the power of God to save (Rom. 1:16). Men and women are saved by preaching (1 Cor. 1:21) in their obedience to the truth (1 Pet. 1:22). These passages to which he refers are the very ones that I have been emphasizing every day of my ministry of the word of God. These are passages that teach the Spirit's operation through and in the word of God for the word of God is the Spirit's sword (Eph. 6:17).

"He cut off his leg with a sword" can be a statement of fact.

"He" personally cut off the leg. However, he did it "with a sword." Thus it is that the Spirit operates upon the heart of man, "with the word," which is his sword. It is a personal operation but he uses the word to do it. Mr. Jackson is to show an operation on the heart "distinct from" the word.

Webster says that "separate" is a synonym of "distinct." He also says that "from" means "away, out of contact with or proximity to." Therefore Mr. Jackson is obligated to show an exercising of power "out of contact with the word" or "with no proximity to the word." If he can do that we will have something to examine and study.

Now Mr. Jackson tries to define my position and maneuvers to force me into the affirmative. My position is not under consideration. Neither will it do him any good to quote Mr. Campbell, Mr. Briney, or any other man. He should spend his space in showing that the scriptures teach his proposition or give way in defeat for the discussion of another proposition.

Again coming back to depravity in paragraph 12, Mr. Jackson says, "Baptists believe man is born... with a nature inclined to do wrong." Nay, Mr. Jackson, they have believed more than that as shown in the quotations given from your Confession. "Wholly inclined to evil," "Utterly devoid of holiness" is the way it has been put. Do you accept or deny?

Now regarding souls of babies let us know what Mr. Jackson means by "soul." Many fail to distinguish between "soul" which is the physical life and is received from the parent and "spirit" of which God is the Father (Zech. 12:1). The mind is a faculty of the soul and may be diseased from the parent's abuses but the Spirit is from God and is not so diseased, neither is it depraved. Let Mr. Jackson make himself clear upon the distinction between soul and Spirit and we shall have more for him than he wants on that question.

Depravity is more than a "destitution of holiness." Holiness cannot be inherited but neither can depravity. How can Mr. Jackson so confidently say that "Holiness is not inherited from man" and

then affirm that "depravity" which he says is the absence of holiness, can be inherited. The whole race went down with Adam physically, but our Spirits are not inherited from Adam and are not contaminated by his sin.

Mr. Jackson makes a fatal blunder in his reasoning along this line for he finally concludes that save the sting of death which is sin be in the infant he could not die. Now what will he do with the Christ who was carried into Egypt to escape death at the hand of Herod. Of course, Christ was later "made sin on our behalf" but in his infancy he was as subject to death as any other infant in the land. If he was not then God made a blunder in hurrying him out of the land that he might escape that which threatened him not.

Here was an infant, surely "as pure as Adam" yet he was subject to death and God protected him from it that he might fulfill his work in the world. He was a "man that is born of woman" and he was "of few days and full of trouble" yet he knew no sin but was nevertheless as much subject to death as any infant that ever lived.

Now Mr. Jackson would make a distinction in depravity and sin and cites Eph. 2:3 and then Eph. 2:1 as proof texts along this line. He so warps the meaning of the apostle that there is little to be recognized in his argument. Paul says that these "were by nature the children of wrath" but note it is while they were "doing" evil that they were children of wrath. Paul does not say they were born that way, neither does any other passage of scripture in all the word of God.

Finally in conclusion he says that "Total depravity does not mean that man is incapable of aggravating sin in his life." Pray tell me how one who is born "wholly inclined to evil" and "utterly void of holiness" can ever get worse than that. How can sin be aggravated and made worse in such a life as that which is the picture Baptists give of every child born into the world.

So there my friends you have it. Mr. Jackson has surveyed the field and I have followed him as I shall throughout this discussion. In his space he has given up both parts of his two-fold proposition.

He does not want to affirm the true meaning of depravity and prove that man is born "inherently depraved." Rather he would soften the word and just make him morally weak or inclined to evil.

Next he has jumped the track on the operation of the Spirit and wants to forego that which he agreed to affirm. His proposition is Baptist doctrine. His arguments are not. He wants to give it up and yet hold on to it. Well Mr. Jackson, you can't "have your cake and eat it too." You must either get in or get out. Either affirm your proposition or give it up. Renounce the errors of the Baptists and come over to Dallas and I will baptize you unto the remission of your sins and you can go on preaching the truth with all your power henceforth.

Jackson's Second Affirmative

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

As even the casual reader could observe, Mr. Smith approached my first affirmative with dreadful trepidation despite his boast that he is "set to convert

D. N. Jackson and all Baptists from their error." That sounds too much like his father Campbell not to believe in inherent depravity. Campbell, not much over a hundred years ago, undertook "to convert all Baptists from their error," but soon found himself impaled upon their toe at the exit of their fold, and since then all his sons in the ministry have kept up the attack. He failed as signally as Mr. Smith will fail in this debate.

Mr. Smith suggests that I "come over to Dallas" and he will baptize me "unto the remission of sins." This is in keeping with his teaching that everybody is on the road to hell unless he is a member of the church to which my opponent belongs. His doctrine says no one can be saved except in the arms of a man. But suppose I should start to Dallas to meet Christ in the arms of Mr. Smith, and die before arriving, where would my soul go? As I have already entrusted myself in the arms of Jesus, I shall go on joyfully defending the truth and exposing my opponent's error.

Keeping the issue in mind, you see that I teach that man is born with a fallen nature that induces to sin, and in his conversion to God, the Holy Spirit, in connection with the word yet distinct from it, moves upon the sinner's heart, while Mr. Smith teaches that man is born as pure as Adam in creation, and in fact the Spirit no more personally operates on the sinner's heart than a dead man's spirit

touches the reader of his letter.

His position is the "word only" theory. He passed over my quotations to this effect from his Campbell and Briney with the slight remark that he cares not what they/said. Then why urge upon me what any Baptist says. Mr. Briney said: "I deny there is any personal power of the Holy Spirit exerted upon the sinner's heart in conversion." If Mr. Smith gives up what his church used to teach, let him say so, and if so, he might find full employment correcting the "errors" of his fathers. Mr. Campbell said virtually the same thing as Mr. Briney, as I quoted in my first affirmative. The "word only" theory robs the Spirit of God of any personal contact with the sinner in conversion. It is, therefore, a Spiritless conversion.

"He cut off his leg with a sword" is Mr. Smith's illustration of the work of the Spirit and the word, but whoever heard of a sword cutting off any one's leg except as used by another? The word is the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17), and it does not read "the sword of the preacher." Mr. Smith should see that there is a clear distinction between the Spirit and the sword. His position is that the preacher stands off and cuts the sinner's "leg" off with the word—the "word only" theory, while I maintain the Spirit accompanies His own word, spoken or written, and uses it as a sword in a personal operation on the sinner. Can you imagine a physician operating on a man with his sword (knife) and not coming into personal contact with the patient? Mr. Smith has the preacher operating on the sinner by throwing the sword (knife) at the patient. I do not believe he would allow a physician to operate on him in so careless a manner. Thank you, my friend, for that illustration, as it helps to sustain Baptist doctrine. Try another one. The Spirit and the word are distinct, yet they work together, as the surgeon and his knife are distinct and still work together. I know no one should fail to see this point.

That explanation shows the true relationship of the Spirit and the word in the Scripture references such as as Acts 16:14: "Whose (Lydia's) heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things spoken of Paul"; Psalms 119:130: "The entrance of thy words giveth

light"; Heb. 4:12: "The word of God is quick and powerful," etc.; although some scholars maintain that the "word of God" here means the Son of God (Jno. 1:1-2, 14); and 1 Peter 1:22: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit"; Rom. 1:15—Gospel of Christ is power of God unto salvation.

Paul knocks the "word only" theory out in 1 Thess. 1:5: "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." This is in keeping with 2 Thess. 2:13: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

Mr. Smith complains that I was not full enough with my definition of depravity. I think so. The trouble is he jumped before he read all. I said it is "moral weakness," "the destitution of holiness"—the loss of three things: "Union with God, original righteousness, and original holiness" (Campbell); it is both negative and positive. Negatively, it comprehends the state, the natural state, of mankind into which we are born of our parents. Positively, it includes all transgressors. That is what I said, and what's the matter with my opponent that he utterly failed to notice it? He treated that like he did my argument on Rom. 5:12, 14, and another on the image lost—skipped it.

By all means Mr. Smith should listen to Mr. Alexander Campbell, writing as follows:

"Our nature was corrupted by the fall of Adam before it was transmitted to us; and hence that hereditary imbecility to do good, and that proneness to do evil, so universally apparent in all human beings. Let no man open his mouth against the transmission of a moral distemper, until he can satisfactorily explain the fact, that the special characteristic vices of parents appear in their children as much as the color of their skin, their hair, or the contour of their faces. A disease in the moral constitution of man is as clearly transmissible as any physical taint, if there be any truth in history, biography, or human observation.... All inherit a fallen, consequently a sinful nature, though all are not equally depraved" (The Christian System, p. 80).

Father Campbell, Mr. Smith, told you not to open your mouth against the "transmission of a moral distemper," and he adds that "All inherit a fallen nature, consequently a sinful nature." Mr. Smith should respect this quotation, for Dr. Richardson, Mr. Campbell's biographer, referred to Mr. Campbell as a "balance-wheel" regulating "the entire movement of the Reformation." Get in line, my friend, with the "balance-wheel" of your movement, and do not unbalance the balance-wheel. So far as the quotations Mr. Smith made from the Confessions pertaining to depravity are concerned, I accept them. Now, let him bring on his charge of "infant damnation," and I'll let both the Lord and Alexander Campbell answer him.

Funny of the funnies is Mr. Smith's answer to my challenge: "I challenge my opponent to explain how the seed of death enters an infant, who tastes the sting of death in infancy, except by the process of natural birth." He replied that Christ was subject to death. Don't laugh, please. Christ was subject to death because He bore man's sins; He tasted death for every one (Heb. 2:9), yet without sin (Heb. 4:15) and knew no sin (2 Cor. 5:21). Will Mr. Smith take the position that Christ had in Him the seed of death? Let him answer. If so, when and how did it enter Him? The devil did not put it into Him in the temptation. Tell us plainly, my honorable opponent, how and when did Christ pick up the "seed of death," if He had it? Ah, my friends, he quibbles to escape the noose, but he shall never escape it. Watch and see.

He says: "The whole human race went down with Adam physically, but our spirits are not inherited from Adam and are not contaminated by his sin." That's interesting, but it would be a lot better if he could prove all he says by the Bible. He found that in the first chapter and third verse of the book of his imagination.

"Whole human race went down physically with Adam." So far so good, as physical death resulted from the transgression, or sin, but Adam did not die physically for hundreds of years after his expulsion

from the garden. Explain, then, Mr. Smith, how Adam's children,

who died before or after he did, went down with him physically unless his sin was transmitted to them. Come on, my friend, and we'll debate some.

Again, he says "our spirits are not inherited from Adam." Why did he not tell us how we obtained them? One of two positions he must take: (1) God did not finish His work of creation when He said He did (Gen. 2:1, 2), or (2) hold to the doctrine of transmigration of souls or spirits. Which horn of the dilemma will he lay hold of? The reference to Zech. 12:1 avails him nothing but actually proves my position of the finished creation in the beginning. Read it: "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." The prophet here looks back to the original creation of the heavens and the earth, for surely He is not still laying the earth's foundation and stretching forth the heavens. Before creation was completed, God formed man "and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7).

Mr. Smith wants me to explain what I mean by "soul." Sir, I mean the same thing the Lord did in the creation of man. Did God give to Adam's children anything in birth that He did not give to Adam in creation? If so, what was it? Mr. Smith speaks of the soul and spirit of an infant, and says its soul "may be diseased from the parents' abuses."

Thus we have driven him to take the position of inherent sin for the infant's soul, and since he says man went down physically with Adam, he admits both soul and body inherently affected by sin. Watch out, or he'll be coming east for baptism, instead of my going to Dallas. Now here are a few simple questions, and see if he answers them: (1) Since the spirit goes "upward" and we know the body goes to the grave at death, where does the infant's soul go? (2) Did Christ die for infants? If so, why? (3) Was Christ made in the likeness of infant flesh? (4) Does the Spirit personally contact the preacher, the word, or the sinner, or all, in conversion? (5) Is it possible for a sinner to be saved by the word preached by an

unsaved minister?

More still. God created man in His image and after His likeness (Gen. 1:26). Image, from the Hebrew word *tselem*, signifying moral relationship as the ideal, the principle. Likeness, from the Hebrew *demuth*, signifying a rational being capable of possessing reason, will, love, etc. While these words are closely related, we can see the image or moral relationship disappearing in the fall of Adam, and if so, under no circumstances could Adam transmit his original relationship to his posterity. Therefore inherent depravity must be the logical consequence. We know fallen man does not possess this image for the reason he is told to "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:24), and thus he is made in the image of Christ who is in the image of His Father. Rom. 8:29; Col. 3:10; 2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15; Heb. 1:3).

Since we obtain the image of God through Christ In regeneration only, it is an evident fact man without Christ does not possess the image of God. If not, when and how did he lose the creative image? It was lost in the first Adam, and can be obtained now only through Christ the second Adam. When done it is stamped in the blood of Christ in regeneration, and as it is not obtained by a natural process, as it comes by grace, it cannot be transmitted by natural procreation.

Smith's Second Negative

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

We will allow the casual readers, and all others, to judge as to the "trepidation" with which we approach Mr. Jackson's ramblings. It would be better for Mr. Jackson to make an affirmative argument than to spend his words in vain boasting about the fears of any one. He has now expended four thousand words on his side of the debate, and, as yet, has failed to make one scriptural argument to support his proposition. When, Oh when, will he start to debate?

In a debate of this kind, Mr. Jackson, the laboring oar belongs to the affirmative. It is not mine to answer your questions nor is it my position, doctrine, or practice that is to be examined. You have obligated yourself to affirm the proposition which you signed and thus far have signally failed. Your evasion and quibbling is showing up for what it is and your dear Baptist brethren are going to lose patience with you soon if you do not get down to the issue.

Of course the attempt you make to force me into the affirmative and get a discussion of something other than the proposition is an old debater's trick, but it is not going to work this time. It is your affirmative and I call upon you to either take your proposition, stay with it and support it by scriptural arguments or admit that it is not true.

You are obligated, as you know, to show that the scriptures teach the proposition you affirm. What then does it matter what I believe or what J. B. Briney, or Alexander Campbell said or taught. It matters not what you can find in any man's writing or belief in the world, your proposition is not established until you show that the

scriptures teach that which you have signed to affirm.

Where, Mr. Jackson, do the scriptures teach that man is born, "inherently depraved?" Where, Mr. Jackson, do the scriptures teach a direct, immediate contact of the Spirit upon the heart of the sinner, "distinct from" the word of God. This is what you should be searching for and if you do not get busy there are going to be a lot of disappointed Baptists who will leave an institution whose doctrine cannot be found in the Bible and whose debaters must resort to subterfuge, evasion and quibbling to fill space.

What matters it whether Brother Campbell was "kicked" out of the Baptist church or not? That will not prove Mr. Jackson's proposition. The facts of the matter, of course, show that he was not "kicked" out but contrariwise, when he learned the truth his teaching was such that he no longer would stand with them and thus took his stand on the word of God. It begins to look like Mr. Jackson no longer can believe or affirm Baptist doctrine so he should be as honest as this one he ridicules and get out of an institution which he knows is unscriptural in its teaching and practice.

What matters it, so far as this proposition is concerned, what I teach about people going to hell? No such quibbling as this will prove Mr. Jackson's proposition. My doctrine is a Bible doctrine, that no one can be saved outside of Christ, and the Bible reveals no way of entering Christ save through Baptism but that will all be amply handled when I take the affirmative. This cannot help Mr. Jackson today save as it arouses prejudice in the minds of the readers to cover his inability to produce his needed scriptures.

It matters not what I teach or believe at this time and I am sure you can see this is an evasion of the proposition by Mr. Jackson, but in discussing it Mr. Jackson cannot stay with what I believe. He now tries to build a "straw man" so he can kick that around. It is much easier to kick than the Bible which I believe. He charges me with a "word only" theory. I challenge him to find where I have said anything about people being saved by "word only." That is the phraseology of Mr. Jackson's creeds which he says he will accept.

It is in the creeds of men that salvation is attributed to one thing or another "only" and now he would place such a charge against me. I deny ever having made such a statement or believed such a thing from the day of my conversion. My conversion was not by "word only" but was accomplished by the spirit personally as he operated on my heart by the word of God. Thus must it be in every case and in no other way does the Spirit operate. Now, Mr. Jackson, show a case where He operated "distinct from" the word.

My illustration was an is, "He cut off his leg with a sword." So the spirit does his work through the word as the man does through the sword. You readers can see that as clearly as Mr. Jackson sees it. However, I trust you readers will not try to evade it as he does. He changes my illustration to a physician and a knife and says, "the surgeon and his knife are distinct and still work together." Now, good friends, I have not denied that the Spirit is distinct from the word. That is not what Mr. Jackson set out to prove. He set out to prove and I to deny, that the Spirit operates "distinct from the word." I do not say and have never said that the Spirit and the word are the same. That is the "straw man," the perversion, that Mr. Jackson would erect to cover his dismal failure in the affirmative but he shall not pass.

Now, Mr. Jackson, find me a scripture where the Spirit "operates without the word." He would have the surgeon making an incision with his finger nail for he would have him operate separate and apart from his knife. The scriptures that he gives (Acts 16:14; Psa. 119:130; Heb. 4:12; I Pet. 1:22; Rom. 1:16) are all evidence of the Spirit operating through the word. Where is one that tells about an operation on the heart of a sinner without the word. That is Baptist doctrine but it is not in the Bible. Therefore, Mr. Jackson must fill his pages with something to keep Baptists under their delusion which has been produced by the false teaching of their preachers.

Yes, I am still saying that his definition of depravity is weak and does not show you the meaning of the word. He has not gone as far as Baptists have gone in authoritative works. He says he will accept the Philadelphia and New Hampshire confessions of faith

(Par. 10). Well, then let him bring out some scripture to show (1) That man is born "wholly defiled, in all the faculties and parts of soul and body" or (2) That man is born, "Utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly indined to all evil." Where is the scripture for this doctrine on depravity which is from his confession of faith. I need make no charge about the matter, it is his obligation to sustain these by scripture, since he said he accepted them and has affirmed that man is thus born.

But again he refers to Campbell and his teaching. I verily believe he reads Campbell more than he does his Bible. He calls him "Father" and that without quotation marks. Thus he honors him as his "Father," a thing I do for no man on the earth (Matt. 23:9). However, I believe if A. Campbell was living today he would not honor D. N. Jackson as his son, for although he can see the weakness of his Baptist position, he does not have the forthright courage to come out from among them and take his stand for the truth as did Mr. Campbell.

But now to my "funny of the funnies." Christ was "made sin on our behalf" (II Cor. 5:21). Yes, he was made sin but he was not born a sinner. He was not born "wholly defiled, in all the faculties and parts of soul and body" was he, Mr. Jackson? Now Mr. Jackson's position is that an infant could not die if he did not have in him the "seed of death" which is sin. Therefore he must be born in sin. My answer was that Christ was subject to death in infancy, before God "made him sin on our behalf" and that the "seed of death" being in an infant did not show him defiled and depraved. Now, Mr. Jackson, you can see that, can't you? Don't twist it again and make it appear as something I did not say. Try your hand on it for a little while and see what comes of it. God hurried Christ into Egypt as an infant that he might escape death at the hand of Herod. Do you deny that he could have died? Try answering that, Mr. Jackson. If you deny he could have died, you make God's action ridiculous for He hurried him away to escape that which he could not suffer. If you say he could die you have in him the "seed of death." Does this mean that Christ was depraved in birth? Please, Oh, please answer.

Yes, all went down physically with Adam. Paul says, "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." Do you think this refers to spirits? This is a physical, bodily death as it is a physical, bodily resurrection. To say that this reference to Adam means that all die spiritually and from him inherit depraved Spirits is to say all will inherit salvation from Christ and none can be lost in the end. Fact of the matter is that all, both good and evil will come forth in the resurrection through the power of Christ and thus they regain in Christ what was lost in Adam and this statement of Paul has reference to this physical body, its death in Adam and its resurrection by the power of Christ.

Adam's sin was not transmitted to his children, for the Bible says, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20). Now, Mr. Jackson, will you say that Adam's sin was transmitted to his children? Did they inherit sin from their father Adam? I will not be surprised for you to say that they did, Mr. Jackson, for I know it is a Baptist teaching, but it is contrary to the Bible. However, this is not the only point at which Baptist doctrine contradicts the Bible.

Hebrews 12:9 says God is "the Father of our spirits." That is Bible for you, Mr. Jackson. Now will you please find me a passage of scripture that says our parents of the flesh are the fathers of our spirits. That is the very thing that Paul is contrasting here in Hebrews twelve but Mr. Jackson is clinging to a false theory that our spirits are the offspring of our fathers in the flesh. Where is there any scripture for that?

The soul of man, as Mr. Jackson knows, if he will quit quibbling and evading, is the physical life of the body. The Spirit is that which goeth upward to God at death and it is the spirit which shall come with Christ to inhabit the resurrected body.

We answer his questions lest he consume his time in further quibbling. It is not the negative's job to answer such but here are the answers. (1) The Spirit goes to God, the body to the earth and the soul (physical life) ceases. (2) Christ died for all, to save them from their sins, not their father's sins. (3) Yes.

(4) Acts 2:1-4; 8:29. (5) The word is powerful (Heb. 4:12) regardless of who the preacher may be for it is the Spirit operating through the word.

But now in closing Mr. Jackson would have you believe that in Christ we become far different to the nature of an infant. In Christ those who have sinned are made pure and free from sin. But remember Christ said, "Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18:3). Now it is evident that when one turns to Christ he becomes as a little child. The image that he regains in Christ is the one that he has lost in sin. However, he was not born with that image lost for when he regains the image he must become as he was when a little child. Therefore the "image" in the little child is as it is in the Christian. This image is lost in sin, not inherited sin but our own sin and is regained in our obedience to the gospel of Christ.

Yes, even Mr. Jackson can see that. Now come on, Mr. Jackson, get in the affirmative and let us see if you can somewhere, somehow, find a scripture that teaches "inherent depravity" or an operation of the Spirit on the sinner in conversion "distinct from" the word.

Jackson's Third Affirmative

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

I regret Mr. Smith is nervous. In fact you can see the trembling of his hand in every word of his last reply. Read it again and note this sad feature. Of the more than twenty paragraphs, he devoted only a few of them to an enfeebled reply, and the others to a witless ridicule. In his dodges, he runs faster than his father Campbell did when he was trying to keep the Baptists from excluding him. As his showing falls far below the mark of his reputation as a debater, I am hoping he will soon regain his footing and overcome his nervousness. After all, it is the weakness of his doctrine and not of the man, for his man-made doctrine is built upon the sand which has been knocked from beneath his feet. Come down to the earth, my friend, cast aside your false doctrine with which you and others have been deluding people, open your eyes to the plain truth, and then you can be used of the Lord in a great way, as you are a man of ability.

He says I made no arguments. In almost every paragraph of my two preceding affirmatives, I made an argument. Does he want me to proceed like an affirment in a little high school debate? I am in the affirmative, it is true, but the trouble with Mr. Smith is he is in neither the affirmative nor the negative.

Do not worry about my Baptist brethren losing patience with me. They are not oblivious to the truth.

He whimpers because I exposed his doctrine that no one can be saved except in the arms of one of Campbell's preachers. He says that is not the subject. True, but why did he invite me to Dallas that

he might baptize me "unto the remission of sins?" He started it, then complains under the lashing I gave him. Remember now, Mr. Smith, you will not get by with ONE thing. Not one. I am sorry for him, but he is the one who proposed this discussion. He says I called Campbell "father." Yes, but not my father but Smith's, and the strange thing is, he refuses his father's doctrine on inherent depravity. As I proved in my last affirmative, Mr. Campbell taught "inherent depravity." Mr. Smith should not reject what the father of his church taught, if he is going to remain loyal to the faith of his early fathers. And yet not so early after all, as there are some old gray mules in the country nearly half as old as his church. He further says I called Campbell "father" without quotation marks. Why use them since Campbell is his real ecclesiastical father.

Mr. Smith avers I evidently study Campbell's works more than I do the Bible. Frankly, I do when I want to know what Campbell and his followers teach, for you cannot find it in the Bible. There is, however, a general hint of it in I Tim. 4:1. He says Campbell left the Baptists because he could no longer fellowship their heresies. Even then he went away with the Baptist cloak on—baptism at the hands of a Baptist preacher, and he never pulled it off to the day of his death. He must have liked Baptist "heresies," as he remained in their fold until they kicked him out, according to his own admission. What was good enough for father Campbell should be good enough for son Smith. Mr. Smith refuses to notice quotations I make from Campbell and others of his own faith, saying he wants the Bible only. Why, then, does he quote from Webster's Dictionary and the Philadelphia and New Hampshire Confessions? Does he think they are the Bible? Ah, my friends, that's a dodge to try to keep me from exposing his doctrine. He says his doctrine is not on trial. I would say the same thing of mine if it had no better foundation than his. As to the Confessions, they affirm that one is born into a depraved state, and from that he leads out into open wickedness.

His major reply is: "Show us where the Bible says 'inherent depravity' and the Spirit's work is 'distinct from the word'?" That is child's play in debate. The teaching of those principles is in the

Bible as I have shown and will show. In his affirmative he will say that the design of water baptism is "in order to obtain" the remission of sins. Will he show those exact words in the Bible? NO. Watch and see.

He challenges me to prove that the Spirit operates "without" the word. I do not affirm the Spirit operates on the sinner's heart in conversion without the word, as in my very first affirmative I said He operates in connection with the word, quoting from the New Hampshire Confession to show my position is not new. The surgeon, as I illustrated in my last affirmative, operates on a patient with a knife. Both the surgeon and the knife come into personal contact with the patient, still they are distinct in both personality and function. The word is the sword (knife) of the Spirit. Mr. Smith's position makes the word the sword of the preacher, not of the Spirit, and the preacher stands off and throws his sword at a patient in an operation. Changing the figure, we read in James 1:21: "Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." The word is "engrafted," but no graft in a fruit tree can attach itself to the stock. Equally so, the Spirit, not the preacher, doing the grafting, comes into personal contact with the sinner's heart in connection with yet distinct from the word. That's Baptist doctrine, and I know even Mr. Smith can see the point.

Mr. Smith says I wrongly charge him teaching the "word only" theory. I know he claims to believe in the personal work of the Spirit, but it is no more personal than a dead man's spirit personally works in a letter he wrote before his death. The only spirit in his theory is in the word which was given centuries ago by the writers, but Mr. Smith will not tell you he believes the Spirit, in actual person, comes to the sinner and makes personal contact with his heart when the word is preached. I challenge him to take that position. It is a mere dodge and a play upon words when he says he believes in the personal work of the Spirit. This I proved by both his Messrs. Briney and Campbell, earlier leaders of his church.

He contends that a child inherits its soul and body from its parents but God immediately creates a spirit for it. As he admits

the mind is a faculty of the soul and at death the soul ceases to exist, which would make the mind to cease also, I suppose eternity will be inhabited by mindless people! But both Abraham and Dives, after death, exercised their minds, and so did others. Such is man's doctrine, which gives God the lie that He did not finish His creation in the beginning, as He said He did, if He creates a spirit in conception or birth for each person. All that constitutes man as such was given him in the original creation, as all that constitutes the 'beast, the bird, and the fish, was given them originally. To man was given a soul which was corrupted by sin and may be "born again" with the Spirit of Christ to dwell therein, dispossessing the spirit of the evil one (Gal. 2:20).

He first used Zech. 12:1 to try to prove that God creates a spirit in birth for a person, and when I took that from him, he then jumped all the way to Heb. 12:9 with a faint hope of relief. But he shall not stand there either. Paul says God is "father of our spirits." Whose spirits, if you please, is he talking about? Is God the father of the spirits of the incorrigible wicked? Whose spirits, then? Read verse 8, which shows the difference between spiritual bastards and sons. God is the father of the spirit of His sons, for "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9). However, God is the father of the spirit of all men but only in the original creative sense.

Mr. Smith maintains the soul is one's physical life which ceases to exist at death. I challenge him for the scripture to prove it. Come on, with the "chapter and verse." Why then would he quote the Scripture: "The soul that sinneth it shall die?" What about the soul that does not sin? What? And does death mean annihilation? I am surprised at him. He leans so far backward the soul-sleepers would not have him. But such is his dodge to keep his doctrine from being exposed. God breathed the breath of life into man in creation, and man became a living soul, still Smith declares the soul ceases to exist when the body dies. Hear Jesus: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). If the soul ceases to exist when the body dies, then

whoever kills the body kills the soul also, which Jesus says cannot be done; and, then, the Lord affirms the soul may be sent to hell, but how can it go to hell if it ceases to exist at the death of the body? Such is Smith's doctrine, but I believe Jesus in preference to him.

We must become like "little children" to enter into the kingdom, is Mr. Smith's argument for the moral purity of an infant's nature. First, Jesus is not talking about infants; second, will Mr. Smith say he is as morally pure and perfect as infants who he says are as pure as Adam in creation? Jesus is not speaking of the moral nature of children, but of their dependence and trust.

"All die in Adam and shall be made alive in Christ," refers only to physical death and the resurrection, says Mr. Smith. That is not true, in the first place, but even if it were true, the point is, since he says all went down with Adam, physically, how did the seed of death enter if not by birth? If by birth, my position of inherent depravity is sustained as death comes by sin.

Now to my questions and his answers. (1) Since the spirit goes upward, and we know the body goes to the grave at death, where does the infant's soul go? Smith answered that the infant's soul ceases to exist. Take him over, soul-sleepers, as he comes near you. (2) Did Christ die for infants? If so, why? Smith's answer: "Christ died for all, to save them from their sins, not their father's sins." But suppose the infant dies in infancy, what effect will Christ's death have on it? Answer that Mr. Smith. (3) Was Christ made in the likeness of sinful flesh? Smith's answer: "Yes." And there is where he traps himself. Christ being made in the likeness of infant flesh, and since Paul says He (Christ) was made in the likeness of "sinful flesh," therefore infant flesh is sinful, and if so, the sin could enter only by natural birth. That's when the seed of death entered. But Mr. Smith says Jesus, in infancy, was subject to death. Granting it, for argument sake, how did the seed of death enter him except by birth? That in itself would knock out his position and prove mine. But, as a lamb, Jesus was made a sacrifice for sin, and was subject to death because our sins were laid on Him, not

because any sins were in Him. Will Mr. Smith take the position that Jesus was subject to death by disease? Let him answer that, please. Mr. Wendell Willkie, in his description of living conditions in the Middle East, says: "Only one out of every five children born in Teheran lives to the age of six" (One World, p. 29). Tell us, friend Smith, if Christ had been there, would He have been subject to the same fatal diseases? He argues beside the question to dodge the issue which is, when and how does the seed of death enter the infant? If by nature, there is inherent depravity for the reason Paul says the "sting of death is sin" (I Cor. 15:56). Connecting this with question 2 and Smith's answer, would Christ have died for Adam before he sinned? and since Smith teaches that infants are born in the same pure state in which Adam was created, why did Christ die for infants unless sin is in their nature? This fact alone shows that the natural state of infants is not the same as Adam's state in creation. (4) Does the Spirit personally contact the preacher, the word, or the sinner, or all, in conversion? Smith refuses to answer, and for a good reason. He merely refers to certain verses. Come on, Mr. Smith, with the answer. (5) Is it possible for a sinner to be saved by the word preached by an unsaved minister? Smith answers it is. Thank you, for this pins you down to -the "word only" theory as I have charged you teaching.

Having completed my basic arguments, I shall now proceed with other arguments.

No. 1. The human race, standing in Adam as the federal head, went down with him in his fall. Proof: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12). "If one died for all, then were all dead" (2Cor. 5:14).

That proves: (1) Sin entered the world by Adam. (2) Death comes by sin.

(3) All men—all mankind including all ages—are dead by sin. (4) Since all are dead, Christ died for all, and, as Mr. Smith admits Christ died for infants, and He did, therefore infants and all mankind, are dead. "If one died for all, then were all dead." Yes,

that is the Bible and Baptist doctrine. The race went down in Adam as the federal head. Dr. Murphy, late scholarly professor of Hebrew, Belfast, remarks: "The first man was potentially the race.... The single transgression has involved the guilt, the depravity, and the death, not only of Adam but of that whole race which was in him, and thus has changed the whole character and condition of mankind throughout all time" (Book of Genesis, p. 126). Smith will answer that he cares not what Dr. Murphy says, and with that he will pass over the scriptures also.

No. 2. Adam, the federal head of the human race, voluntarily transgressing the holy will of God, suffered not only expulsion from the garden of Eden but also from the Tree of Life with the solemn warning, in effect, that none could return of themselves by the flaming swords, but must return to God by way of Calvary. Proof: Gen. 2:17; 3:24; Heb. 2:9; II Cor. 5:21.

The sin and consequent expulsion from the garden with the Almighty's edict enforced by flaming swords, makes our heavenly abode depend on the effectual workings of Christ for us. This involves infants for the reason mankind went out of the garden with Adam. All who dwell in heaven will be there on the merits of Christ's blood, as he tasted death for ALL MANKIND. Infants, not being subject to gospel address, will be cared for in their death. I am eager for Mr. Smith to argue the question of so-called "infant damnation" as Baptists are charged with teaching. They do not teach it, but come on with your charge, my friend.

No. 3. The image of God, or the moral relationship of man to God, being lost in Adam, the federal head, none of Adam's posterity can, by nature possess the image; therefore inherent depravity is a certain truth.

This axiomatic truth is seen in the fact Adam's sin involved the death of the human race (Rom. 5:14-18), and that only in Christ can one obtain the divine image or moral relationship (Rom. 8:29; Eph. 4:24).

No time in the Bible do we read that a child is born with God's

image, but we do read where one was born in Adam's image, after his transgression. "Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called "his name Seth" (Gen. 5:3). Dr. Murphy, the great Hebraist, makes a timely comment in loco, as follows:

"The only peculiarity in the life of Adam is the statement that his son was born in his likeness, after his image. This is no doubt intended to include that depravity which had become the characteristic of fallen man. It is contrasted with the preceding notice that Adam was originally created in the image of God. If it had been intended merely to indicate that the offspring was of the same species with the parent, the phrase, after his kind, would have been employed, as in the first chapter. This is one of the mysteries of the race, when the head of it is a moral being, and has fallen. His moral depravity, affecting the essential difference of his nature, descends to his offspring" (Book of Genesis, p. 171).

That is sufficient for this time, and Mr. Smith's people are expecting him to make due reply and do more than ask: Where does the Bible say "inherently depraved?" Mr. Smith, come on and grapple with the real issue. We are not in a little school set-to.

Smith's Third Negative.

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

Yes it is evident that Mr. Jackson now realizes that he is not in a "little school set-to." Evidence of this is found in his submission of far more than three thousand words for his third affirmative when the agreed limit was two thousand per issue. He extends me the privilege of replying at equal length but if he needed so much after my last reply what will he need to come back if I reply in this issue in length equal to his affirmative.

As to my "nervousness" and the "witlessness" of my ridicule I will let the readers judge but one thing I want you to keep in mind:

Mr. Jackson agreed to affirm that the Spirit operates in conversion "distinct from" the written or spoken word.

Now Mr. Jackson argues that the Spirit operates in conversion "in connection with" the word.

It may be "witless" for me to ridicule such puerile attempts to evade the issue but I am sure that you good readers can see the point quite as well as Mr. Jackson sees it. He sees the point so well that he is unwilling to come near it for he, like one of old, knows that "it is hard to kick against the goad."

Mr. Jackson, I am sure, knows the truth but is trying to hold his position with the Baptist people and is having a hard time doing this in view of his knowledge of the manner in which the Spirit of God operates.

The Baptists are learning and after while some of them will come to the truth, even as they have moved nearer in time past. Mr.

Jackson quotes the New Hampshire Confession of Faith as upholding his position on this. Then why did Mr. Jackson not write the proposition as he now wants to argue it.

Prior to 1853 the New Hampshire Confession did not say "in connection with divine truth." Mr. Jackson likewise prior to the beginning of this debate did not say this but contrariwise signed a proposition embodying the words "distinct form." Now he would change and come nearer the truth, even as the Confession authors did move near in 1853. Come on all the way Mr. Jackson and get your feet on solid rock.

As to his use of "father" in connection with Mr. Campbell, go back and see how he used it. In his second affirmative his use of the term without quotation marks around it shows that he refers to Campbell and quotes him in support of his proposition, then why not honor him as "father." I recognize no man on earth as "father," religiously, and Mr. Jackson only refers to such as this to prejudice the minds of the readers that they may overlook his failure to make his affirmative stand up.

As to the age of the church, I know he cannot find "The Missionary Baptist Church" before the nineteenth century, probably not before 1832. Therefore most any "old gray mule" in the country is half as old as it can be. As to the church of the Lord, of which I am a member I find many references to it in the days of the apostles and Paul spoke of various congregations of this body as "the churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16) and that is a lot more than Mr. Jackson can find in the Bible for any Baptist church. I am quite ready to affirm that the church of which I am a member began on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection but Mr. Jackson would not agree to deny that. Neither would he affirm that the Baptist church began in the first century.

It might be rather hard for Mr. Jackson to prove that brother Campbell was ever a member of any Baptist church on earth. His baptism, at the hands of elder Luce, a Baptist preacher, was "contrary to Baptist usage" according to historians. How then did he become a Baptist? But again, since we recognize his baptism as

scriptural, for the reason that the candidate's faith and understanding were according to the will of God, how can Mr. Jackson say we preach there is no salvation save in the "arms" of one of our preachers. Honest readers can see the truth of this and note Mr. Jackson's attempt to create prejudice to cover his weakness on his proposition.

In answering Mr. Jackson's question I said one could be saved through hearing the word of God preached through an unsaved man. He says I have thus shown that I preach a "word only" theory. This I denied before and I deny it again but see what Mr. Jackson is into now. In his saying that the gospel must be preached by a converted man has he not made the salvation of the soul depend upon a man? If not why not?

My illustration of the work of the Spirit is "He cut off his leg with a sword. ' The Bible speaks of the word as the "sword of the Spirit." Mr. Jackson says I have the preacher using the sword rather than the Spirit. Mr. Jackson is going farther than I go, however, for he would make it necessary for a converted man to use the sword while I contend that the Spirit operates in and through the word regardless of who preaches the word. Mr. Jackson, in saying that it must be preached by a regenerated man has made the preacher more essential than I. His illustration of a surgeon and a knife is foreign to the Bible. The word is never referred to in such a way in the Bible but of course it is only natural for a Baptist debater to seek some illustration that has no Bible foundation.

Yes, the Spirit is personally there and operating in the conversion of a sinner. He is there just as the husbandman is there in making the graft upon the tree. I say the Spirit is there and operates in and through the word which is His sword. Mr. Jackson is supposed to show the Spirit operating "distinct from" the word. You can see that good readers, even if Mr. Jackson cannot.

But listen and weigh this carefully Baptist friends: What if an unconverted man preached the word to you? Since no man knoweth the spirit of a man save that man himself you may have been deceived. Now Mr. Jackson says if the preacher who

preached to you was unconverted you cannot be saved for you would thus have been saved by a "word only" theory, a thing both he and I agree is valueless. How unequal are the legs of the lame!

Now Mr. Jackson would make a big stir about "soul and Spirit" and "brain and mind." Paul speaks of "spirit and soul and body" in I Thes. 5:23. That is enough to show that there is a distinction between soul and spirit. Sometimes this distinction is not clearly preserved in the use of the words for oftentimes the word "soul" is used to refer to the entire man, again it refers to the spirit of man but when we consider man a triune being we must recognize the body as flesh, the soul as physical life and the spirit as the eternal, immortal part of his being.

Likewise in the use of brain and mind we have the same confusion in use sometimes and he would make a play upon my use of the word "mind." I used this really thinking of the brain for I was discussing the physical, fleshly life of man. If we consider the two words separately (as we really ought to and I apologize for confusing them) we see that the brain is part of the physical organism and life and therefore is to be classed with soul (physical life) and body while the mind is part of the Spirit. This can never die for it is immortal having come from God.

The mind of man is not diseased but his brain may be. God creates for each being a spirit that is perfect and the mind is part of that. This spirit and mind may be placed in a twisted, diseased body, because of the parents' abuses and thus the mind can be hindered from functioning normally. In speaking of this we sometimes say, "he has a diseased mind" which is an improper way of speaking. The mind is sound but in a diseased body and therefore cannot function properly.

Now that we have followed Mr. Jackson through his rambling and quibbling let us note the few arguments he has made. Friends, I know that Mr. Jackson can do better than he is doing. I have notes on a former debate of his on this subject and he put out some affirmative arguments. Of course they can all be easily answered and it may be that Mr. Jackson is afraid to see them in print for it is

so much more permanent than the spoken word. Maybe, however, he will get brave and let you have the benefit of his ability before the debate is over.

So far Mr. Jackson's principal argument has been that our spirits are inherited from our earthly parents and therefore inherently sinful and depraved. He says that Hebrews 12:9 refers to God being the father of the spirit in Christians only. Now please note carefully. If God is not the father of the spirit in man before he is Christian that man's spirit cannot be immortal for Paul says that it is God "who only hath immortality" (I Tim. 6:16). Earthly parents, especially non-Christians do not have immortality and therefore could not transmit it to their children. For immortality of spirit to be enjoyed it must be received from God. But if God is not the father of the spirit of non-Christians then he has no immortal spirit and if he dies in such condition he will be like the little dog rover, "dead all over." Now that is the position of the "soul sleeping" Jehovah's Witnesses and Russellites and Mr. Jackson is the man they should take over.

But further, if God is the father of the spirit in Christians and a Christian man and wife become the parents of a child how is that child born. The parents are clean and holy, having been regenerated, and God is the father of their spirits. How then can they generate and give birth to a depraved spirit in the child. I want Mr. Jackson to give particular attention to this for this is a difficulty that many people would like to have solved.

Now remember, the non-Christian cannot have immortality for he receives his spirit from parents that cannot transmit immortality since they do not have it. The Christian's spirit is of God, says Jackson, but when he transmits it on to his child it is totally depraved. How is all this to be?

Isn't that ridiculous friends? The truth of the matter is that God is the father of our spirits (Heb. 12:9). It matters not who our earthly parents are God is the father of the spirit and gives to each individual a spirit that shall never die. This spirit from God is not depraved nor sinful and becomes so only when we turn into sin and

ungodliness. Then it must be regenerated, born again, to make it fit for the Master's use.

But now, what of Christ's nature Mr. Jackson? Was he born "totally depraved" or not? Come out in the open here and let us know just what you think about him. One sentence from Mr. Jackson makes you think he was and another he wasn't. Mr. Jackson would make physical death the whole thing. He would say that the fact an infant is subject to physical death shows that it is born depraved. Well, then, the fact that the Christian is subject to physical death would prove that the Christian is depraved. If not, why not?

Christ was subject to physical death as God showed by hurrying him out of Herod's reach to save his life. Infants of today are subject to physical death in like manner. However this does not prove that Christ was inherently depraved nor does it show that infants of today are inherently depraved. If it does then the fact that Christians are subject to physical death proves that they too are depraved.

Christ refers to little children as examples of the regenerated man (Matt. 18:3). Mr. Jackson says "in dependence and trust" but we ask where he found that except in his imagination. Do you think Christ took the little children in his arms and knowing they were inherently depraved, sinful and black as night said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven." Such an idea is ridiculous and preposterous.

Christ was born as other infants are born so far as his flesh was concerned. His body was received of his mother when his generation had been accomplished by the Spirit of God. Now Mr. Jackson says that since he was made in "the likeness of sinful flesh" it is evident that infant flesh is sinful. No friend Jackson, you do err not knowing the scripture. How does flesh become sinful? Read with me, "Know ye not, that to whom ye present yourselves as servants unto obedience, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto

righteousness" (Rom. 6:16). Surely then we see that flesh becomes "sinful flesh" when it is used as the servant or instrument of sin but it is not so when that flesh is born into the world.

Next he would have us believe that the child inherits the condemnation for sin that is in the father. This is not so. Jehovah is the God or father of all Spirits (Numbers 16:22; 27:16). Moreover God says, "All souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:3). Some of Ezekiel's day asked as do Baptists of today, "Wherefore doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:19)? God answered then and now by saying, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20). Surely that is plain enough for anyone who is honest in desiring the will of God.

Then all of Mr. Jackson's vaporings about the fall of man in Adam as the federal head has no Biblical foundation whatsoever. It matter not what "Dr. Murphy, late scholarly professor of Hebrew, Belfast remarks." God says the son does not bear the iniquity of the father and that is enough for me and every honest person.

But some may ask, What of Paul's statement in Romans fifth chapter? Let us turn and consider that very carefully as Mr. Jackson would distort it to fit his doctrine when Paul did not so much as dream of what Mr. Jackson is trying to put over by his distorting and wresting of the scripture.

"Therefore as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned: —for until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come" (Rom. 5:12-14).

Anyone seeking the truth can see that Paul is not talking of spiritual death or the condemnation of the soul in this passage. He talks only of physical death for I do not believe Mr. Jackson would

say that those against whom no sin was imputed went into hell. Then it must have been physical death and that did not show sinfulness of nature any more than the fact that a Christian today is subject to physical death shows his sinfulness of nature.

But reading on, "But not as the trespass, so also is the free gift. For if by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God, and the gift by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ abound unto the many" (Rom. 5:15). Now note in this verse "the many" used two times. Once in reference to the trespass and again as to the gift. All that was lost in Adam was regained in Christ. The second "many" is just as many as the first "many." Therefore if this teaches that all became inherently depraved because of Adam's sin then all became inherently righteous through Christ's gift. If not, why not? Truth of the business is this has reference to the death of the physical body and as death passed upon all men physically so all men shall be raised physically through the power of Christ. Paul is not discussing the condemnation of spirits because of sin. Reading on through verse 18 only confirms this fact all the more.

Dr. Jackson and Dr. Murphy have tried to "Doctor" the Bible to make "in his likeness, after his image," mean that Seth inherited the iniquity of his father. God says not so in Ezekiel 18 and I accept God regardless of the Doctor's doctoring.

But this is enough for this time. I have followed Mr. Jackson as this is the obligation of the negative. He is in the affirmative and the burden of proof lies upon him. Let him come on out with his arguments for I do not intend to be engulfed in his "debater's trick" and forced into the affirmative. There are many things I could say and arguments that I could make but I intend to wait for him to lead and where he leads I will follow for that is proper debating high school or otherwise. But remember Mr. Jackson your brethren are anxiously waiting for you to go to work and really affirm the proposition which you signed. When will you do it?

Jackson's Fourth Affirmative

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

Mr. Smith is dying hard, but "die he must." As I have promised, he has not and will not get by with one point, as his position is as groundless as the space under Neptune. He is so upset that he talks about having taken notes on a former debate of mine and is determined not to be "engulfed" in my "old debater's trick." Laughable. While he thought he was shying a mile from my "old debater's trick," he has fallen into a trap with both feet. He was completely thrown off balance when I failed to meet the demands of his "notes." A little more experience and a lot of truth would aid my opponent in debate. I did not expect to tie him "hand and foot" so soon in this discussion, and already he has ruined himself for the next proposition. Wait and see. He is in deep trouble as I shall proceed to show you.

1. He apologized in his third negative for the position he took in his first that "the mind is a faculty of the soul and may be diseased from the parents' abuses." He actually stumbled upon the truth for once, but when 'he discovered what he had done, he apologized for it. While he has a good chance, he should apologize for all his doctrinal blunders. He woke up to find himself "engulfed in my old debater's trick." If the mind is a faculty of the soul, as he first agreed, you can see how his position would force him to say that Eternity will be inhabited by mindless people for the reason he affirms that the soul ceases to exist at death. His new position now is the brain is a faculty of the soul and not the mind. Nonsense! The brain is a part of the physical body, and might as well to say the head, the foot or hand is a faculty of the soul. But such is his

man-made doctrine.

2. Mr. Smith says the soul ceases to exist at death. I challenge him again for the "chapter and verse." The verse he quotes mentions the soul, spirit and body, but does not say a word about the soul ceasing to exist at any time. Come on, friend Smith, or apologize for your error.

3. I have driven him away from the regular "Campbellite" position of the entire purity of an infant at birth to admit an infant is inherently depraved in body and soul, but he says the spirit is pure. Why stop at two-thirds of the truth? Come all the way or apologize for it. He is so crossed up he does not know what he does believe.

4. He states: "Prior to 1853 the New Hampshire Confession did not say 'in connection with divine truth.' " This clause was added then not because the principle was not taught but to clarify the statement, as the next clause so states the necessity of divine truth—"So as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel." This same truth appears in Baptist Confessions ante-dating the New Hampshire Confession by some two hundred years. Yes, I believe the Spirit operates on a sinner distinct from the word yet in connection with it. Even Smith should be able to see the harmony. Besides, I have before me a history of the old Philadelphia Baptist Association, from 1707 to 1807, which shows Baptists did hold to the position as I advocate here. Now apologize, Smith.

5. Smith declares I cannot find the Missionary Baptist Church "before the 19th century, probably not before 1832." Great Caesar! The old Philadelphia Association of churches itself began to operate as a missionary group in the first part of the 18th century. Besides, Smith's father Campbell said the Jerusalem church was a Baptist Church, and since she was missionary, evidently she was a Missionary Baptist Church, and he also says Baptist sentiments have come down to us from their apostolic origin (Campbell-McCalla Debate, pp. 377-378). Why not apologize again?

6. "It might rather be hard for Mr. Jackson to prove that brother

Campbell was ever a member of any Baptist church on earth"—Smith. Anyway, he surely did like the Baptists, for he stayed with them until he was kicked out, according to his own admission.

7. Mr. Smith devoted four paragraphs to a flimsy argument based upon a false charge that Jackson teaches no one can be saved unless the gospel is preached by a saved man. I never said it. Apologize, Smith. I was only showing that Smith's position was the "word only" theory as he affirms the Spirit is in the word only. Please remember this. As affirmed by Clark Braden: "The Holy Spirit is always in the truth, as our spirits are in the words we utter, and that He influences men by arguments and motives in the truth thus presented. I believe this power to be resident in the word and co-extensive with the word, and I recognize no power beyond it as now exerted" (Braden-Hughey Debate, p. 449). That's Smith's position.

8. I could scarcely believe my eyes when I read in Smith's last negative that: "Earthly parents, especially non-Christians do not have immortality," and he refers to I Tim. 6:16. What next? No wonder he takes the foolish position that men's souls cease to exist at death. If unsaved people are not immortal, how was Dives conscious in torment? I will allow his Mr. C. R. Nichol to answer him on the verse to which he refers: "The passage says that God 'only hath immortality'—i. e., there is nothing 'mortal' about him. Man has a 'mortal' body; God has not; he 'only hath immortality'—not one thing mortal about him" (The Nichol-Bradley Debate, p. 244). Again, Nichol says: "If the soul means 'animal life,' man becomes a living animal life. Think of it—a living animal life. Wonder if the gentleman thinks there can be a dead 'animal life?'" (Ibid., p. 298). Mr. Nichol thus answered an Adventist, Mr. A. S. Bradley. What will Mr. Smith's people think of him lining up with the Adventists to meet me? If Smith had not brought this misery upon himself, I would feel sorry for him.

9. Mr. Smith wants to know why are not children of saved people born without depravity. Two reasons: (1) No parents are sinlessly perfect (I John 1:8); (2) the new Christ life in a child of

God (Gal. 2:20) cannot be passed on by natural birth (John 1:13). This is seen from the fact that we, like Isaac, are children by promise and not by the flesh (Gal. 4:28).

10. Mr. Smith wants me to answer if Christ were born totally depraved. No, not depraved in any sense. The only reason He was subject to death was because our sins were laid on Him, not because of any sins in Him. But will Mr. Smith answer if Christ were subject to death by disease?

11. Mr. Smith thinks it is preposterous to think of Christ saying we should become like little children if they are born depraved. Is that any more unreasonable than if they are born two-thirds depraved, as he teaches?

12. Smith acknowledged that Christ was born after the likeness of "infant flesh," and if so, infant flesh is sinful (Rom. 8:3). If infant flesh is not sinful, then Christ was not born after the likeness of it.

13. Numbers 16:22 and 27:16 do not say God is the Father of all spirits. It says He is the God of the spirits of all flesh, meaning in the sense of the original creation.

14. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20); is Smith's argument against inherent depravity. Pshaw! The prophet is speaking of a son not being responsible or liable because his father commits a sin, as, for instance, the son is not condemned because the father commits murder, steals, lies, etc. This is right because the next clause says: "Neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." Why not apologize again, Mr. Smith?

15. Finally, Mr. Smith shoots wide of the mark when he says Rom. 5:12 refers to physical death only and not to the spiritual. Strange logic. Wonder why man dies physically if it were not for sin? If there is sin back of it, then there is spiritual death in man. Christ died because our sins were laid on Him (II Cor. 5:21). Smith says the "free gift" came upon as many as condemnation had come upon. We know condemnation passed upon all mankind and all were dead because Christ died for all. "If one died for all, then

were all dead" (II Cor. 5:14). "Then were all dead," not will die in the body. The free gift does come upon all who died in Adam, but remember it is a "gift" and therefore must be accepted by faith by those who are subject to its address. If Mr. Smith says the "free gift" came upon all who died in Adam in the sense of their being saved, then that is universal salvation, for we know the Bible plainly says "all were dead." We'll turn him over to the Universalists this time. First with the Adventists and then with the Universalists. Where will he land next? He dodges to hang on until the "gong" sounds.

The only answer Mr. Smith made to the scholarly comment by Dr. Murphy was that he would accept God "regardless of the Doctor's doctoring." I am somewhat disappointed to find that Smith does not respect scholarship enough to give a dignified answer when it is employed. I wonder if his people are pleased with the femininity of his course in debate.

I shall ask the reader to study again the closing arguments I made in my last affirmative, as we shall proceed now from that point.

No. 4. David, by divine inspiration, positively declares that in natural conception and birth the principle of sin is inbred. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51:5). "Conceive" is from the Hebrew word *yaukam* meaning "to be warm in lust." "Shapen" is from *chul* meaning "pains, especially of childbirth." "Iniquity" is from *auvon* meaning "wrong," "perverseness." Then a good rendering would be: "Behold, I was born in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive."

This interpretation of the verse is corroborated by the scholarly Drs. Lange and Schaff, as follows: "It merely refers to descent from sinful parents (Job 14:4), and inborn sinfulness, which with its guilt and its ruin is transmitted from parents to children, by means of natural propagation, so that they are infected with sin from their mother's womb and from their youth, Gen. 6:5; 8:21; Psa. 58:4" (Commentary, in loco).

We await Mr. Smith's gentlemanly reply to this argument based upon the original Hebrew and corroborated by two scholars. Will he grapple with it?

No. 5. The principle of sin being inbred in natural conception, the acts of wickedness are performed with respect to a natal source. "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies" (Psa. 58:3).

As much as I would like to see my opponent gain one point in this debate, I hasten to spoil his little pet argument in reply at this point. "Do little children tell lies as soon as they are born?" is the stock-in-trade reply, but before me is the Septuagint Version, translated from the Hebrew into Greek about 251 B. C., by seventy learned Jews, and which was in common use among the Jews in the days of Christ on earth, which renders the verse thus: "Sinners have gone astray from the womb: they go astray from the belly: they speak lies." That plainly teaches that the principle of sin is born in a person. Therefore my proposition is true (See Isa. 48:8).

No. 6. The certainty of the doctrine of inherent depravity is manifestly sustained by Job. "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (Job 14:4). Gesenius, who gave the world his great Hebrew Lexicon, renders the verse thus: "Who will show one pure born of impure?" He says the Hebrew word *tahor* means "purity in a moral sense," so the cleanness spoken of is not physical but moral, which definitely upholds my proposition. The Septuagint renders it: "For who shall be pure

from uncleanness? not even one; if even his life should be but one day upon the earth." If that is not "inherent depravity" taught, pray tell me how it could be made plainer. If man is not inherently depraved, please explain why there is universal existence of sinful dispositions in every mind. Chief Justice Thompson, of Pennsylvania, said: "If those who preach had been lawyers previous to entering the ministry, they would know and say far more about the depravity of the human heart than they do. The old doctrine of total depravity is the only thing that can explain the falsehoods, the dishonesties, and licentiousness, and the murders

which are so rife in the world. Education, refinement, and even a high order of talent, cannot overcome the inclination to evil which exists in the heart, and has taken possession of the very fibres of our nature." Yes, John says "the whole world lieth in wickedness" (John 5:19).

No. 7. Inherent depravity being true, one's imagination is evil from his youth. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8:21). "Imagination" is from the Hebrew word yetser, meaning purpose. The Septuagint renders it: "The imagination of man is intently bent upon evil things from his youth." One's imagination is "purposely" bent upon evil from his youth. Psychology defines imagination to mean "creative faculty. "Bent" signifies an inclination. So man's imagination, by nature, is inclined from his youth to evil things.

There is the doctrine of inherent depravity plainly taught in the word of God. Mr. Smith should either give more than a surface reply, or retract and apologize for all his vagaries as he did one of his positions in his last negative.

Smith's Fourth Negative

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

"Die he must" says Mr. Jackson and so it was that truth hating Caiphaz spoke concerning Christ (John 11:50). The servant is not above his master and it is little wonder that those who despise the truth and the one who gave it also despise those who defend it I say they despise the truth for this is evident in many things, especially their rejection of the name which the truth gives to God's children while they wear one of their own choosing.

No, Mr. Jackson, I am not upset by your not following your former path but simply called attention to the fact you are not doing your best for fear of having your little arguments, formerly used, exploded. We need not worry about the next proposition 'till we get to it. It would be better for you to use your space in affirming the one which you have agreed to affirm at this time.

Now we shall follow on through his presentation number by number and ask that our readers compare these things diligently.

1. I made no apology for any position taken. Turn back and read the third negative and see that I was simply trying to help Mr. Jackson to an understanding of the use of the words "mind" and "brain" in our everyday use of the words. This was to help him get straightened out for he seems unable to comprehend some things in the English language and forgets that words are sometimes used with one meaning and sometimes another.

2. Mr. Jackson is not content with my definition of "soul." Well then Mr. Jackson, "Elucidate." Let us hear from you as to what the soul is and let us have the distinction between soul and spirit.

God's word makes a distinction. What is it? Let us have some information here.

3. I have not at any time said or inferred that the body or soul was inherently depraved. Readers will judge such groundless assertions by the affirmative. There is a vast difference in diseased and depraved.

4. "The Spirit operates on a sinner distinct from the word yet in connection with," Jackson. Honest readers, can you see that? I confess my inability and it is not the proposition Mr. Jackson signed. He has evidently given up his proposition on this point. If it is in connection with the word it is not "distinct from" and no wresting of words can ever make it so.

5. Historians and scholars have spoken of "baptists" in past ages but have used a small "b" and denoted thereby everyone who immersed for baptism. Mr. Jackson, please find "The Missionary Baptist Church" in any recognized history before 1832. No history makes mention of such for it did not exist and you know it. Even your own Baptist histories so declare it.

6. Well, Mr. Jackson made no attempt to show that brother Campbell was ever a member of any Baptist church. He shied from that and well that he did but thus his former quibbling on the point was shown up.

7. Mr. Jackson, you said my answer that the word could be preached by an unsaved man pinned me down to a "word only" theory. If that be true as you have asserted (though it is not true) then do you not make the preacher an essential part of a genuine conversion and make the salvation of the soul depend upon the preacher of the word being "spirit filled." If not why not? Yes, good friend he does and you can see that. Why not let Smith state his own position and why not deal with what Smith says Mr. Jackson? It would be far better than to run all over creation quoting from men. Our proposition calls for Bible proof and it is your obligation to give it. Why do you not make an attempt to do this?

8. Jackson quit twisting and making false assertions. The reader

can turn back to the last negative and see that your charge is false. I am simply asking a question regarding immortality in non-Christians if your position be true that we receive our spirits from our earthly parents. You can see that and should answer to the point rather than evading by making a false charge about what I said.

9. Very well Mr. Jackson but if the moral goodness of a Christian parent cannot be inherited how in the name of common sense can you say that moral perverseness and wickedness can be inherited. Thus all sensible people can see the utter absurdity of your position on inherent depravity, and you can see it too I am quite sure.

10. Thank you Mr. Jackson. Christ was not born depraved but will you say our sins were laid on him when he was an infant? Of course they were not, yet he was subject to death as shown by God moving him to Egypt to escape the wrath of Herod. Therefore the fact that infants are subject to death is no evidence of their depravity as you argued earlier in this debate.

11. Mr. Smith does not, has not and never will say that infants are two-thirds depraved. That charge is false Mr. Jackson and you know it.

12. Infant flesh is not sinful flesh. If so infants dying would go into hell. That is Mr. Jackson's position but it is not Bible. Flesh becomes sinful when used in the service of sin (Rom. 6:16).

13. Mr. Jackson admits that "God of Spirits of all" means "Father of Spirits of all" but says in original creation. Where did he find that? In the third chapter of his lucid imagination.

14. I used scripture as an argument, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20). Mr. Jackson's answer is "Pshaw!" Isn't that logical dear friend. But note him giving up his position. He says, "The son is not condemned because the father commits murder, steals, lies, etc." Yet Mr. Jackson says he is condemned for his father's sins. Which is right, Mr. Jackson? Is he condemned for the sins of his father or is he not? You signed to affirm that he was and now you say he is not.

15. No, Mr. Jackson, it is you that would teach universal salvation by the fifth chapter of Romans. I know and teach that the subject here is the physical body and as all die physically so shall the bodies of all, good and bad be raised through Christ's power. Other passages teach on salvation of the soul but this one on the resurrection of the body. If you say this means salvation you must admit universal salvation for one "all" must mean as many as the other "all" and one "many" must comprehend all that the other "many" comprehends. Whatever was lost in Adam universally was regained in Christ. Your argument that our souls were lost in Adam and we are inherently depraved and condemned would make this mean universal salvation. However the truth is our souls were not lost in Adam's sin but only physical death is brought to each one by it. Therefore the thing Paul sets up against that is a physical resurrection at the last day and thus "as many" as die physically shall be raised physically and by this we have shown the fact that the death all died in Adam was not of the Spirit but of the body.

The first three arguments which Mr. Jackson made in his third affirmative were based upon his misinterpretation of the above passage and upon the "scholarly" comments of his "Doctors." The passage is mis-applied in such use as he and the "Doctor" made of it and any one does not need a "Doctor's degree" to see that he has mis-applied it as we have shown in the preceding paragraph. Therefore his first three assertions which he presents under the name of arguments are "groundless as the space under Neptune" and we turn our attention to his further efforts.

No. 4. David declares no such thing. David speaks of himself and not the human race. When Judah begat Perez and Zerah of Tamar, they being unmarried, the children were illegitimate (Matt. 1:3; Gen. 38). Now read this, "A bastard shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none of his enter into the assembly of Jehovah" (Deut. 23:2). Now count the generations in Matthew 1:3-6. Perez, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, Nahshon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, Jesse, David. David is the tenth and is therefore still under the condemnation and restriction as spoken in Deut. 23:2. David speaks of his own position at birth and

not that of the whole race. Come again, Mr. Jackson.

No. 5. Your assertion here is groundless, Mr. Jackson. Your proof text denies your assertion. You should do better, Mr. Jackson. You assert that the principle of sin is inbred and affirm that children are born inherently depraved. Your proof text (Psa. 58:3) says "They go astray." Your proposition says they are born astray. If one is born astray how can he go astray. It is evident to all thinking people that this verse teaches exactly what I have maintained at other places. The flesh becomes sinful when we yield our members as servants to sin (Rom. 6:16). No, Mr. Jackson, this one will not do either. Good readers, just turn and read the entire 58th Psalm. If you think David is talking of the activities of infants let me hear from you. I don't believe I'll have much mail on that, Mr. Jackson, do you?

No. 6. Job in his perplexity cried out his question and Mr. Jackson takes the question of this suffering man as his proof. Oh the frailty of a position that must rely upon such evidence. Job is asking a question not making an affirmation and without hearing the answer Mr. Jackson takes it for his proof text. When God says in Ezekiel 18:20 that the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father he shows how one clean can come out of one unclean. Let us base our arguments on the answer to the question rather than on the despairing cry of Job. You may say that Job said "Not one." True it is that man cannot do this but God can as He has shown.

But note that terrible statement which Mr. Jackson quotes with approbation. It is "the lawyers teach" now whereas the proposition is "the Bible teaches." We shall have more to say about this in our closing remarks in just a moment.

No. 7. Sad it is to see Mr. Jackson strive for a morsel of comfort in the scriptures. "Imagination is evil from youth." Yes that is true but that does not say one is born in sin and inherently depraved. No if that were true God could have said "from birth" not "from youth." Too bad that Mr. Jackson cannot find a translation that says his imagination is evil from birth. That might help his failing cause.

But now good friends, Mr. Jackson has come out on his doctrine, lets look at it for a moment. He quoted with approbation the following, "The old doctrine of total depravity is the only thing that can explain the falsehoods, the dishonesties, and the murders which are so rife in the world. Education, refinement, and even a high order of talent cannot overcome the inclination to evil which exists in the heart and has taken possession of the very fibers of our nature."

There it is my friends. Man's disclaimer of his responsibility. Mr. Jackson says if he lies it is no fault of his he was born that way. If he murders he can't help it, he was born that way. If he rapes he is not responsible for he was born that way and no refinement or education can eradicate that inherent depravity. There good Baptist friends is your doctrine. You don't hear your preachers preach on that very often do you? Why not, it is the creeds that they study and subscribe to, why not preach it? They know in their hearts it is an unwholesome doctrine and they flee from it save when pressed to it.

There good Baptist friends is your baby. You think he is a darling but Mr. Jackson says in his sweet and innocent heart there is murder, rape, lies and everything. You need not try to educate or refine him for this cannot take it away. Further if he dies now he is so black that hell must be eternally his home for he dies in sin. If not why not Mr. Jackson?

Further, this Calvinistic doctrine makes God a terrible monster instead of a loving father for He creates and then damns without recourse. Here is a man horn in sin and sins because he was born that way. Nothing he can do can change his nature and he is not responsible for he was born that way if he dies he must spend eternity in hell. That my friends is the Calvinistic doctrine of "inherent depravity." It has made more infidels than anything Satan ever put out and yet your Baptist preachers are proclaiming it.

It is not true. It is contrary to the Bible. It is blasphemous for it falsely accuses God. Yet the creeds teach it. Hear what the Philadelphia confession has to say and Mr. Jackson says this

Philadelphia association is his kind. "Wholly defiled in all the faculties, and parts of soul and body" (Art. VI, Par. 2). "From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil do proceed all actual transgressions" (Art. VI, Par. 4). Now there, Baptist friends, your "actual transgression" comes from your "original corruption." You cannot help it so why worry about it. That is the doctrine Baptist preachers study in their colleges and see what the result of such seed is.

According to a "National Religious Survey of State Prisons, Dec. 1, 1933" Baptist led all religious denominations in inmates. Why is this? First of all the teaching that man is born corrupt and is not responsible for his own acts and second that when he is a Baptist no matter what he does he cannot be lost. These Baptist Siamese twins, "Inherent depravity" and "Impossibility of Apostasy" are of the devil and his teaching but not of God's word.

Jackson's Fifth Affirmative

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

Mr. Smith reminds me of the man who swallowed a potato bug and then took paris green to kill it. He has unwittingly fallen into a trap set by his own hands. A little more experience and a lot of truth would keep him from doing that sort of thing. He waxed quite hot in his last negative with his invectives against Baptists. Calm down, my friend. We all know his misery is great, but he has brought it upon himself. He has introduced one side issue after another, but remember I have assured you he will not get by one thing. His replies so far are surface, as he refuses to wade out from the shore.

Mr. Smith says Baptists reject the "name which the truth gives to God's children while they wear one of their own choosing." Wrong. They wear the same name Smith's father Campbell liked so well that he lined up with the Baptists. Chapter and verse for his people's name, please, and their right to wear it.

He denies having apologized for changing his position on "mind" and "brain." The record will show he did. He was so confused his mind did not know itself from his brain. Furthermore, he refuses to name the "chapter and verse" that says the soul ceases to exist at death. I again challenge him to produce it. He denies confessing the soul and body being depraved by birth, but the reader will remember what he has said about them. He said the body went down with Adam, and if so, why would the infant die unless there was sin present? "The sting of sin is death." I explained that Christ was subject to death because He bore our

sins, not because sins were in Him. Then he wants to know when Christ bore our sins. The Bible says He was a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8) which prescribed for Him a death on the cross. He was the Saviour before He was born, all the time He was on earth, and since His crucifixion. Yes, He was sin-bearer even at the time of His birth (See Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:21-23).

Keep in mind that Mr. Smith says the Spirit is in the word, as we will have need of this later. Moses E. Lard, an earlier exponent of Smith's doctrine, said: "The Spirit spends on the mind of the sinner in conversion no influence except such as resides in the truth as divine" (Lard's Review of Campbellism Examined, p. 83). Yes, it is the "word only" theory. The Lord opened Lydia's heart that she attended unto the words spoken. There's the distinct work of the Spirit along with the word. Even Smith should be able to understand that doctrine.

It tickles ray risibles to see how "Campbell's children try to explain away what their father said about the Baptists existing back to the days of Christ. Smith says Campbell referred to them with a small "b" and meant they favored immersion for baptism. He identified himself with Baptists who began their name with a capital "B", and he said they had connection" all the way back to Christ, as he referred to them as "The Baptist denomination

in all ages and in all countries," etc. (Campbell on Baptism, p. 409). But Smith says Campbell never was a member of a Baptist Church. Well, he received baptism at the hands of a Baptist minister and brought the church he was a member of into a Baptist association. If he and his church were not Baptists, then they were a set of hypocrites. Was Smith's father a hypocrite?

If God still creates spirits, as Smith claims, He did not cease His work of creation in the beginning as He said He did. See how Smith's doctrine gives God the lie.

My opponent seems blind to the truth in Rom. 5:12-19. It plainly says all men are dead, who were made sinners by one man's disobedience. Unto them the "free gifts," mark you, it is a gift,

came. All died in Adam and so the free gift came upon all. "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound," v. 20. But the gift must be accepted by those subject to gospel address for it to be effective in their life unto salvation. "If one died for all, then were all dead" (II Cor. 5:14). He died for infants; therefore infants were dead. Notice that argument, if you please.

His remarks on Ezek. 18:20 and about children not inheriting righteousness are trite and have been answered two or three times already.

"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51:5). I based an argument on this verse to show that sin is inherent, but Smith says David had reference to him' self being born a bastard and goes way back to a grandfather. David said his mother conceived him in sin. I have thought all the while that the job of conceiving belonged to the woman, but my oppo

nent has laid it off on David's poor old grandfather of ten preceding generations. Such puerile quibbling is disgusting to common sense. What will he say next? Here he contradicts himself as he has been crying, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father," but now he passes a sin down through ten generations to David, who was a "sweet singer in Israel," yet Smith says he was a bastard and could not come into the "congregation of the Lord." He was a man after God's own heart, but Smith says he was a bastard and could not enter into the "congregation of the Lord." He was king of Israel, but Smith says he was a bastard and could not enter into the "congregation of the Lord." He was a man of God (Psa. 57:7; 116:1-3), but Smith says he was a bastard and could not enter into the "congregation of the Lord." He was a fleshly ancestor of Jesus, but Smith says he was a bastard and could not enter into the "congregation of the Lord." Tut! tut! Smith, be ashamed to quibble so to keep from believing the truth. And why not give attention to my argument based on the original Hebrew of the verse.

"The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies" (Psa. 58:3). Note Smith's

enfeebled reply to my argument based on this verse. He says "they go astray." Yes, and the text says "as soon as they be born." Read again my comments based upon the Septuagint Version in my last affirmative.

Of all unscrupulous handling of the word Mr. Smith shows his hand in his reply to my argument on Job 14:4: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." He says Job asked that question in his despair, but he answers it by saying "not one." Job says it cannot be done; Smith says it can. It is Smith versus Job. Which shall we believe? As for me, I will take Job. Might as well say Job in his despair cried out: "If a man die, shall he live again?" and that without answer. Smith is in deep trouble.

My argument based on Gen. 8:21 stands without a decent reply. Connect this verse with Psa. 58:3 and you will discover the early planting of sin.

My quotation from Chief Justice Thompson set fire to friend Smith. The Chief Justice knew, as Bible students do, that the sin of the heart cannot be eradicated by culture or anything except the blood of Christ. If depravity is true, we are not responsible for our sins, Smith charges, but he is sadly mistaken, for the love and mercy of God has appeared to put away sin. Might as well argue because a man was born in the slums and taught to hate, kill, steal and rape he is not responsible. Education may restrain sinful acts, but it takes the grace of God to save the soul. Smith appeals to the sympathy of mothers to stay his doctrine, but that won't work. Mothers who know the Bible are not turned aside by prejudice.

Mr. Smith's charge of infant damnation, based on the doctrine of depravity, is wholly false. As his father Campbell says, we did not personally sin in Adam's transgression but our nature did sin (Christian System, p. 29), and as people are held responsible for their personal sins, infants dying are not damned in hell. Those who perish, perish through their own fault or failure to believe in Christ (See John 3:18; I Tim. 4:10). Make another charge, Smith, as all your ranting goes with the wind.

I now pay my respect to Mr. Smith's vilifying the Baptists and their doctrine of depravity and security of the believer. He introduces a sideshow to keep off the subject, but he has opened the way for me to give him the "spanking" he needs. I am sorely disappointed in him, for I thought he was a man of educational dignity, but now he dips into the mud. Mark my word, he will regret his step. I cannot believe his people, as a whole, will agree to stoop with him. But let's reach down and give him the thrashing he needs as we try to lift him up. Here goes.

He says there are more Baptists in prison houses than any other church group. He quotes from "National Religious Survey of State Prisons, Dec. 1, 1933." That sounds big, but who is the author of the "National Survey?" "E. Couch, Paris, Texas," is the author. Who is he? And then why go back to 1933? Why not come up to date? But let's examine his own witness. The trick is, Mr. Couch separates all "Church of Christ" Campbellites from all other Campbellites, and shows the small number of only 433, 714, whereas the "Christian Church" Campbellites number 1, 563, 937. (Since only "Church of Christ" Campbellites can be saved, according to Smith, won't heaven be sparsely populated!) Both branches of them number only about two million, whereas Baptists are set down as numbering nearly ten million, and this includes all who wear the name Baptist.

Even though much smaller in number, the two branches of Campbellites have only a little above four-ten thousandths per cent less "national membership in prison" than all the nearly ten million Baptists of all kinds. In other words, according to the famous survey, the small number of Campbellites are almost as "mean" as the many millions of Baptists. Cic! Come on, Smith, with your survey.

Smith further falsely charges that the doctrine of depravity and security of the believer is responsible for Baptists going to prison. I challenge him for the proof. If he does not produce it, he should confess he falsified. The "Christian Church" Campbellites do not believe that doctrine, still they have a larger per cent of

membership in prison than the Presbyterians who do believe it, according to his own witness; and they also have a much larger percent in prison than the Catholics and Episcopalians combined. Startling! Now since there are a larger per cent of "Christian Church" Campbell-ites and "Church of Christ" Campbellites in prison than the Catholics, Episcopalians, or Presbyterians, tell us, Smith, what doctrine held by you people is responsible for your large percentage of membership going to prison. Tell us what it is. But I'm not through yet.

Mr. Smith, in his own paper, preaches against "Church of Christ" boys and men being drafted for combat duty in the war. He is trying to hide them out under the plea of "conscientious objectors," and while they feed on the fat of the land in concentration camps, others are giving their life blood to defend the liberty that grants Smith the right to preach his doctrine. Is your doctrine responsible for that? Baptists may produce some "jail birds," but at the same time they are loyal citizens and produce patriots to fight for a glorious heritage that has been handed down to us by hands dripping with the blood of dying soldiers and martyrs. Smith not only preaches against his people going to war in defense of their country, he also preaches a doctrine that damns the precious boys in the "foxholes" who are unable to receive baptism. Is that the fruit of his doctrine? Come on with your famous "survey," Smith. You thought you could put one over with it, but I have met that slander before. I have before me the survey of his own witness plus more. He shall not get by with one point. I do not doubt that some from his church group are in combat service, but if they are they are contrary to his doctrine. All his "ranting is entirely off the subject, and even if it were true, it would not help his cause any. Very well then.

No. 8. The doctrine of inherent depravity is revealed in the divine contrast between the seed of the woman and of Satan. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. 3:15).

The seed of the woman is Christ (Gal. 3:16) who partook of no sin (Heb. 10:5), and the seed of Satan are those whose nature is constrained by him. Before me are the two original languages—the Hebrew and the Greek. The Hebrew word used here for seed is zera which Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon defines as "children, offspring, posterity... breed." The Greek is sperma, which word is employed in the Septuagint, and Thayer defines it: "Seed, children, offspring, progeny; family, race, posterity." The idea conveyed is that the seed of Satan have in them by offspring his perversion of their nature. This is further explained by John the Baptist who branded certain ones as a "generation of vipers" (Matt. 3:7). They had the poison of the old serpent in them. They received it by nature, as the Greek word translated here "generation" (gen-nemo) means "that which has been begotten or born" (Thayer). No need of my opponent muddying the waters by asking if little babies are devils, or serpents. It means by birth, we have the poison of the serpent in us. That means inherent depravity.

No. 9. In His instruction to Nicodemus, Jesus plainly sets forth the doctrine of inherent depravity. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (Jno. 3:6). "Flesh" here does not mean the mere body, as we are told in Rom. 8:8: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." The original word is sarx which Thayer says means "mere human nature, the earthly nature of man apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God." Dr. Hodge says it designates "our fallen and corrupt nature" (Systematic Theol., Vol. 2, p. 242). And with this Drs. Dwight and Neander agree. These four great scholars say the word for flesh in this verse means our depraved nature which Jesus definitely says we obtain by birth. This argument alone is sufficient to prove my proposition, but watch my opponent pass over it with a surface gesture toward an answer. Notice if he really answers any of my arguments. He says I'm not doing my best. Why should I, if I'm not, when he is unable to answer what I do put forth?

Smith's Fifth Negative

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

Mr. Jackson begins to squirm, as does every false teacher when the consequence of his false doctrines are uncovered. My replies may be "surface but they are raising quite a rash on my friend, Dr. Jackson and his Baptist associates. Mr. Jackson's replies look like a man scratching a nettle rash. The more he scratches the worse it itches and the more he needs to scratch. In every affirmation he runs over the agreed length and thus evidences the trouble that my "surface replies" are giving him.

As repeatedly stated, Mr. Campbell is not my father, but nevertheless if he was one time called a Baptist he learned the truth and gave up the name as every Baptist will do, if he is honest, when he learns the truth. I am a Christian as the disciples were in the first century (Acts 11:26) and in suffering for this name I know no shame (I Pet. 4:16). This is the name of God's people today and is sufficient for all those who are content with God's word. Now let Mr. Jackson give chapter and verse for wearing the name "Baptist."

All can check the record as to my statements on "mind" and "brain" and see what was really said. I am content with what I have said on this and Mr. Jackson will not bother it. It is easier for him to pervert and distort than to answer the things that have been said.

I know, as all Bible scholars know, that the word "soul" is many times used to refer to the "spirit" and sometimes to the entire man in all his parts. But it is also a recognized fact among all true scholars that in the distinction of "body, soul and spirit" the term soul is used to denote the physical life that ceases at death. Let Mr.

Jackson tell us the distinction in "soul" and "spirit" if he does not agree with this.

If Mr. Jackson knows where I said that the soul and body were depraved in birth, let him cite the number of the negative, the paragraph and the line where such was said. Let us know where it is Mr. Jackson. I have made no such statement for I have never believed such a thing. It is easy for you to corrupt and pervert and insinuate but give us the reference.

Now in Paragraph 3 Mr. Jackson argues the infant would not die unless sin were present. Note his proof: He quotes "The sting of sin is death." That proves it says Mr. Jackson, but alas and alack his "proof" (??) is a perversion of the scripture. Not scripture mind you, but a perversion of it. Sad indeed is the plight of such a one who must wrest the scriptures to his own destruction (II Pet. 3:16). The scripture which he attempts to quote gives the very opposite of his quotation. I Cor. 15:56 says, "The sting of death is sin" but he quotes it "The sting of sin is death." Oh the weakness of a position that needs such as this for support.

Mr. Jackson knows that Christ was subject to death as an infant and will not come near the point.

He circles and looks at it from every angle but will never take hold of it. There was no sin in Christ when he was an infant. Now one question for Mr. Jackson, If Herod had killed the infant Christ would he have carried our sins away by his death?

I said it might be rather hard for Mr. Jackson to show that Campbell was ever a Baptist. If he will try to prove that he was we may have some interesting things for him in later issues. Campbell's baptism was "contrary to Baptist usage." Where did he receive a favorable "vote" from a Baptist church? What makes one a Baptist anyhow? Doing what the Bible says never did make one a Baptist and that is all brother Campbell did. How then did he become a Baptist? Tell us Mr. Jackson.

It seems as though Mr. Jackson thinks God went out of operation on the seventh day. God is still active in every phase of nature and

has not ceased his activity. To so interpret the scripture is to misinterpret it and make God only a "potent force" as the Modernists do but to leave him out of all connection with the world and man today. Such cannot be.

Let us now look closely at Rom. 5:12-19 and see how completely it refutes Mr. Jackson's position and affirmation. First of all Paul says, "so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned" (ver. 12). For that to help Mr. Jackson it would have to say, "so death passed unto all men, for that one hath sinned." It doesn't say that but the very opposite of it. Death and sin entered the world through one man but spiritual death comes upon all men only when they themselves sin. Verses 18 and 19 do not indicate that all are condemned for the sin of the one but it was through him that sin came into the world and thus the way was opened for all to sin. All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God and become subject to physical death. All are to be raised from the grave through the power of Christ and this is the gift that Paul speaks of here. He is not talking about eternal life in heaven for if he were then the doctrine of Universalism would necessarily be true and that even Mr. Jackson will deny. See my comment on this under the fourth negative No. 15,

Infants not being "dead in sin," "infants not being depraved," Infants being as pure as anyone in the kingdom of God have no need of a sin offering. To say that infants need an offering for their sins is to beg the question and assume the very thing Mr. Jackson is obliged to prove.

Mr. Jackson says he has answered our arguments on Ezek. 18:20 two or three times already. Maybe he has tried to answer them but when he has done all, the Bible still says, "the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." That is diametrically opposed to Mr. Jackson's proposition and little wonder that he tries to pass it so lightly.

Mr. Smith did not say that David was a bastard. Deut. 23:2 says the seed of a bastard shall not enter the assembly of Jehovah unto the tenth generation. I said that Perez and Zerah were the

illegitimate children of Judah and Tamar (Gen. 38) and David fell within the restriction of this verse. To say that he could not enter the congregation of Jehovah is not to say he was "inherently depraved." We know that he was not and David knew that he was not and Mr. Jackson likewise knows that he was not if he would be honest with himself and give up the false doctrine which he tries to defend by misrepresenting the arguments that are made.

Again on Psa. 58:3 I simply answer that Mr. Jackson's proposition is that they are "born astray" while David says "they go astray." Entirely different and in fact this verse will forever prove that we are not born inherently depraved.

Of Job's statement in Job 14:4 I said that Job answered "Not one" but he must have referred to man's power not God's power for God says he can bring a clean thing out of an unclean when he says, "the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20).

Mr. Jackson says I did not give a decent reply to his argument on Gen. 8:21. You know, it is strange, but the Baptist preachers I have met in debate have never liked the way I have answered their arguments. Of course I regret that but will have to keep on answering them that way whether they like it or not. He says, "Connect this verse with Psa. 58:3 and you will discover the early planting of sin." Well if you did discover that it still would not show that we are born "inherently depraved." Mr. Jackson, what you need to discover is a text that shows we are "born in sin" not one that shows an "early planting of sin."

Mr. Jackson says I am sadly mistaken about inherent depravity making man irresponsible for his sins. To show that I am mistaken he says that this inherent depravity does not condemn a man and that infants dying go right on to heaven. Heavenly day!! What will we have next? Children are born "wholly depraved, inclined to all evil and without and inclination for good," yet if they die they go right on into heaven. Heaven is a place where nothing defiled or unclean can enter (Rev. 21:27) yet Mr. Jackson says they go right on in. Oh the absurdities of the doctrines of men. I know that

infants dying go right into heaven and that is the strongest argument against Mr. Jackson's proposition.

Common sense teaches anyone who has a little grain of it that to teach people they are born "inherently depraved" "wholly inclined to evil and opposite to all good" will start them out on a life of sin and crime. Then add to that the idea that they can not go to hell for such blackness of soul, and then when they become Christians they can never be lost regardless of what they may do and you have a combination that will engender lawlessness and strife wherever it is accepted.

I am holding no "brief" for the Christian church. They have forsaken God and the Bible and in many communities I have far more respect for the Baptists and there attempts to follow the Bible than I have for my erring brethren of the Christian Church. Since Mr. Jackson has questioned the "National Survey" we will publish it in full in an early issue of Gospel Broadcast and suggest that he do the same in the American Baptist. Facts are facts and figures don't lie so just see what the results of his teaching are in the cold facts and figures that have been compiled from reliable sources.

Then finally he has to appeal to popular sentiment today as it is aroused by the great wave of propaganda put forth to induce everyone to engage in war. Mr. Jackson knows, if he knows anything at all that the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of a warrior are two different spirits that cannot abide in the same heart. Mr. Jackson shows his ignorance of our constitution and form of government as well as of the Bible when he denominates the Conscientious Objector Camps as "Concentration camps" and would impugn the righteous motives of those boys who are in them. It so happens that there are Baptist boys in these camps as well as some from the churches of Christ. There are far more from churches that Mr. Jackson will fellowship than there are from churches of Christ. The "Field Secretary" of the entire work, "Mr. Leroy Dakin" is a Baptist preacher. Shame on Mr. Jackson for making such statement as he has made.

This is a land of religious freedom. The constitution gives to

every citizen the right to believe and preach as he sees fit. These boys are conscientious in their belief. I grant them that honor whether they be of my brethren or of Mr. Jackson's brethren. The government respects their conscience and provides "work of national importance" that they may live as useful citizens of this great country and at the same time keep themselves free from the sin-fulness of this carnal war in which the country is engaged. It is a mark of ignorance or littleness to disparage these boys who for the strength of their convictions are willing to stand and endure the ridicule that men such as Mr. Jackson and some of my carnally minded brethren are heaping upon them today.

Now Mr. Jackson has used up his two thousand word limit, he begins finally to make affirmative arguments, or at least what he is pleased to call arguments. It would be my privilege to cut these off and throw them in the waste basket but we know Mr. Jackson needs more room to "scratch his hives" which are stirred up by my "surface replies" so we give him room and answer in equal length.

No. 8. Mr. Jackson's argument on "the seed of Satan" is most revealing and interesting. Mr. Jackson has already taken two positions on the spirit of man and now he takes a third one. He has said that

God created our spirits. Then he argued that we inherited them from our parents. He had to give this up because he had Christian parents bequeathing a depraved spirit to their offspring, just the same as sinful parents. He said Christian parents could not bequeath their Christianity and that it right. But when he admitted that everyone could see that likewise the child could not inherit sinful spirit from its parents. Now he jumps on something else entirely. He has Satan as the father of our spirits and we are all children of the devil not of God. He argues about the Creek and Hebrew words to show that we are the "children, offspring, posterity... breed" of Satan. He says that "Generation" as used by John means, "That which has been begotten or born" and therefore John was saying to the Jews, "Ye are that which has been begotten or born of vipers." This is, he says, is partaking of the poison of the

serpent. This says Mr. Jackson means "inherent depravity."

All right Mr. Jackson that is your argument and we will cut it off with one verse of scripture, too plain to be misunderstood. The apostle Paul says (Acts 17:29), "Being then the offspring of God." That is enough to show the absurdity and the utter falseness of Mr. Jackson's position. He argues we are the offspring of Satan. Paul says the offspring of God. I take Paul and leave Mr. Jackson. And since he argued that being the offspring of Satan made us inherently depraved surely then the fact that we are the offspring of God will show for all time that we are not inherently depraved.

It matters not what Mr. Jackson's scholars and Doctors may say about these Greek and Hebrew words when Paul says we are the offspring of God he forever shows that their interpretation which makes us the offspring of Satan is entirely wrong.

No. 9. Mr. Jackson makes an absurdity out of Jesus' words in the third chapter of John, just as every Baptist preacher does every time he gets near to what Jesus said about the new birth. Mr. Jackson and his scholars would make the word flesh means our "depraved nature." Now since it is not our flesh it must be the spirit or soul. Which is it Mr. Jackson? He says soul and spirit is the same so it must be the spirit since it cannot be flesh. Then Jesus is saying, "That which is born of the spirit is spirit and that which is born of Spirit is spirit. Isn't that sensible? Why friends it is not even good nonsense but it is about all a man can do when he is trying to find scripture to support a false proposition.

It seems that Mr. Jackson has about given up on the direct operation of the Spirit. Maybe he will have something for us next time.

Jackson's Sixth Affirmative

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

Mr. Smith says I squirm under the consequence of my doctrine. Yes, because the Bible says the truth is a savour of life unto life or of death unto death, and Baptists teach it, but I have not had even a quiver of the flesh under Smith's false charges of the consequence of Baptist doctrine.

My opponent claims his father Campbell "learned the truth" and gave up the name Baptist, if he were ever called one. Why would he give it up, if, as Smith says, he used it with a small "b" and meant only one who practiced immersion? What a dodge! But I challenge Mr. Smith to show where Campbell ever repudiated his position on "inherent depravity" and the perpetuity of the Baptists from the days of the apostles. Watch him "squirm under the consequence of his doctrine."

He seeks sympathy by saying he knows no shame for suffering for the name "Christian." He needs a lot of sympathy, for he has fallen down on argument. Why should he be a stickler for the name "Christian," as he refuses to apply it to his church? He damns all who wear that name as a church. Anyway, the term was not applied to the disciples for some eleven years after Pentecost, and then not by the Lord. Smith's father Campbell says the term was applied in derision by the enemies of the Lord. But where in the Bible does he find his name, "The Church of Christ"?

Mr. Smith seems to have difficulty in determining whether his mind or his brain is a "faculty of the soul." Which one, please?

I have repeatedly pressed him for the Scripture saying that the

soul ceases to live at death. He comes back and says "all true scholars" say the soul denotes the "physical life that ceases at death." What! Has he gone to the "scholars" for his proof? I thought he has been saying he cared not what scholars said, as he "wanted only the Bible." Shame on him for his blatant inconsistency. All the scholars agree with him. I deny the statement and challenge him for the proof. And along with the "proof" he might also name the chapter and verse saying the soul ceases at death. His Mr. C. R. Nichol made fun of Adventist Bradley, in their debate, for saying the soul is the physical or animal life. God breathed into Adam's nostrils and he "became a living animal or physical life." Think of it, but that is not the way the Bible reads. Now read Acts 2:31, and explain if Christ's soul ceased at death.

Smith wants me to show where he ever said the soul and body are depraved. Well, he said the body went down physically with Adam and that the soul is the physical life. If this is true, then how can the conclusion be otherwise?

Yes, the "sting of death is sin" (I Cor. 15:56). Sin is the sting, and for this reason even infants die. If infants did not have sin in their constitution, there would be no infant mortality from diseases. "Sting" is from the Greek word kentron, and here we will allow Thayer's Greek Lexicon to speak: "Kentron ... a sting, as that of bees, scorpions, locusts, Rev. 9:10. Since animals wound by their sting and even cause death, Paul in I Cor. 15:55 (after Hos. 13:14 Sept.) attributes to death, personified, a kentron, because sin is death's cause and punishment, Rom. 5:12." My opponent should be able to understand this plain language. But his reply is, if Herod had killed Jesus, would He have carried our sins away by death? That's the height of silliness for a grown man to ask. Might as well to ask, What would happen to the world if God should cease to exist? Paul (II Cor. 5:14) plainly says: "If one died for all, then were all dead." The past tense idea— "were dead," not that people will die physically. As Christ died for infants, as Smith will admit, therefore infants were dead, the past tense idea— infants were dead. He even refuses to notice this argument much less attempt to answer it. While Christ subjected himself to death all right,

because of the sins of the world, not his sins, the time and manner of His death must fulfill prophecy. (Psa. 22; Isa. 53). Therefore He was guarded from death until the cross.

No, Jackson did not say God "went out of operation on the seventh day," but he did say God ceased His work of creation, and I challenge Smith to prove God is still in the business of creation. "On the seventh day God ended His work which he had made" (Gen. 2:2), Smith to the contrary. If God still creates spirits, then He did not end His work of creation as the Bible says He did.

Mr. Smith says if I am right on Rom. 5:12 it would have to read: "So death passed unto all men, for that one hath sinned. ' No, for the verse opens with the affirmation that "by one man sin entered into the world," one man, the door of sin into the world of mankind, but if not, then there are as many doors of sin today as there are people who sin. As a result of that, "death passed upon all men," and as proof and manifestation of it, "all have sinned."

Smith contradicts himself when he attempts to disprove inherent depravity with Ezek. 18:20: "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father," and his effort to answer my argument on Psa. 51:5 by saying that David, being seed of a bastard, could not come into the congregation of the Lord. Such an argument is 'silliness gone to seed. If his father's sin of ten generations back were handed on down to David, did not the "son bear the iniquity of the father" according to Smith's idea of it? Straighten your theology out, Smith, the Bible does not contradict itself but you do.

My arguments on Psa. 51:5; Job 14:4; Gen. 8:21 and Psa. 58:3, stand with a very enfeebled reply by Smith. Frankly, if I could not do any better than he has done on these arguments, I would be ashamed of myself. He pays no attention to the original construction of the verses. Does he not know one thing about the original languages of the Bible? Smith, what's the matter with you? Let the reader turn back for my arguments, and then read Smith's attempted replies and notice just how light they are. Job says no one can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, but Smith says it can be done. Job versus Smith. David says "the wicked are estranged

from the womb." Smith says not so. David versus Smith. For example, "A certain man lame from his mother's womb" (Acts 3:2). How long had the man been a cripple? From his "mother's womb," that is, from birth. So David says the "wicked are estranged from the womb." How long are they estranged, then? From their mother's womb, that is, all their life, or from birth. I know Smith can see in this the doctrine of inherent depravity, and only his man-made doctrine keeps him blind to the truth. The one dying in infancy, sinning in Adam in his nature and not personally, is therefore not damned in hell for he is not held personally responsible (Jno. 3:18). In this case the blood of Christ takes care of him, as all who get to heaven will be there by virtue of the blood, and all will sing the same song. Smith would have some there singing one song and some another.

In his last reply, Mr. Smith made a false charge against Baptists, which I definitely challenged, and I challenge it again. He frets under my lashing, but he should not be so reckless with the truth. He charged that as a consequence of the doctrine of depravity and security of the believer, Baptists go to prisons. I challenge him again for the proof, and if he fails to produce it, he should confess he falsifies on Baptists. As evidence that that doctrine is not responsible for sending people to prison, I showed according to his own "survey," gotten up by a Campbellite laundryman (as I am told his trade is) of Paris, Texas, that the "Christian Church" Campbellites, who do not believe in depravity and security of the believer, have a much larger per cent of membership in prison than the Presbyterians who do believe the doctrine. Explain why, Smith, if your charge against Baptists is true. If that doctrine will send Baptists to prison, why won't it send Presbyterians also? And why are so many Campbellites in prison who do not believe it? What doctrine they believe sends them to prison? Answer, Smith. Furthermore, according to the famous "survey," the "Christian Church" Campbellites and "Church of Christ" Campbellites have a much larger per cent of membership in prison than the Catholics and Episcopalians combined! What a startling revelation against him! But he avers he holds no "brief" for the Christian Church, as

he says "they have forsaken God and the Bible," and in many communities he has more respect for Baptists than for them. How intense his disrespect for them must be! Well, if he refuses to count them, then why would he be so unfair as to hold me responsible for the ten million Baptists of all kinds? His group does not number even a half million. What a small number there will be in heaven, as he damns all except his "Church of Christ" group.

I countered by showing that Smith's doctrine opposed his people taking up arms in defense of their country in time of war. He claims to be a "Conscientious Objector," but he does not object to Baptists and others taking up arms to protect the liberty he exercises in preaching his doctrine. He says there are Baptist boys in the "Conscientious Objector Camps." If so, they are there contrary to the stand Baptists have almost uniformly held, and not in line with the doctrine as in the case of the Campbellite boys, for Smith teaches them not to bear arms. Yes, sir, he teaches them to go to the camps rather than to defend their country. He also says the field secretary of the "entire work" is a Baptist preacher. Well, it is good to put a Baptist over the "Church of Christ" conscientious objectors, if it is true. And, oh, listen to him: "The government respects their conscience and provides 'work of national importance that they may live as useful citizens of this great country and at the same time keep themselves from the sinfulness of this carnal war in which the country is engaged.'" (1) They do work of "national importance." Do they aid the soldiers who are fighting? If so, they are particeps criminis, aiding the "murderers," as Smith thinks of our boys who kill the enemy in time of war.

(2) They are "free from the sinfulness of this carnal war." Huh? He wants Baptist boys and others to partake of the "carnality" but "Church of Christ" boys to be shut up in "holy places." I do not criticise the boys, but I have no respect under heaven for Smith's doctrine that is misleading them and which will cause them to hate themselves in after years and hang their heads in shame as they study the history of the heroes who gave their blood for their freedom. That's your doctrine, Smith. He says some of his

"carnally minded brethren" are of the conviction that they should bear arms. Tell us, then, Mr. Smith, if they can go to heaven with such a conviction. I would not spank him like this, if he had not falsely charged Baptists. But it is due him, and he will get more if he persists in his attempts. I speak not against Mr. Smith but against his doctrine.

How pitiful is Smith's effort in reply to my last arguments. I'll ask the reader to read again my arguments and then read his reply. It is so weak it does not interest me to review it at any length. His "reply" to my argument on the "seed of the woman and Satan" is that Paul says we are the "offspring of God." Yes, because God created man (Gen. 1:27) who did not evolve out of a lower order. Afterwards man fell and his nature was corrupted. That is when Satan stepped into the natural channel and injected his poison, as of a serpent, into the course of nature.

His reply to my argument that "flesh" in John 3:6 means the "carnal nature" is that "since it is not our flesh it must be our spirit or soul." Great stuff! I gave the definition by Thayer and three other great scholars who said it means "carnal nature," but Smith will not have the scholars except when he tries to prove that the soul means the "physical or animal life." If it means the mere human body, then why would Paul say: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit" (Rom. 8:8, 9)? Were not the Roman church members in their body? I know Mr. Smith can see I am right.

No. 10. The doctrine of inherent depravity is true because the Bible connects the transgression of man with his birth, "I knew that thou wouldest deal very treacherously, and was called a transgressor from the womb" (Isa. 48:8). The Hebrew word pasha, rendered transgressor, means rebellion, transgression, sin against God. Mibbetan (Heb.), rendered "from the womb," as defined by Gesenius, means according to the nature received from the womb. This is backed by Isa. 1:18: "Though your sins be as scarlet," etc. "Scarlet," from the Hebrew derivation, means "double dyed." "Wool dyed then after it was weaved, it was dyed again. Sinners are

corrupted by nature and afterwards by practice of sin.

No. 11 The doctrine of inherent depravity is true because the Bible represents a man bom with an untamed nature, "For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt" (Job 11:12). The American Standard Version renders it: "Yea, man is born as a wild ass's colt." The untamed nature of man is here affirmed to be connected with one's birth. Hebrew yauladh means "to hear, to bring forth."—Gesenius' Lexicon. No amount of prejudice and jesting about the "wild ass" can change the true import that an untamed nature is obtained from both the begetting and birth. Let Mr. Smith answer the argument as it is made.

No. 12. The doctrine of inherent depravity is true because the Bible sets forth the fact that the

natural course of man, has been perverted. "Were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Eph. 2:3). As a result people are "dead in trespasses and sins," and walk "according to the course of this world." "Nature," rendered from the Greek word phusis, means "natural birth," "inborn quality." The meaning is sustained by: (1) Etymology; (2) Greek Lexicons; (3) Cognate Scriptures; (4) Translations; and (5) Classic Usage. Now let us follow this line briefly.

(1) The etymology or derivation of the word phusis. Liddell & Scott's "Unabridged Lexicon" says it is formed from phuo which it defines: "To bring forth, produce, put forth, to beget, engender, generate." That should be sufficient, but let us move on.

(2) The definition of the word plusis as given in Greek Lexicons: "Nature, natural birth."—Geo. R. Berry, Ph. D., Lexicon; "The nature, the inborn quality, property or constitution of a person or thing... natural origin, birth."—Hinds & Noble, Lexicon; "Inborn quality."—Liddell & Scott, Lexicon; "Birth, physical origin."—Thayer, Lexicon; "Natural source, nature, origin, generation, birth, descent."—Robinson, Lexicon; "Procreative power, birth, origin, nativity, instinct."—Greenfield, Lexicon.

(3) Cognate or allied Scriptures. Gal. 2:15: "We who are Jews by nature," yes, by "nature," not custom, were they Jews. Rom. 11:24: "The olive tree which is wild by nature," phusis, the natural condition of the tree. I now challenge Mr. Smith to introduce the "long hair" argument based on I Cor. 11:14 and his version of what Thayer says. I am ready, yea, eager for it.

(4) Translations of the Bible. "Living Oracles," which Smith's father Campbell approved and called it his, puts it "nature" in Eph. 2:3, and so do the American Standard Version, the King James, Rotherham's, Moffatt's, Emphatic Diaglott, and others. If phusis means "custom, practice," as my opponent teaches, why so much weight against it in the translations?

(5) Classic usage of the word phusis. "There is not in a known language a single item which can be truly claimed to exist phusei, 'by nature'" (Life and Growth of Language, by Wm. D. Whitney, late professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale, p. 282). This shows that the ordinary use of the term in its original setting was nature as I have here set it forth.

Thus, from five distinct angles, I have shown that the word phusis means "nature, inborn quality, natural origin," and if so, my proposition is fully established by the Scriptures. Mr. Smith, your people and mine are expecting more of you in your reply than a mere skimming of the surface. Watch him, readers, and see if he does anything better than that.

Smith's Sixth Negative

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

Mr. Jackson says Baptists teach the truth but I challenge his statement. Mr. Jackson does not teach one thing, which is peculiar to the Baptists, that is of the truth.

Following the command of Christ (Matt. 23:9) I have no "Father" upon the earth. As said before, it is evident Mr. Jackson has taken Campbell as his "father" or he would not quote him so much when his proposition reads, "The Bible Teaches." However, Mr. Campbell could not have been Mr. Jackson's "father," even though Jackson would claim him, for Campbell was never a "Baptist" in the way Mr. Jackson is a Baptist. If he was I challenge Mr. Jackson to show how he became so and to tell if one can become a "Baptist" today by doing what he did.

Now comes Mr. Jackson with the infamous charge that the name Christian is not God's name for His people but was applied by the enemies of Christianity. He quotes Mr. Campbell to that effect but as said before we are not concerned with what Campbell taught. We would know what the Bible has to say and it is very clear on the subject.

God said, "thou shall be called by a new name which the mouth of Jehovah shall name" (Isa. 62:2). Mr. Jackson, if that name is not "Christian" will you please tell the readers what it is? You know, being the "scholar"??? that you are, that the name "Christian" was not given in derision by the enemies of Christ. In Acts 11:26 where the "disciples were called Christians" you know, or should know before you make such statements that the word "called" comes not

from the Greek word "kaleo" or any of its derivatives, which simply means "to call" but in this passage of Acts 11:26 the word "called" is from the Greek Chrematizo which means "To declare by an oracle." This word always carries the idea of an action of divine nature and was thus used here to show that the name "Christian" is the name which Jehovah has given His people. Deny it Mr. Jackson and we will have some fun. If you will not deny then apologize for your inexcusable attempt to deceive and dishonor the "worthy name" which the children of God wear today.

As for the name of the church we turn to the Bible for that and that is a lot more than Mr. Jackson can do for the Baptist church. In Acts 20:28 Paul says, "the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood." This can refer to none but Christ and therefore Paul speaks of it as we do. Later referring to various congregations of this body of Christ he says, "the churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16) and if these congregations in many localities are so designated anyone with sense enough to come in out of the rain would know that any one of them would constitute the church of Christ in that locality. Mr. Jackson is hard-pressed for ammunition on his proposition, so he runs all over creation to find a diversion and keep from having to use his space to prove his proposition from the Bible.

I have no trouble in distinguishing between mind or brain and in knowing which is of the Spirit, eternal, and which is of the soul to perish with it. I am of the opinion that if Mr. Jackson would use whichever he has or both if he possesses them that he would be able to know also.

As for "soul" meaning "life" Mr. Jackson, just remember what I said about it. The word "soul" is sometimes used to indicate the spirit, sometimes the whole man in all his parts and again it means "the life." In those passages where "soul and spirit" are both used I have repeatedly challenged Mr. Jackson to explain the difference and he is as silent as the grave. Disregarding this sincere question and all that he could learn by consulting a lexicon he is determined to continue his deception of the people.

In the Bible we have the word "soul" more than five hundred times from the Hebrew, *nephesh*, and its Greek equivalent, *psuche*. Of this Greek word Thayer says, "The breath of life; the vital force which animates the body and shows itself in breathing." Now Mr. Jackson, that is what Mr. Thayer says and surely he will be recognized by you as a scholar. I know also that he later says "the soul is an essence which differs from the body and is not dissolved by death" but that is when the word indicates the Spirit and I have contended all along that it is sometimes so used. However, when it is used with Spirit as in Heb. 4:12 and I Thes. 5:23 Mr. Jackson, please tell us what the meaning is and let us see if you will fly in the face of all your scholars, and lexicons No I doubt that you will for you know •; better than that but you will just keep still on this, as in the past, and thus continue your attempts to deceive the people. Assuredly sin is the cause of death and Mr. Thayer in commenting on I Cor. 15: 56 and the "sting" or *kentron* says this is in harmony with Rom. 5:12. Mr. Jackson would make it contrary to Rom. 5:12. In Romans 5 Paul says death entered by the sin of one man, even Adam. That is exactly right and all that was lost in Adam was regained in Christ. I have repeatedly emphasized that and Mr. Jackson fails to notice it. Therefore the gift is the resurrection of the body at the last day and the good and bad shall both be raised. This is no indication of "inherent depravity."

Again Mr. Thayer says that sin is death's punishment. Mr. Jackson is just the opposite of that and says that death is sin's punishment. He says where there is no sin in the individual there can be no death. He even went so far in his fifth affirmative to misquote scripture to prove this and makes no apology for that misquotation in his present affirmative. Sin is death's sting. Thayer says by use of *kentron* Paul shows sin to be death's punishment. That is exactly what I believe for where there is no sin, as in the little child, death is no punishment and has no punishment. Rather it is an eternal happiness and joy in the presence of God for one to be taken away from this world in infancy and purity. Paul and Mr. Thayer are both with me and against Mr. Jackson on this passage and since he was caught mutilating and wresting it he had better

leave it alone for it offers him no solace.

On II Cor. 5:14 Mr. Jackson would do well to consult his lexicons again. The American Standard (Revised) Version will suffice for all who do not have a lexicon to consult. Here the translation is "that one died for all therefore all died." That is exactly what I believe. We all sin and fall short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:23). However Mr. Jackson's proposition is contrary to this for he would have us "born dead." This is contrary to all scripture and no passage that Mr. Jackson has found or will find will ever support his affirmation.

As to the ending of God's work of creation let us note how the Bible contradicts Mr. Jackson. Jackson says, "God ceased his work of creation and I challenge Smith to prove God is still in the business of creation." Well Jackson here it is, now apologize. "And Jehovah will create" (Isa. 4:5) (Future tense in Isaiah's day). "I create the fruit of the lips" (Isa. 57:19) (present tense in Isaiah's day). "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth" (Isa. 65:17). Now all of these are from the Hebrew word bara. Please note Mr. Jackson that this is the same word used in Gen. 1:1 and verses following regarding God's creation. Now according to God's word he has not gone out of the "creating business."

Then in the New Testament we have the Greek word ktizo which is equivalent to the Hebrew bara and Paul says, "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:10). Here Paul uses the same Greek word that he does in Col. 1:16 where he says, "all things were created by him." Now apologize Mr. Jackson for attempting to deceive the people or else say you did not know and thus in ignorance said what you did. It is one or the other and if you did not know you should have found out before you wrote as you did.

Therefore since God is still in "the creating business" Mr. Jackson will have to find another answer to the truth which I have continually presented during this discussion; that is that God is the Father of our Spirits (Heb. 12:9), that we are the offspring of God (Acts. 17:29) and in each body creates a spirit of perfect

soundness.

As repeatedly emphasized before if Rom. 5:12 teaches that man became inherently sinful through Adam's transgression then it must also be taught in Rom. 5:19 that he has now become inherently righteous in Christ for all that he lost in Adam he regained in Christ. This Mr. Jackson will not admit but there can be no other conclusion. The fact of the matter is that in Adam physical death came to all men and in Christ and by his power all are to be raised (I Cor. 15:22). Paul is not here discussing anything but that one fact and to apply his language to any other matter is to distort it.

No Smith does not contradict himself in what he says on Ezek. 18:20 and Psalms. 51:5. Man bears many consequences of the sin of his parents but does not bear their guilt. It is Mr. Jackson's idea and his obligation to prove that the guilt of sin is inherited. David was suffering the consequences of his father's act but that did not make him totally depraved. If it did then God must be totally depraved for He bears witness of David that he was a man after His own heart.

Mr. Jackson may think my replies "enfeebled" but he has consistently required more space than was agreed upon to compose his answers. It seems that if they are so feeble he would be able to answer and stay within the two thousand word limit set for each article.

Of Psalms. 51:5 David refers to nothing but the fact that he is within the ten generations of the seed of a bastard (Deut. 23. 2) and could not enter into the congregation. This is not to say and does not say that he was born totally depraved.

Of Job 14:4, Mr. Jackson thinks that a clean thing cannot be brought from an unclean. I replied that Job's answer concerns man who may not be able to do such but that God can, as shown by Ezek. 18:20. Now here is an example. The birth of Christ is the proof. Christ was born of woman, unclean in the sight of God. Will Jackson say that Christ was unclean or clean? If unclean then totally depraved. Will Jackson say it? Was Christ totally depraved?

If not, then we have God bringing something clean out of an unclean. Get on one side or the other of this matter Mr. Jackson.

Of Gen. 8:21 nothing more need be said. This is from "youth" not from "birth". Of Goliath it was said, "a man of war from his youth" (I Sam. 17:33). Does that mean that he was born with a shield and sword in his hand?

And of Psa. 58:3, let us turn and read some of that. He says "estranged from the womb" means born depraved. Then why did David say in the next line "they go astray." How could one "go astray" if he was born that way? But read more of this, "Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: They are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear" (Psa. 58:4). Here is the Baptist picture of a baby.

Baptist mothers look at your baby. Is that a picture of it? Is your baby in your arms "speaking lies," "poison," and "like the deaf adder." That is what your theology tells you but your heart and the word of God cries it is not so. Christ says, "of such are the kingdom of heaven" and it is so that you look upon your child. It is therefore apparent that David speaks not of little babies here for in asking their punishment he says, "Break their teeth, O God" (Psa. 58:6). Therefore he is not referring to babies at all and Mr. Jackson is indeed hard pressed for scripture to use such a passage as this one to attempt to carry his point.

Now of course Mr. Jackson has a theory whereby they can be saved if they die in infancy. He has given up the old Baptist saying that "hell will be paved with infants not a span long" for that was turning people away from his doctrine and church. However it is impossible for him to find his idea of infant regeneration in the Bible. He can spin in fancy a very pretty theory but he cites no Bible to prove it. This is for the simple reason that there is no Bible for it. There is not a need of such for babies are not inherently depraved.

No other church in the world pushes and glorifies this doctrine as the Baptist and its fruit is shown in their record as cited. In due

time we will publish the "survey" and let the readers decide for themselves.

Mr. Jackson would like to get off the proposition and debate the "conscientious objector issue." If he wants to debate it, lets arrange a proposition but right now lets get acme scripture on the present proposition. He rambles through three thousand words this time without mentioning the operation of the Spirit. Guess he has given that up and would like to give up "inherent depravity" too if he could sidetrack the discussion.

Yes man is the "offspring of God." Jackson says of Satan and that may be God to him but not to me. God is the father of our spirits (Heb. 12:9).

Mr. Jackson thinks I did not properly answer his argument on John 3:6. It is strange that I cannot please Mr. Jackson with my answers. Let him say then if the "carnal nature" is flesh or spirit. If he can get in the affirmative maybe I can do better.

No. 10. Mr. Jackson's argument (???) is entirely invalid. Isaiah is referring to Israel as a nation and makes no mention of the nature of a child whatsoever.

No. 11. Mr. Jackson tries to put into the words of Job 11:12 what is not there. He would have it say, "Man is like a wild ass's colt." It says "born like," not "is like." For Mr. Jackson to make this prove his proposition he would have to show that the wild ass was "totally depraved." Will he attempt it?

No. 12. Let us very carefully follow Mr. Jackson's course now on Eph. 2:3 and see how subtle and yet how deceptive his conclusions are.

(1). The etymology of derivation of Phusis he would make you believe must carry its action back to birth. It is not so but the thing may be "produced or put forth" after birth. In fact the word carries no idea of the time that such "nature" is acquired. It is not "inborn quality" as we shall show. The same word is used in Romans 2:14 relative to good works. Will Mr. Jackson say they were born in

them?

(2). In his definition he definitely misuses the lexicons for Thayer says of his word as used in Eph. 2:3, the passage Mr. Jackson is using, "A mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature." This is the lexicon's definition of it as used in the passage under discussion. In other places it is used with a different sense and they so define it but Mr. Jackson would deny them on this passage.

(3). Let Mr. Jackson have something to say about the "nature" in Rom. 2:14 where good comes by that course.

(4). Translations of the Bible say nature but "doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him." The word nature does not necessarily mean "acquired from birth" but may mean as shown above, "A mode of feeling and acting which by long habit have become nature." Therefore the fact that the word "nature" is used in the translation proves nothing for Mr. Jackson.

(5). The "classic use" and the "New Testament use" are many times different as Mr. Jackson well knows. Why try to confuse the mind of the people.

It is time that Mr. Jackson found a verse of scripture to teach his proposition. The debate is almost over and he has given up one side of his proposition and is losing the other. He should do better or admit his defeat.

Jackson's Seventh Affirmative

Proposition: 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.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

Mr. Smith wants to know why I sometime Use 3000 words if his replies are "surface." The reasons are obvious. It often takes as much time! or space to answer a "surface" quibble as it does a real argument; not all space is used in reply to him as I am in the affirmative; but why should he complain, as I grant him the same privilege that I take? In fact, if I had no more truth than he has, one hundred words would be enough.

Being conscious of the weakness of his efforts, Mr. Smith made a little stronger effort in his sixth reply. In doing so I surmise he took Young's "Analytical Concordance," or a similar book, and fingered out the original words I had used. One familiar with the original languages of the Bible can easily detect his second-handed use of the words. And, now, for an expose of his efforts.

I am little concerned, touching this discussion, whether or not Alexander Campbell was ever a genuine Baptist, but this I know, he was immersed by a Baptist minister, brought his church into a Baptist association and said the Baptists had existed back to the days of the apostles. If he were not a Baptist, that fact itself would add weight to his testimony in their behalf.

Mr. Smith attempts to prove that the disciples at Antioch were first called Christians by divine authority. His "proof" is based upon the Greek verb *chrematizo*, "to call," which Young's "Concordance" says means "to declare by an oracle," but it does not say a divine oracle. He quotes Isa. 62:2, which says "thou shall be called by a new name," and then he jumps, without either

reason or Scripture, to Acts 11:26 to show the new name must be "Christian." What a leap! But he quit quoting too soon from Isaiah, but that is characteristic of false teachers. Had he been fair with the Scriptures, he would have quoted verse 4 which explains that the new name is Hephzibah. Shall we call his people Hephzibah-ites? But we shall let his father Campbell answer him, "father vs. son," as follows:

"I am bold to affirm that there is not the least authority—in the word here used (chrematizo) for concluding that the name Christian came from God, any more than from Antiochus Ephiphanes" (Camp" bell, Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 2, p. 394).

Why should Mr. Smith be so strong for the use of the name Christian, when he damns every one who wears it as a church name—"The Christian Church." He says it must be "The Church of Christ," which he cannot find in the Bible to save his life. "The churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16), is not a church name but denotes possession, belonging to Christ. In the same sense at least seven times in the New Testament (Acts 20:28; I Cor. 1:2; 10:32; 11:22; 15:9; Gal. 1:13; I Tim. 3:5) reference is made to "the church of God," but not one time to "The Church of Christ." "The Church of God" people of today have Smith and his people overshadowed seven to nothing, if such a proof is given credence for a name.

He squirms desperately to get out of the trap he fell into in his second negative installment concerning the soul of man, as follows: "The spirit goes to God, the body to the earth and the soul (physical life) ceases." Now he says the word soul has different phases of meaning. That matters not, as he plays upon the word to work out of the trap, but he shall not get by. Tell our readers, Mr. Smith, what "soul" means in I Thess. 5:23, as you have quoted that verse. Don't forget this, please. Does the soul of this verse cease at death? Psuche is the Greek word here translated soul. Will a man have a soul (psuche) in eternity? If so, will he have two beings (soul and spirit) then? Answer, Smith, and some of your quibbling will disappear.

If sin is "the cause of death," as Mr. Smith admits, then why

does the infant die unless sin is present, and if sin is present, my position of inherent depravity is true. Thanks for the admission, as my point is gained. Certainly infants taken away are in "eternal happiness and joy," just as all the adult redeemed, but both infants and adults taste the "sting of death," which is sin, in passing out of this life. That should settle it.

If "all that was lost in Adam was regained in Christ," as he affirms, and as he also says mankind went down "physically with Adam," being diseased, I wonder if he takes the "Holiness" position that "divine healing" is included in the atonement of Christ, and will he say Christ removes all physical ailments of all people? Let him answer, and we'll "have some fun."

After much pressure he quotes the American Standard Version in an attempt to answer my argument on II Cor. 14: "If one died for all, then were all dead," which shows if Christ died for infants, then they were dead. But his quotation helps him none—"That one died for all, therefore all died," all died, the past tense idea, not that they will die physically, but already dead. Thank you again, friend Smith.

Pardon me, but I had to laugh at Smith's feeble effort to prove that God is still in the "creation business." He is so eager to show that God creates a spirit immediately for each person born that he will make himself ridiculous. "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." Mr. Smith should know the Hebrew word *bora* means "to form, prepare, fashion, create." Let him deny it. Now notice his references: "The Lord will create" (Isa. 4:5), but create what? A spirit in a person at birth? No, but the same verse says "a cloud and a smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night." I suppose Smith thinks every time a cloud appears in the heavens, God creates in the sense he brought the world into existence. Such silly nonsense. What's wrong with you, Smith? "I create the fruit of the lips" (Isa. 57:19). What is? "The sacrifice of praise to God" (Heb. 13:15). "I create new heavens and a new earth" (Isa. 65:17). This is not the creation of new matter following complete annihilation of it but the forming of a new

order and system, for the earth per se will remain for ever (Eccl. 1:4). "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus." Yes, indeed, but not by bringing into existence additional substance but by washing us from our old sins (Rev. 1:5) and planting in us the life of Christ (Gal. 2:20) and His spirit (Rom. 8:9) and the divine nature (II Pet. 1:4). Come again, Smith. I challenge him to prove that God creates now in the sense of the original idea of bringing into existence new substance.

Psa. 58:3 positively declares the "wicked are estranged from the womb," and with this genital connection, they go astray "as soon as they be born." In Acts 14:8 we read of a man who was a cripple from his mother's womb. How long? All his life. This shows what is meant by the expression, "from the womb," all of one's life. The "poison like the poison of a serpent" is sin, which is in one "from the womb." That's true of both Baptist and "Campbellite" babies. Smith thinks it cannot refer to infants because verse 6 speaks of "breaking" their teeth. Tut! Does he not know infants ever grow up? No, Smith, our Baptists have never taught "hell will be paved with infants not a span long." That lie is a Siamese twin of the one about Baptist doctrine leading people to prison as criminals.

Still again, I challenge Smith to prove his wild statement that as a consequence of the doctrine of depravity and security of the believer, Baptists go to prison. Let him prove it, or confess he has told a plain falsehood. He says he will publish the famous "survey" in due time. Possibly he is coward enough to wait until his last negative when I will have no chance to reply. I challenge him to publish it in his seventh reply.

He says I would like to "get off the proposition and debate the 'conscientious objector issue'." Off the subject? Great Caesar! What did he do when he introduced the "famous survey?" But when I exposed his unpatriotic doctrine concerning the defense of our country, he whimpers like a whipped puppy. He even said, in his fifth reply, that "the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of a warrior are two different spirits and cannot abide in the same heart." O' what next from his radical pen? Answer this, Smith: Can a member

of the church to which you belong, dying in battle, go to heaven?

Poor King David, according to Smith, was a bastard, rather seed of a bastard, and could not come into the "congregation of Jehovah." Let him answer: Was David a saved man, and if so, was he saved inside or outside of the "congregation of Jehovah?" But David knew better than Smith, for he said: "That I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life" (Psa. 27:4); "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord" (Psa. 122:1); "Then went king David in, and sat before the Lord" (II Sam. 7:18). David said, in Psa. 51:5: "In sin did my mother conceive me." My mother, not my grandfather of ten generations back, as Smith would frame a dodge. His own mother conceived him in sin. He says David inherited the "consequence" of sin, not the guilt. But Ezek. 18:20 says nothing about not inheriting guilt.

Mr. Smith avers that he knows a "clean thing" can come out of an unclean because Christ was born of His mother. I wonder if he thinks Job 14:4 has reference to the uncleanness of the physical body! As I have proved by the original, it has reference to moral uncleanness. Before Joseph knew Mary in a carnal way, "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 1:18); "for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (verse 20). As Christ was God and was conceived in Mary's womb by the Holy Ghost, He did not partake of her moral nature, and ergo His birth was not bringing forth something "clean out of an unclean." Any" way, will Smith say he, like Christ, was conceived in his mother's womb by the Holy Ghost? Let him answer.

The "youth" of Gen. 8:21 was affected by sin, and I used it to show that sin affected that age as all ages from adult all the way back through the youth to the infant from its mother's womb.

I am greatly astonished at the flabbiness of Mr. Smith's replies to my arguments. I will kindly ask the reader to read again my arguments in my sixth affirmative and then read his efforts at a reply.

His reply to my argument on Isa. 48:8 is that the nation of Israel

was called a "transgressor from the womb," not the individuals. Sir, do you not know that the nation was made up of individuals who were born members of it? If I could not answer, I would at least be honest with God's holy word and not try to deceive people like that.

Job 11:12 affirms that "man is born as a wild ass's colt," showing the untamed nature in him by birth. Smith's reply is that the verse says he is "born like," not "is like," and I would have to prove the ass totally depraved. Oh, no; the Standard Version says "as a wild ass's colt," but how is he born? With a wild nature, and so a man is born with an estranged nature. His remark is impious levity, that I must prove the ass is "totally depraved." As the ass is not a moral being, such is out of place, but I can prove he is an ass and with the ass's wild nature. Compare Gen. 49:9: "Judah is a lion's whelp." According to Smith, Judah must be totally a lion, or the lion totally like Judah. No. Judah like a lion, had a desire for the prey. So a man, like a wild ass's colt, is born with an untamed nature. I know Smith can see the point, and only his wilful blindness keeps him from accepting the truth.

He boasts: "Let us very carefully follow Mr. Jackson's course now on Eph. 2:3," but please read my argument on this verse (phusis), and see how very careful he was to avoid getting entangled. His effort at this point is so weak it is not interesting to reply to it. "We are by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3). I showed that phusis, here translated nature, means inborn quality, that which we get by birth. This I showed from five angles, but what does he say in reply? Practically nothing. He says "nature" means custom, habit, etc. / challenge him to produce one standard lexicon that gives that as the primary meaning. He refers to I Cor. 11:14 which says: "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?" Yes, nature teaches that, for nature, not custom, has made the average length of a man's hair shorter than the average length of a woman's hair. Alford and Stanley, two great scholars, comment on this verse as follows: "The original course of nature which has made distinction between the sexes by giving the woman's head the more abundant hair."

There you are. We know it does not mean "custom," for verse 16 says: "But if man seem contentious we have no such custom," etc., and the original word here is *sunetheia*, not *phusis*. Note, "Doth not even nature." That shows that it means nature, not custom, for the word "even" puts emphasis to it.

Mr. Thayer gives no comfort to my opponent's dodge, for he defines *phusis* to mean "birth, physical origin," and referring to I Cor. 11:14, he says it means "the native sense of propriety;" and then, way down to the tertiary meaning he states: "A mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature... by (our depraved) nature we are exposed to the wrath of God." Then if "mode of feeling and acting" becomes nature, it is not custom per se. As to Rom. 2:14, "The Gentiles... do by nature the things contained in the law," it comprehends nature, outwardly, which points to the God of such nature; and, inwardly, to the natural gift of reason, not one's moral condition. But, Mr. Smith, what about Gal. 2:15?

I have given attention to all his references and objections, but why does he persistently overlook many of my points and quotations unless he is conscious he is unable to meet them?

As I have set forth the doctrine of inherent depravity in unanswered and unanswerable arguments, I shall now proceed to enlarge upon the doctrine of the work of the Spirit in the conversion of the lost. Baptists teach that the spirit personally and distinctly comes in contact with the sinner's heart in connection with the word of God. Here is proof of this doctrine:

1. The Spirit being a person (Acts 5:3-4), and possessing the attributes of Deity (Heb. 9:14; Psa. 139:7-8; I Cor. 2:10-11), is not absolutely confined, therefore, in words in making contact with the objects of His creation (I Thess. 1:5; Job 26:13).

2. In the creation and orderly arrangement of the material universe, the Holy Spirit, in connection with the divine word (Heb. 11:3), came into distinct, personal contact with matter (Gen. 1:2; Psa. 33:6; Heb. 1:2; Jno. 1:13). So in the "creation in Christ" (Eph.

2:8-10), the Spirit comes into distinct, personal contact with the sinner's heart (II Thess. 2:13).

3. In the renovation of the soul, called the new birth, the Spirit comes in personal contact with the sinner's heart, for the reason he is "born of the Spirit" (Jno. 3:6), which transforms him into the divine likeness, gives liberty, seals, etc. It is not reasonable that one can be "born of the Spirit" and sealed by Him without a personal contact having been made. If so, my proposition is sustained.

4. The spiritual resurrection (Col. 3:1), like the physical, comes by a personal and distinct quickening of the Spirit (I Pet. 3:18; Rom. 8:11; Eph. 2:1; Jno. 5:21; 11:25; 5:25, 26).

5. The living entity in man, called his spirit or soul, can be quickened only as the Spirit of God makes personal and therefore distinct contact with it. This is done in connection with the word (Jas. 2:26; Jno. 6:63; Jas. 1:18). This is further shown by the fact Jesus cast evil spirits out of people by His Spirit and word (Matt. 8:16; 12:28). My opponent will say he believes in the work of both the Spirit and word but he will not say he believes in the personal, distinct work of the Spirit in conversion.

6. This doctrine is proved by the functions of the symbols of the Spirit: (1) wind, Jno. 3:8; Acts 2:2; (2) water, Jno. 7:37-39; (3) fire, Acts 2:3. Is not one personally touched by wind, water and fire? Even so by the Spirit.

7. The metaphorical allusions to man's lost condition shows the need of a distinct, personal work of the Spirit in conversion. (1) He is said to be blind (II Cor. 4:3, 4); (2) in captivity (Lk. 4:18; II Tim. 2:24-26); (3) his heart and ears are uncircumcised (Acts 7:51). Words without the personal touch of the Spirit will not relieve him of these conditions.

8. The word is engrafted by the Spirit (Jas. 1:21). In grafting trees, the scion is inserted into a stock, which means the horticulturist makes personal contact with the graft and stock. So does the Spirit make personal contact with the word and the sinner

in his conversion.

9. The distinct power and presence of the Spirit in conversion is needed for the reason Paul prayed for sinners to be saved (Rom. 10:1). If all the power of conversion resides in the word, as Mr. Smith teaches, what good is prayer? Why not give a sinner the word only?

10. The fact the word is referred to as seed (Matt. 13:3-4) shows that the distinct power and presence of the Spirit is necessary in salvation, for the seed alone, without moisture and air, will not even germinate.

Thus I have proved my proposition by the word of God.

Smith's Seventh Negative

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

I leave it to the reader to judge, and I think you will be able, as to why Mr. Jackson must use so much space each time. Of coarse he says I have the same privilege but that does not justify him in his "long-windedness." The fact is that he has been and is having difficulty and tries to conceal it.

Mr. Jackson knows how we "finger" out the original words from Thayer or Young's or some similar hook. The only trouble is he would charge me with such "fingering" and not admit it of himself. Jackson you ought to be honest with the people and not try to palm yourself off as an authority on Greek and Hebrew. All that you know or can write of any word or phrase in these languages is that which you "finger" out of some authoritative work and many times you show either gross ignorance or downright dishonesty in your use of these. Come on Mr. Jackson don't try to appear to be something when you are nothing.

Jackson shies from any attempt to prove that Mr. Campbell was ever a Baptist and it is well that he does. That is one thing that no Baptist preacher will ever be able to prove.

Now look at Mr. Jackson's answer to my argument on the name "Christian." The word *chrematizo* meaning "to declare by an oracle" will forever show that this name came from God not man. But says Mr. Jackson, "it does not say a divine oracle." "Divine oracle" indeed! Of course it does not for even Mr. Jackson would see the futility of saying "tooth dentist." Then he should know that the word "oracle" is sufficient just as the word "dentist" is

sufficient. Webster says of oracle, "The medium by which a God reveals hidden knowledge or makes known the divine purpose." The word oracle carries within itself the idea of divinity and Mr. Jackson but exposes his ignorance by such a reply and admits that he has no answer for the argument.

The word "Hephzibah" is not a name any more than the word "Forsaken" was the name of Israel. In this reference (Isa. 62:4) God uses these descriptive terms but they were not the names by which His people were called or to be called. They were then called "Israel" yet He uses the descriptive term "Forsaken." They were to be called "Christians" and of that happy time and relationship he uses the descriptive term "Hephzibah" which literally means "My delight is in her." This was not to be a name any more than "Forsaken" and if it was to be will Mr. Jackson please give us the reference where any inspired man ever referred to the people of God by this name, "Hephzibah." Does Mr. Jackson rank Campbell ahead of Thayer and Young as authority. He has great confidence in his ability if he does. I do not and will take the word of these authorities that the word *chrematizo* does show that the name "Christian" came from God.

This name "Christian" however is never used of the church and therefore to so use it is unscriptural. I am a member of a church of Christ which is one of "the churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16). Mr. Jackson may know of some who would defend "The Church of Christ" but he will not get me to for I have never so used the term, neither do I intend to so use it.

Mr. Jackson would like to get me to do his work. I have repeatedly insisted that he tell us if "soul" and "spirit" are the same in I Thess. 5:23. Now he would shift and try to evade answering the question by asking me one. I will await his answer and when it comes I will give mine.

Yes, "sin is the cause of death" but does not have to be in the individual to bring death. Christ died and was subject to death all the days he lived yet sin was not in him. The fact that infants die is no proof that they are born in sin.

All that was lost in Adam is regained in Christ. This is the resurrection of the body at Christ's coming, not the preservation of it today.

The consequences of Adam's sin come to all and, in the sense "all die" but the guilt of the transgression of Adam does not inhere in the individual and the fact that "Christ died for all" does not prove that we are born inherently depraved.

His laugh about God's "creating" seems rather forced and is, I know, entirely out of place. However a "laugh" is about as good an answer as a Baptist can find when they meet up with the truth. The Hebrew word for "create" in Isa. 65:17 is the same one found in Genesis 1, How then can we accept Mr. Jackson's puerile reasoning. He says this is not the forming of new matter for the earth will remain forever. He makes the same mistake about "forever" that many denominationalists make. Jonah said he was in the fish "forever" (Jonah 3:6). This word does not indicate eternity. This world will "pass away" (Rev. 21:1), be "burned up" (II Pet. 3:10) and God says He will "create" a new one. He uses the same word that was used of His first creation yet Mr. Jackson laughs and says he is not in the creating business.

Now Mr. Jackson has made what he pleases to call twelve arguments on the proposition that man is born inherently sinful. These are in general mere assertions, not arguments, and they have been noted as presented throughout his first six articles. They may be found scattered through his articles and numbered consecutively from one to twelve. We now want to give a resume of our answers to these and in this we will notice all the remainder of his work on his subject in the current affirmative.

No. 1 (Found in 3rd affirmative). From Paul's statement in Rom. 5:12 that "death passed upon all men" Mr. Jackson would conclude that man is inherently depraved. This death is physical death which is in the world as a result of Adam's sin (I Cor. 15:21-23). We suffer the consequences of Adam's sin but there is no semblance of proof in this that we are born depraved and are condemned for the guilt of Adam's sin. Going further in this same fifth chapter of

Romans we note the work of Christ and as "by one many were made sinners" so also "by obedience of one shall many be made righteous." We insist that if Mr. Jackson can find inherent depravity in this then we must also find "inherent righteousness" in the work of Christ. This we know cannot be but it brings us to the truth. The truth is that physical death is suffered by all as a result of Adam's sin and the bodies of all shall be raised as a result of Christ's obedience. This has no reference to our ultimate salvation but is concerned only with the death and resurrection of the physical body.

No. 2 (Also in 3rd affirmative). This argument that none can return to God but by the blood of Christ begs the issue. Mr. Jackson assumes that babies are away from God and must return. That is the proposition which he set himself to prove. We admit that those away from God must come by the blood and the cross but deny, and Mr. Jackson has failed to prove, that babies are born in sin, totally depraved and wholly inclined to evil. Even he says they will be saved but has yet to find any scripture to cover his idea. The reason that the scripture is lacking is that God contemplated no such idea since babies are not born in sin.

No. 3. (Also found in 3rd affirmative). Without a vestige of scriptural proof Mr. Jackson asserts that none of Adam's posterity can, by nature, possess the image of God. Not one line of scripture is given but he calls it an axiomatic truth. It is no such thing for when Christ sought an example for the kingdom of God he "took a little child and set him in their midst." Here was the example and if the "image of God" in which Adam was created was not present in this "little child" why would Christ so use him and say, "Except ye be converted and become as a little child ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18:3). Mr. Jackson is strong on assertion and assumption and short on scripture. Therefore you will find little scripture and much assertion and assumption in that which he is pleased to call argument.

No. 4. (Found in 4th affirmative). From Psa. 51:5 he reasons that the principle of sin is inbred. This has been fully answered for in

the light of Deut. 23:2 and David being the tenth generation from Perez, son of Judah and Tamar he was born under this shadow but this is not said of the human race generally for David speaks of himself and not of the race in general.

No. 5. (Also in 4th affirmative). Here he attempts to use Psa. 58:3. However the passage is entirely against his proposition. His proposition is they are "born astray." If born astray how could they go. If this is babies then they are damned for they "speak lies" and "all liars" are lost (See Rev. 21:8). Reading of the entire paragraph and noting the calamities David calls upon the subject of his discussion will forever show that he does not refer to babies.

No. 6. (Also in 4th affirmative). Mr. Jackson's claim that Job's language proves his proposition when he says "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (Job 14:4) has been successfully refuted. In his current affirmative he gives up on that for he has shown himself entirely unable to cope with the answer given. Christ (clean) was brought forth out of Mary (unclean). His only answer is that I was not so conceived. What has that to do with it? We have Christ born undepraved and to make Mary (clean) he will have to say she was born undepraved so you see how he flounders in the web around him.

No. 7. (Also found in 4th affirmative). Mr. Jackson thinks that Gen. 8:21 teaches inherent depravity because it says the imagination is evil from youth. Not from birth as his proposition calls for but from youth mind you. Goliath was a "man of war from his youth" (I Sam. 17:33), was he born that way. Such argument (?) if it can be called argument is a waste of time and paper and Mr. Jackson would find better if the Bible afforded it.

No. 8. Mr. Jackson thinks that the doctrine of inherent depravity is proven by the fact that we are the seed of Satan. He has been very quiet on this of late but notice what he said. "The seed of Satan are those whose nature is constrained by him." Further of the word seed he says it is from the original zero and says that both Thayer and Gesenius say it means "offspring." Therefore he says man today is the offspring of Satan. We are quite sure that Mr.

Jackson would give a considerable sum to have that argument out of this debate. Paul said in Acts 17:29, "Being then the offspring of God" and since that verse was called to Mr. Jackson's attention he has had little to say about man being the offspring of Satan. In this as in other matters whenever Mr. Jackson has resorted to scripture he has distorted and wrested the same to his own destruction. As said before he is long on asserting and assumption and short on scripture.

No. 9. (In the 5th affirmative). Mr. Jackson tries to make an argument on Jesus' words to Nicodemus but as always when a Baptist starts talking about the new birth they get into all manner of difficulty. They cannot be content with the English translation and in trying to change it produce an absurdity every time. Enough has been said of this before and we leave it with the reader for Mr. Jackson has never attempted a rejoinder.

No. 10. (In the 6th affirmative). Mr. Jackson thinks the doctrine of inherent depravity true for he says Isa. 48:8 teaches it. This passage as shown has reference to a nation and not an individual. It has reference to the birth or establishment of that nation and the best Mr. Jackson could then do was to say that the nation was made up of individuals. That is the height of silliness put forth as argument.

No. 11. (Also in 6th affirmative). Because a man is "born like a wild ass's colt" (Job 11:12), Mr. Jackson supposes he is depraved. To be a substantiation for his argument Mr. Jackson would first have to prove the wild ass's colt depraved. This passage refers to the manner of birth and not to the moral nature of the one born.

No. 12. (Also in 6th affirmative). Here we finally have Mr. Jackson coming to the "nature" of Eph. 2:3. This has usually been the beginning point with Baptist debaters but it has been so completely upset so many times that they now hesitate to use it. Mr. Jackson would make a great argument about this "nature" which he says makes man evil in his birth. However in Rom. 2:14 we have some doing good by the same nature and that ruins Mr. Jackson's playhouse. For here the "nature" produces good whereas

according to his doctrine only evil can be produced by this "nature" since it is inherently bad.

Mr. Jackson is a great one for his lexicons and he quotes them at length. However in the midst of many definitions Mr. Thayer says specifically of this word phusis that in this passage under consideration, Eph. 2:3, it means "A mode of feeling and acting which by long habit has become nature." Therefore Mr. Jackson can find no comfort here for Paul refutes and confounds him and Mr. Thayer betrays the weakness of all his argument on the word.

Now we have diligently followed Mr. Jackson through seven rambling affirmations. We have answered him paragraph by paragraph in our corresponding negatives and have now found space to sum up and gather into one all of what he is pleased to term his arguments (?). Mr. Jackson has one more article on this proposition. He has consistently violated the agreement and run over in his space. Now we call upon him to confine himself to his space in the last affirmative. Charity can only extend so far and another affirmative of the length of this one will be returned for a rewrite.

Mr. Jackson cannot sustain his proposition from the scripture for we have abundantly shown that little children are not depraved for "of such are the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18:3) and "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20). These passages will never be contradicted by the word of God and these alone forever show the falsity of Mr. Jackson's affirmation that depravity is inherited.

Now of course in the beginning Mr. Jackson had another part to his proposition and that was on the operation of the Spirit. However he in the beginning refused to affirm that which he has signed and therefore yielded that portion of the proposition. The agreement was that he would affirm that in conviction and conversion the Holy Spirit operated upon the sinner "distinct from" the word but in his first affirmative he switched to my side saying it was "in connection with." Now a thing cannot be "distinct from" and "in connection with" at the same time.

I have always believed and taught that the spirit of God has a part in the conversion of man and that he exercises his power upon the heart of man through the word. That is the spirit operating in connection with the word and Mr. Jackson is adopting this same line of argument has forever departed from the old Baptist position which called for an operation of the spirit "distinct from" the word of God.

Now in concluding his seventh affirmative Mr. Jackson makes ten statements about the Spirit and his work. He tries to emphasize the idea of a "distinct" work and this no one is disposed to deny. However notice that he carefully avoids using the wording of his proposition and not one time affirms this work to be "distinct from the written or spoken word." Rather he would make it in "connection with" and have the Spirit operating upon the sinner through the word. That is exactly what I believe and Mr. Jackson if he believes it should never have signed the proposition that he did. We are glad to know that he has left the old Baptist theory which was contrary to the word of God and rejoice to see Mr. Jackson slowly accepting the truth.

We are hopeful that in days to come he may be not only in this but in all other things humbly ready to accept the truth and to do the will of God as it is set forth in His word.

We anxiously await Mr. Jackson's last Affirmative and hope that he may find some argument that will have a semblance of reason and logic that we may at least have some ground for believing him honest in his attempts on the apostasy question. To date he has not done that for our answers have been, according to many readers, sufficiently strong. Nevertheless Mr. Jackson says he could do better. Therefore he must know that those things on which he has relied do not support his proposition.

Jackson's Eighth Affirmative

Proposition: 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 3. Smith, denies.

MR. SMITH AND READERS:

Presenting my last affirmative, I am conscious that my opponent has not sustained one point, neither has he answered any argument of mine. I feel sorry for him, but as he proposed this discussion he has brought the misery on himself. Being intelligent and his people's "champion," he is somewhat chagrined over the fact he has made a flat failure in his effort to answer my argument. I know he knows that the people know that he knows I know he has failed; This being my last installment on this subject, I shall abide by the usual custom of giving a general review.

He charges me with assuming to be an "authority on Greek and Hebrew," and then says I should not pretend to be something when I am nothing. That sounds very "Campbell-istic." The readers know I have made no claim of being an authority on anything, but one thing I do know, I do not have to depend on "Young's Analytical Concordance" for the selection of the original words. Smith is humiliated, and it seems some of his own brethren are too, because he has been unable to answer the arguments in the light in which they have been given. Therefore he has resorted to ridicule, dodging, backstepping in order to hang on until the end. He

knows that. He has not stood on both feet and fought like a two fisted fighter, not because of the weakness of the man but of his doctrine. His claim that I am "long-winded" appears ridiculous for the reason one installment would make about a twenty-minute speech; and, too, I will leave it to our readers as to the one who has the "wind."

Jackson cannot prove that Alexander Campbell was ever a Baptist, says Smith. He was either a Baptist or a hypocrite, as he was a member of a church in a Baptist association. Smith will not deny that.

I chuckle at Mr. Smith's idea that an "oracle" always implies divine authority. Has he never read of the oracles of the heathen? I wonder if they were of God? And according to his father Campbell, sinners of Antioch were the ones who first called Christ's disciples "Christians." But he says he will not accept Campbell. Poor Mr. Smith; he slaps his own ecclesiastical father right in the face. Shame on him. He asserts that we might as well say "tooth dentist" as to say "divine oracle," that is, of God. Oh, no; for all oracles are not of God. When he reads a little more, he will understand better.

He strains hard to show that "Christian" (Acts 11:26) is the "new name" mentioned in Isa. 62:2. The wearing of this name is made a sine qua man of salvation by some of Campbell's followers despite the fact he rejected it as being of divine origin. Chrysostom, who was born at Antioch, about 345 A. D., and later preached there, said of the wicked inhabitants of the city: "Although they had invented the Christian name, they left to others the practice of the Christian virtues," Of course Chrysostom "showed his ignorance," according to Smith's viewpoint. But notice Isa. 62:2: "Thou shall be called (kaleo, Greek Septuagint, not chrematizo) by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." Then read verse 4 for the explanation: "Thou shall be called Hephzibah," not Christian but Hephzibah, and it was "by the mouth of the Lord," but the original word in the Septuagint is kaleo, yet Smith says Christian in Acts must be from God because the Greek word for "called" is chrematizo. Then why is it not the same word in Isa. 62:2? Explain that, my friend. Where is your "oracle" there?

Mr. Smith conies right out and says he is a member of "a church of Christ" but not "The Church of Christ." Praise God from whom all blessings flow. Smith surrenders the old sugar stick: "The Church of Christ," which he says Jackson cannot get him to

defend. No, sir, Jackson cannot push him into it. What will the old debaters say who have been debating under that name for so long time? Shake hands, Smith, and come over and I'll baptize you with other qualifications met. But Smith is not a member of even "a church of Christ," but a church and the church of Alexander Campbell.

Mr. Smith refuses to answer my question: "Does the soul of I Thess. 5:23 cease to live at death, and does one have a soul (psuche) in eternity?" He dodges by saying he will answer me when I answer his question. My friend, you are the one who raised that issue, and it is not my responsibility to answer but yours. But of course as I will have no other affirmative, he will likely attempt an answer when he knows I will have no reply. There he dies hard.

In his blind dodging, like false teachers will do, Mr. Smith lines up with the theory of universal salvation. He did not mean to do it but went headlong on to it in an effort to escape encirclement by the truth. He takes the absurd position that "the gift (of Rom. 5:15-18) is the resurrection of the body at the last day and the good and bad shall both be raised." Now, as the "free gift" is "unto justification" (verses 16, 18), all people will be justified, if, as Smith affirms, the gift is the resurrection of all people. Take him over, Mr. Universalist! But Paul says the gift is eternal life (Rom. 6:23), which may be accepted or rejected.

He says "sin is the cause of death, but does not have to be in the individual to bring death. Christ died and was subject to death," etc. That we have explained over and over again. Christ died for our sins, not because any sin was in Him, but, Mr. Smith, why have you not told our readers what causes an infant to die, since it does not die for the sins of the world? And, too, Mr. Smith, why have you not told our readers if Christ were subject to death by disease? Of course he can answer in his last negative, as he knows I will have no further reply.

"All that was lost in Adam is regained in Christ," says Smith. But he positively refuses to answer if all physical weaknesses in incorrigible sinners are ever regained in Christ, and if the healing

of physical ailments is in the atonement of Christ? He may answer now, as he knows I will have no other reply. Adam was created in the image and likeness of God, and possessed all the physical, mental and moral uprightness that God gave him. Those things were either lost or marred by sin. Tell our readers, Mr. Smith, if the wicked in hell will be in possession of them. If not, do all people regain in Christ what was lost in Adam? You say man "went down physically with Adam" and as a result the mind suffered the "abuses of sin." Explain, then, if those abuses will be removed from the sinner in hell, and if he will come up "physically" with Christ in the resurrection as pure as Christ or as perfect as Adam was in the creation. If not, then all that was lost in Adam will not be regained in Christ. Ah! He is hard pressed.

Mr. Smith thinks I made an awful blunder when one time I said "the sting of sin is death," with reference to I Cor. 15:56: "The sting of death is sin." Of course it is stated in the latter order, and in this way I have quoted it time and again, but if sin is the cause of death, as Smith admits, is there not the sting of sin in death? We have been taught that "things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other."

In a futile effort to prove that God creates a spirit immediately for each infant in conception, Mr. Smith takes the untenable position that God is still in the "creating business" for the Bible says He will create a new heaven and new earth. I have already shown that does not mean He will create new matter, as such, but a new order and status, as the earth "abideth for ever" (Eccl. 1:4). He replies that Jonah 3:6 says the prophet was in the fish forever (It's 2:6, friend). Yes, but Jonah was describing a condition that seemed to him forever, as he saw no way of escape from death. Matter as such will not be annihilated, but changed and made anew. For instance, God told Noah He would "destroy them with the earth" (Gen. 6:13). Still the earth was standing after the Flood, although changes had taken place. Destruction there does not mean annihilation of the earth.

I read with amusement Smith's rehashing in his seventh negative

of his pretended replies to all of my arguments on inherent depravity. I had to stop and laugh out loud. Read it over again and see if you do not laugh too. He seems conscious that he had utterly failed in his first replies, so, like a little boy getting a whipping in a fight, he wants to try it over. He could have spent his time in an effort to reply to the ten clear-cut arguments I made for the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion of a sinner, but not one of them did he notice. Why? The reason is obvious—he knew he could not answer them, but as I will have no other chance, he may be so unfair as to make an effort at a reply in his last negative. He says he agrees with me. No, he does nothing of the kind. That is a mere excuse to keep from trying to answer. I know he does not believe that the Holy Spirit comes into personal contact with the sinner's heart, and that is what my arguments prove, if they prove anything at all.

But what of my arguments on inherent depravity? I am gratified to know that the man who poses as a champion for his people has not even made a dent in the wall of the arguments much less overturning it. Briefly, here are my arguments, which the reader is asked to turn back and read in their fullness:

1. The human race, standing in Adam as the federal head, went down with him in the fall (Rom. 5:12; II Cor. 5:14).

2. Adam, the federal head of the human race, voluntarily transgressing the holy will of God, suffered not only expulsion from the garden of Eden but also from the tree of life with the solemn warning, in effect, that none could return of themselves by the flaming sword, but must return by way of Calvary (Gen. 2:17; 3:24; Heb. 2:9; II Cor. 5:21).

3. The image of God, or the moral relationship of man to God, being lost in Adam, the federal head, none of Adam's posterity can, by nature, possess the image; therefore inherent depravity is a certain truth (Rom. 5:14-18; Rom. 8:29; Eph. 4:24).

4. David, by divine inspiration, positively declares that in natural conception and birth the principle of sin is inbred (Psa. 51:5).

David says his mother conceived him in sin, but Smith laid the job of conception off on David's poor old grandfather ten generations back.

5. The principle of sin being inbred in natural conception, the acts of wickedness are performed with respect to a natal source (Psa. 58:3). "The wicked are estranged from the womb," from birth if you please. Smith says it is not so. It is Smith vs. the Bible.

6. The certainty of the doctrine of inherent depravity is manifestly sustained by Job (Job 14:4). Job says no one can bring a clean thing out of an unclean. Smith says it can be done. It is Smith vs. Job. He says Christ, the clean, was brought out of his mother, the unclean. But physical uncleanness is not under consideration, but the moral as the word implies in the original, and as Christ did not partake of His mother's moral nature, he did not "come out of it."

7. Inherent depravity being true, one's imagination is evil from his youth (Gen. 8:21). This shows the youth is affected by sin which is "bent" in one in that early age as well as in infancy and maturity.

8. The doctrine of inherent depravity is revealed in the divine contrast between the seed of the woman and of Satan (Gen. 3:15). "Seed," the offspring. Smith says I shied away from his reply. Tut! I saw nothing to shy away from. True, man is the offspring of God in the sense of the original creation. It is Smith vs. the Bible.

9. In His instruction to Nicodemus, Jesus plainly sets forth the doctrine of inherent depravity (Jno. 3:6). Thayer says "flesh" here means the depraved nature, but Smith says not so. It is Smith vs. the Lord and Thayer. Which shall we believe?

10. The doctrine of inherent depravity is true because the Bible connects the transgression of man with his birth (Isa. 48:8). Smith says this has reference to a nation as such and not to individuals at all. Read verse 22: "There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked." Is that to a nation merely or individuals? It is Smith vs. Isaiah.

11. The doctrine of inherent depravity is true because the Bible represents a man born with an untamed nature. "For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt" (Job 11:12). Smith says this has reference to the manner of birth, that Job teaches a woman gives birth to a baby like an ass gives birth to her young. Such nonsense! Job is not giving a lesson in maternity. If so, why use the term "wild ass"? Why not, to suit Smith better, say born like a lamb? No, the untamed nature is there, and there is the doctrine of inherent depravity taught in a figure.

12. The doctrine of inherent depravity is true because the Bible sets forth the fact that the natural course of man has been perverted. "Were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Eph. 2:3). I showed by etymology, the Greek Lexicons, cognate Scriptures, translations of the Bible and the classic or ordinary usage that phusis, translated nature, means "natural origin, inborn quality." If a man ever failed to make anything like a satisfactory reply, Smith did so in this case, as in the others. I am delighted, yea rejoiced, over the fact my arguments stand practically untouched for the reason they rest on the word of God. And in addition to all these, in every affirmative, save one, I gave attention to the doctrine of the distinct yet harmonious work of the Spirit, and in my seventh affirmative, I gave positive arguments which my opponent elected to let go by without even an attempt to answer them. They also rest on the word of God. Be careful, Mr. Smith, lest you be found fighting against God.

Besides all that, I challenged Mr. Smith to publish in his seventh reply his famous "survey" gotten up by a "Campbellite" laundryman of Paris, Texas, but you see he did not do it. It is too late now, for if he publishes it in his last reply, it will plainly show that he is afraid to allow me a chance to reply to it in its complete form. I've never been so unfair to an opponent and afraid of my position as that. If he does, be assured he knows his "survey" is shaky.

I also showed that Mr. Smith teaches an unpatriotic doctrine, as he is opposed to the male members of "A" Church of Christ

"Campbellites" defending our country in combat service even when attacked by our bitterest enemy. His doctrine damns in hell forever every one who dies while bearing arms in defense of Old Glory and the Land of Freedom. Members of "The Church of Christ," your own dear boys, according to Smith's doctrine, will spend an eternity in hell if they die in any form of combat service. Of course he eternally damns all outside of his particular church group whether or not they have ever heard of a war.

Mr. Smith thinks "little children" are not depraved in any sense, for as Jesus said "of such are the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18:3). It is not "are" but "is," neither is it 18:3 but 19:4. He is greatly confused, not even able to determine whether his brain or his mind is a faculty of the soul.

Christ speaks of the dependent, humble state of a child and not its moral perfection. If He has reference to moral perfection, as Smith thinks a child possesses to the degree of Adam's original state, then none but perfect people can be in the kingdom. Say, Smith, are you a perfect man and without sin as you say "little children" are? I John 1:8 says the truth is not in us if we say we have no sin. If one must be sinlessly perfect to be in the kingdom, as Smith claims for "little children," then he is either sinlessly perfect or not in the kingdom. Which one, friend Smith? The perfect man Smith in "A" (not "the") "Church of Christ." Take him over, "Bro. Holiness."

"The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezek. 18:20), is Mr. Smith's argument (?) against inherent depravity, but the principle of inheritance is not involved for the reason the next clause in the same verse, which Smith refuses either to quote or notice in reply, says: "Neither shall the father bear (not "inherit") the iniquity of the son." If the son should commit murder, for instance, the father will not be punished for it, neither the son for the murder committed by the father. Smith can understand that, but contrary to his own teaching, he tries to prove that David was excluded from the congregation of the Lord because his old grandfather ten generations back committed an awful sin. Did not

David "bear" (does not say inherit guilt) his father's sin, if Smith is correct? But why does he not explain if David were saved outside or inside the "congregation of Jehovah?" I have asked for this answer, but maybe as I shall have no other chance to reply, he will venture to answer it in his last negative.

Thus I have not only proved our Baptist position on inherent depravity and the personal, distinct yet harmonious work of the Spirit in the conviction and conversion of a sinner to be Scriptural, but I have also shown by the Scriptures that my opponent's positions to be man-made and therefore unscriptural and false. As he is a man of ability, I intreat him to surrender his false doctrine and turn his talents toward promulgating the truth. He denies the Scriptural doctrine of inherent depravity and the fact the Holy Spirit operates personally upon the sinner's heart in connection with divine truth. He affirms one is born into the world as morally perfect and upright as was Adam in the original creation and that the Spirit does not personally contact the sinner's heart but resides in the word only and operates on the sinner only in the sense a man's spirit moves upon another in a letter he wrote although the writer may be dead and in his grave. That's his doctrine, my friends, and that is what I have spared no effort to expose in the light of revealed truth. I appreciate my opponent, and my work in this debate has not been done against him personally but against his heresies which are a stench in the nostrils of the Lord. I am willing to face my Lord, at the end of my earthly career, with the glorious truth I have preached in this discussion. May the God of all grace be with you.

Smith's Eighth Negative

Proposition: 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.

MR. JACKSON AND READERS:

As Mr. Jackson comes to the end of his eighth and last affirmative on the present proposition he still refuses to affirm the proposition that he signed. In his last paragraph he is still maintaining that the Spirit operates in conversion "in connection with divine truth" and thus will not be brought to affirm the Baptist position which he signed to affirm.

He may cry that Baptists have stated it this way for many years but the fact still stands that he agreed affirm and signed the proposition which is entirely different to that statement. His proposition is that the Spirit operates in conversion "distinct from the written or spoken word." Dear friend, can you see the difference in "distinct from" and "in connection with"? I am sure that you can and so long as you see that distinction and difference you know that Mr. Jackson has refused to undertake the affirmation of that portion of his proposition.

Baptists have long taught, contended and debated that the Spirit of God operated on the heart of the sinner "distinct from the written or spoken word." This is a false doctrine, contrary to everything which the Bible teaches on the subject. Mr. Jackson has seen that and though he would try to keep the fellowship of Baptists by signing the proposition his conscience will not allow him to undertake the proof of it.

The truth of the matter is that the "word is the sword of the Spirit" and through the word of truth as it is preached to men and women the Spirit does his work. That I believe and teach for it is

what the Bible teaches. I agreed to deny that the proposition as he signed it was taught in the Bible. I did not agree to defend any man-made doctrine and will never agree to such. Therefore his efforts on this part of the proposition have been nothing for he has sought to saddle upon me a doctrine to which I have never subscribed and has refused to affirm the doctrine which he signed to affirm.

Likewise on the part of the proposition which deals with inherent depravity Mr. Jackson has sought to evade and has failed to undertake an exposition of all that the proposition comprehends. You will remember that I called his attention to this in my first negative. I showed that his definition of "depraved" was not what it should be but he has never offered a correction. He would rather soften the force of this word for although he wants to hold the name of a Baptist he will not agree to the things which Baptists have taught through the years.

Then too the consequences of the doctrine are too severe for him and he will have nothing to do with them and makes no reply to our reference to them. The doctrine of inherent depravity as set forth in authoritative works of the Baptists is as follows: "From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions" (Phil. Con. of Faith, Art. 6, Sec. 4). Now tell me, pray, how one who is "opposite to all good" can die in that condition and go to heaven. Baptists say that children are thus born and therefore teach "infant damnation." Mr. Jackson says "Not so" and thus he would deny the consequences of his doctrine.

Again in the above quotation we see that Baptists teach that it is from this sinful inherited nature that is inclined to all evil "do proceed all actual transgressions." They make every sin which man commits the outgrowth of his inherited condition. This, as I said, has filled the penitentiaries with Baptists for the exposition of such a doctrine and the shifting of moral responsibility can never bring anything but evil in its wake.

Further, we would quote and have quoted in the past in this debate from the New Hampshire Confession of Faith. Article III states, "Being by nature utterly void of that holiness required by the law of God, wholly given to the gratification of the world, of Satan of their own sinful passions, therefore under just condemnation to eternal ruin, without defense or excuse." Note now, it is "under just condemnation." This inherited depravity condemns according to Baptist doctrine but Mr. Jackson will not accept this and denies the idea of "infant damnation." It is the logical consequence of the doctrine. It has been taught in time past by Baptists. It is so stated in their authoritative works and yet Mr. Jackson will deny it. Upon what grounds does he do this? Upon his own authority but not upon the authoritative works of the people he is supposed to represent.

Mr. Jackson would say that some how, some way Christ will save infants who die in their sinful inherited state. He is very careful to not give any scripture for this idea but what difference does that make. Baptists have never bothered to give scripture for anything they wanted to do. Therefore in this he can just say that it is so and expect gullible people to swallow it down and never question it.

I contend that the doctrine of inherited sinfulness must result in infant damnation if it be true and Mr. Jackson does nothing about it so far as the scripture is concerned. Why not? Because the scripture is silent on the subject. Why is the scripture silent on the subject? Because infants are not born in sin, do not inherit a sinful nature which condemns them and therefore there is no need of the word of God saying anything about the salvation of infants. They are born safe and do not need salvation till they come to that age of understanding and accountability. Then they must believe in Christ, repent of their sins and be baptized for the remission of those sins which they have committed. They are not under condemnation for the sins of their parents or any other one for "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father" (Ezek. 18:20).

Now I said above that Baptists are not concerned about giving

scripture for their practice and lest someone ask what is referred to please note the following: No scripture can be found for the doctrine of inherent depravity yet Baptists teach it. No scripture can be found for the Baptist church yet Baptists preserve and uphold it. No scripture can be found for voting one into the Baptist church or any church, yet Baptists do it. No scripture can be found for baptizing a child of God, yet Baptists do it. Therefore we see that Baptists are not concerned with seeking scriptural justification for practice.

The fact of the matter is that the Baptist church is not a Bible church. No reference is made to it in the Bible. It does not depend upon the Bible for its doctrine and does not heed the warning and admonition of the Bible concerning its practices. It is one of the works of men and its doctrines are the doctrines of men.

If this were not true surely Mr. Jackson, in all of his over-length rambling, could have found one case at least wherein the Spirit of God wrought the conversion of a sinner "distinct from" the word. Surely he could have found one scripture that taught depravity of infants as his creeds teach them. Since he could not find such and has run overlength consistently in eight affirmatives the only logical conclusion is that such is not to be found and the proposition is lost by Mr. Jackson for he was to show that the Bible taught his proposition.

Affirmative after affirmative has been followed by the negative, paragraph by paragraph. Nothing has been overlooked or neglected and Mr. Jackson knows it. The record stands and every argument presented on either part of his two-fold proposition has been properly and fully dealt with so that not one item of his proposition has been substantiated by his attempts.

Mr. Jackson has not made many of the time-worn arguments generally presented by the advocates of this doctrine. He has been afraid to meet the issue squarely from the very first and as a result has spent most of his time in quibbling. We have followed even his quibbling and although this is distasteful to me I felt it necessary lest someone think that in such he had made an argument. His

quibbles have fallen and Mr. Jackson's proposition goes unproven and improvable. Had he presented the time-worn arguments which he and others have used in the past they would have been as completely met and overthrown as the material which he has presented.

Paul says, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16). Moreover he also says, "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe" (I Cor. 1:21). Now in the light of these passages it is evident that the conversion of man is accomplished through the word and not "distinct from" it. There is not one case on record in all the New Testament where anyone was ever converted without the word, that is "distinct from" the word.

Neither is there to be found any record where any apostle ever spoke of man being depraved at birth. This waited for the theologians of later years to bring forth and it is now set forth by Baptist preachers but cannot be substantiated by the word of God. Every reference of Christ or the apostles to babies or little children only show them to be pure as the angels of heaven. In the light of all this it is evident that no one could be trying to uphold the Bible by affirming the proposition which Mr. Jackson has undertaken.

Mr. Jackson's proposition has brought him to the ludicrous position of affirming that all mankind is the offspring of Satan; whereas, Paul says we "are the offspring of God" and Mr. Jackson would show that children are like "the wild ass's colt" but Jesus says, "of such are the kingdom of heaven."

Surely man's position is bad enough without making it any worse. Man is not born in sin but goes into sin all too soon. He is not born in condemnation but falls into it by his transgression of the will of God. This sin must be forgiven and it is the grace of God that makes it possible. By His Spirit in the word He has made

known the way of life for the sinning soul and He may turn and walk in the way of light unto his salvation.

All this has been set forth so many times that it needs no repetition and knowing full well that Mr. Jackson has made no argument that needs further attention and lest he say that we present something new in this final answer we leave him to the judgment of our readers and finally to God whose word he has wrested to his own destruction and the destruction of those who follow such teaching.