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This debate was conducted by personal correspondence, beginning March 7, 1935, and ending January 18, 1936. The reason why it took so long to complete it was because of the slowness of Mr. Tant, as the date when each article was written shows. Elder C. A. Smith, who is 47 years old, and the mark of 49th debate, and he has been in the ministry 28 years. Elder J. D. Tant is 74 years old, and has been in the ministry 55 years, and has held more than 200 debates.

WHY THIS DEBATE?

In my first affirmative you will find that we have held two debates before this one: “Oakland” and “Springdale”. The Oakland debate was held on general propositions. In the Oakland debate I presented my evidence that Alexander Campbell (who founded Mr. Tant’s church) was never baptized in order to obtain the remission of his sins. Mr. Tant maintained that one must be so baptized or else he remains a lost sinner! Mr. Tant also maintained that both Daniel the prophet and John the Revelator foretold the “Apostasy” of the church, and also foretold the rise of the kingdom movement. In Mr. Tant’s efforts to answer my arguments on Campbell’s Baptism, he said that he had the evidence at hand in “Rowe’s Book of the Reformation,” that Elder Matthias Luce, a Baptist Minister, did baptize Alexander Campbell “for the remission of sins” and that in our next debate he would bring the book and present his proof. Before we came to the Springdale debate, I wrote Mr. Tant to bring the book written by Mr. Rowe and present his evidence. But when we were engaged in the debate I called on Elder Tant for the Rowe book, and he even denied that he had promised to bring such a book or to present such proof! However, Mr. Tant, after I pressed him on the matter, when we meet in our next debate you can affirm on the Campbell baptism matter.” To this I agreed. But you will note that Mr. Tant challenged me to affirm a negative; and his challenge at Springdale to affirm on it, and fearing that if I should present an affirmative to him on this subject that he would refuse, and after a few weeks when Mr. Tant had written me that his brethren at Reed, Oklahoma, were desirous of a debate, but that my brethren out there would not endorse me—but the churches in Reed is a Convention church, so I wrote to the Sulphur church, three miles out northwest of Reed, and secured their endorsement, agreeing to collect what I could for my financial support—I wrote out propositions for the Reed debate, and signed them, including the one I am debating in this written debate. The debate was agreed to by J. D. Tant, and he signed the propositions for a five session debate, March 3-7, 1935. Just before the time for me to go, I had a letter from Mr. Tant stating that his brethren would not so much as answer his letters over at Reed; and that if he did not hear from them he would not be there; but said that he wanted me to go, secure the church house belonging to his brethren, and preach. I wrote him that I would go and lecture one night on “Campbell’s Baptism.” So I went, and Mr. Tant did not show up; but the weather was bad, and there was quite a bit of sickness, and no service had been arranged, so I did not deliver the lecture. But I had written Mr. Tant that in case his brethren did not notify him to appear for the Reed debate, that I wanted to have a correspondence debate on the Campbell baptism matter. To this he agreed, stating that he was sure that both of us would be benefitted in the study of the history in the Subject. But now in both of my affirmatives I complain, stating he has “no interest in the matter,” and that he does not know “why Smith wants to debate it”!
Mr. Tant’s arguments until he again attempts to answer nothing in his closing affirmative! So I go to press wholly unanswered; not a point did he even take up and try to answer in neither article, although J. D. Tant had the right to use as much space as I had used (even "4,500 words")!

MR. TANT EVIDENTLY THOUGHT THAT THE LESS HE COULD SAY THE BETTER FOR THE CAUSE HE REPRESENTS, and so he closed out with but a very brief reply, with no attempt to answer a thing I said! This is an admission that all I said was true, and wholly unanswerable. Mr. Tant evidently could see no way around. I offered to let him go in with me in publishing this debate, but he refused, and I am not blaming him for it! Read the articles carefully, and draw your own conclusion.

QUESTIONS TO CAMPBELLITES

In my forty debates with "The Church of Christ" Campbellite preachers they have shown a confessed state of mind on my question: "Do you baptize a child of God or a child of the Devil?"

W. Curtis Porter in our Southwest City debate (1932) said that he baptized "penitent believers, yet unforgiven." But it matters not how "penitent" his "believer" may be, if he is "yet unforgiven", he has not "Redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Eph. 1:17). Though Porter tries to dodge my question, he admits to baptizing children of the Devil!

Will M. Thompson in our Odessa debate (1920) said that he baptized "Neither one". In our Blanton View debate (1923), and again in our Steedman debate (1926), he said that he baptized "a rebellious child of the devil!" In our Alex debate (1932) I asked: "Did the one who baptized Cornelius baptize a child of the devil?" We were to answer "yes" or "no". He answered "no". In our Tuttle debate (1932) I asked: "Did the one who baptized Cornelius baptize a child of God?" "No," was his written answer! So this plainly brought him back to his position at Odessa, "Neither one."

J. W. Chism in our Cold Springs debate (1881) answered: "Neither one!" I showed how absurd this position is; that their "penitent believers" had ceased to be a child of the devil, and, if he should die, he could not go to heaven, because he is not a child of the devil, and, he could not go to heaven, because he is not a child of God! This lashing is what ran Thompson away from the position he first took!

J. N. Cowan in our Antioch debate (1933) said that he baptized "a begotten child of God." J. W. Chism said that one is "first begotten of God, then born." At Tuttle I asked Thompson: "Do you baptize one begotten of God by the gospel?" Answer: "No." Again I asked Thompson: "Does one’s spirit have life when he is begotten of God?" Answer: "Yes." According to Cowan and Chism they baptize one begotten of God, and according to Thompson one begotten of God has life, though Thompson baptizes one "not begotten!" But the Bible says that those who have "life" have "the Son of God." (1st Jno. 5:12.) This is another good reason why Tant would not engage in a written debate with me on what the Bible teaches concerning the design of baptism. The "Campbell Party" started out with the slogan: "We speak where the Bible speaks, and we are silent where the Bible is silent!" Now look what "heavenly harmony" these gentlemen have!

Porter, Thompson, Chism, and Cowan are among their greatest debaters, and this is how they are "agreed" after having run for over one hundred years!

Dedication!

To all those millions of Baptist martyrs who gave their lives in defence of Spiritual regeneration, in their opposition to Baptismal Regeneration contended for by Roman Catholics, and to the multitude of Baptist Preachers who have met the enemy of the truth on every part of the ground from the days of John the Baptist to the present time; and especially to my two Preacher sons, J. Cunis Smith and Isaac J. Smith, I now dedicate this little book! May God’s richest blessings rest upon it.

C. A. SMITH.
WHY DEBATE THIS QUESTION?

In our debate at the Oakland Baptist Church, near Springdale, Ark., June 22-29, 1933, I asked Mr. Tant if he agreed with Elder Will M. Thompson when Mr. Thompson said in answer to a question of mine on the date of the church restoration, "Mr. Thompson (in order to obtain the remission of sins, according to history)." Mr. Tant declared, and since the right sort of baptism puts one "INTO THE CHURCH WHERE SALVATION IS:" THEN, BELOVED, MR. CAMPBELL COULD NOT HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE REMISSION OF SINS. You see, from Mr. Tant's view, that would have put Mr. Campbell into the church; BUT TANT SAYS THAT AFTER THE CHURCH APOSTATIZED IT WAS NOT RESTORED UNTIL 1827. Now, if as Mr. Tant and Mr. Chism say, "THE GOD OF HEAVEN HAS CLEARLY REVEALED THIS RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT" UNDER Alexander Campbell and his colaborers, DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. CHISM IN THE ABOVE EXPRESSION?" Mr. Tant's answer was, "YES!"

AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NO. 1

My first witness is one J. D. Tant himself, and I suppose that he will accept himself as good authority!

(a) In our Oakland debate I presented the following question to Mr. Tant: "In 'Campbellism—What Is It?' J. W. Chism says: 'The God of Heaven has as clearly revealed this religious movement as he did the coming of Christ and approved of the work in the prophecies as he did of the Church.' He is speaking of the 'Reformation or Restoration movement' under Alexander Campbell and his colaborers. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. CHISM IN THE ABOVE EXPRESSION?" Mr. Tant's answer was, "YES!"

(b) Then I asked Elder Tant the following question: "J. W. Chism and Will M. Thompson both say that the exact date when the church was restored after she apostatized is A.D. 1827. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS?" Mr. Tant's answer was, "YES!" On page 227 of Mr. Tant's book before quoted, he says that "SALVATION IS THE CHURCH". This being true from his point of view, and since Mr. Tant declares, and since Mr. A. Campbell was the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his piety and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States..."
AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT NO. 2

My second witness is Alexander Campbell himself. If Mr. Tant will accept himself as an authority perhaps he may accept Mr. Campbell, since he is at least supposed to know, as is the one we are debating about.

(a) In Millennial Harbinger, 1832, Vol. 3, pages 120, 121, Mr. Campbell was in a dialogue with one Rufus, who had been baptized by the "Red River Baptists" in 1813. Mr. Tant says that "Campbell himself says in his own words..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "If Mr. Tant will..." The first passage Mr. Tant quotes is in a dialogue with Rufus. Mr. Campbell never said, "It was in this commonwealth that this doctrine was first promulgated in modern times:..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "I would set up a kingdom..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "That kingdom, on your hypothesis..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "The promises of God have failed, or such persons as were baptized as you were the first time are in the kingdom!..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "The kingdom, on your hypothesis..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "We are still..." This is not true.

(b) In Volume 2 of Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, page 217, Mr. Richardson quotes from Mr. Campbell: "We can sympathize with those who believe in the presence of their crises unredeemed and unanointed in the import and utility; for WE EXHIBITED IT FULLY IN OUR DEBATE WITH MR. MCCALLA IN 1823, WITHOUT FEELING ITS IMPORTANCE AND WITHOUT BEGINNING TO PRACTICE UPON ITS TENDENCIES FOR SOME TIME AFTERWARD." So you see, Mr. Tant, Campbell does not agree with you when he said, "I was assured of..." and "I was then assured of..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "I was then assured of..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "I was then assured of..." This is not true. Mr. Campbell never said, "I was then assured of..." This is not true.

(c) But turning to the Campbell-McCulla debate, page 135, we read: "The blood of Christ then, really cleanses us who believe from all sin. Behold the goodness of God in giving us a formal and token of it, by ordaining a baptism expressly for the remission of sins! The water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. Paul's sins were really forgiven when he believed, yet he had no such pledge of the fact. No formal acquittal, no formal forgiveness of his sins, until he washed them away in the water of baptism. That is the Baptist position; that "PAUL'S SINS WERE FORGIVEN WHEN HE BELIEVED AND WAS BAPTIZED," and that in baptism we have, following the "real" cleansing at faith, only a "formal purification of sins." This is what Mr. Campbell preached almost 11½ years after Matthias Luce baptized him! But we will pursue the evidence still further, letting Mr. Campbell tell bow and when he believed baptism, and he did not begin to practice "baptism for remission" for some time afterwards!

(d) Turning to the Campbell-Rice debate, held in 1843, just 20 years after Mr. Campbell spoke the language as given from his debate with Mr. McCulla (page 472): "Some twenty years ago, when preparing for a debate with Mr. McCulla, I put myself under the special instruction of four Evangelists, and of distinguished apologists and divines, and had some time before that discussion, been often impressed with such passages as Acts 2:38; AND THAT PROVIDENCE CALL TO DISCUSS..."
SINS" was first practiced by the Campbell Party; for which they were excluded from the Baptists, and became a separate people!

(a) In the Religious Encyclopedia, page 462, appears an article written by Alexander Campbell himself, under the heading of "DISCIPLES OF CHRIST, (Sometimes called Campbellites, or Reformers)," and he says of the rise of this society, if we may call it a separation, "the drawing of the lines of demarcation between it and other professors, is of recent origin." Then further on Mr. Campbell says: "After the Mahoning Association appointed Walter Scott an evangelist, in the year 1812, Alexander Wilson and others, great numbers began to be immersed into Christ under his labors, and new churches began to be erected by him and other laborers in the field, did the Baptist Associations begin to declare non-fellowship with the brethren of the reformation, thus by constraint, not of choice, they were obliged to form societies out of those communities that split up the ground of adherence to the apostolic doctrine." Note, will you, that it was not until "Walter Scott, in 1827, began to immers into Christ," that Baptists declared against the Campbell party! Now, we have hit upon the trail that will soon locate for us just when, where and by whom "baptism for remission of sins" first was practiced by these people!

(b) December 23-28, 1920. I met Elder Will M. Thompson (and I have now held five debates with him, and he is one of the greatest debaters of the Campbell Party!) at Odessa, near Gotebo, Oklahoma, and he affirmed the following proposition: "Resolved that the church of which I, Will M. Thompson, a member, know by name, as brethren in the Church of Christ, is the Church of Jesus Christ; being identical in origin, doctrine and practice with the church of the New Testament: and during the Dark Ages the Church was in an apostate state on earth, and the work of Campbell, Scott and others was a restoration work which was exemplified before their eyes in the baptism of a penitent for a purpose which now, on the 18th of November, 1827, for the first time since the Primitive Ages was fully and practically realized." I asked Mr. Thompson: "When, and by whom, was the baptism of repentance first practiced in modern times?" He replied: "I cannot get you to bring out the booklet; and during my rounds I met up with Elder E. M. Borden, and he told me that Mr. Thompson came to him for information; and that he told him that there was no such history! It was now the first time that I knew of, Baptized by Elder Luce." I pinned Mr. Thompson down so closely on this that he promised to bring out a booklet in which he was going to prove the Campbell Baptism matter, but never could get him to bring out the booklet; and during my rounds I met up with Elder E. M. Borden, and he told me that Mr. Thompson came to him for information; and that he told him that there was no such history! It was now the first time that I knew of, Baptized by Elder Luce. I pinched Mr. Thompson down so closely on this that he promised to bring out a booklet in which he was going to prove the Campbell Baptism matter, but never could get him to bring out the booklet; and during my rounds I met up with Elder E. M. Borden, and he told me that Mr. Thompson came to him for information; and that he told him that there was no such history! It was now the first time that I knew of, Baptized by Elder Luce.

(c) On page 36, of the "ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST," published by the "Christian Church" wing of the Campbell Party—they held this when the movement first took shape, I mean a hundred years after 1809, when the Campbells first set up a movement, the "Progressives" celebrated the hundred anniversary—they read: "Walter Scott was the first man in modern times to give to anxious inquirers the answer that Peter gave on Pentecost: 'Repent ye, and be baptized for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.'" It was Walter Scott that discovered the place and function of baptism in the Christian system. He learned and taught that baptism is the culminating act in conversion; that baptism is the remitting ordinance. In baptism the penitent believer received the assurance of the remission of his sins. THAT DID UNDOUBTEDLY MARK AN EPOCH IN THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.

(d) Since it was Mr. Scott that "learned and taught baptism in order to obtain remission of sins;" just where, when, and how did he learn it? Up to 1827, we read in Vol. 2, page 206, of Memoirs of Campbell: "Various controversies, when Mr. Scott put in motion "the ancient gospel" of baptism for remission of sins, and just what date was it performed? ANSWER: "Campbell was the first that I know of, Baptized by Elder Luce." I pinned Mr. Thompson down so closely on this that he promised to bring out a booklet in which he was going to prove the Campbell Baptism matter, but never could get him to bring out the booklet; and during my rounds I met up with Elder E. M. Borden, and he told me that Mr. Thompson came to him for information; and that he told him that there was no such history! It was now the first time that I knew of, Baptized by Elder Luce.

We have now hit upon the trail that will soon locate for us just when, where and by whom "baptism for remission of sins" first was practiced by these people!
hastened to adopt that primitive order of the different parts of the gospel which was then no less a novelty." He continues: “Everywhere the confusion which had involved the subject of conversion was removed; THE MOURNING BENCH WAS ABANDONED: an intelligent obedience was substituted for visionary theories, and a divine assurance replaced delusive frames and feelings.” When was the “mourning bench” abandoned, and an “intelligent obedience” by being baptized, substituted? Why, sir, it was immediately following, and in, Walter Scott’s revival at New Lisbon in November 1827, not back in 1812, when Alexander Campbell was baptized by Matthias Luce!

(g) In conclusion, I turn to the “Life of Walter Scott,” page 107, and read: “This event, which forms an era in the religious history of times, took place on Nov. 18, 1827, and Mr. Amend was, beyond all question, the first person in modern times who received the ordinance of baptism in perfect accordance with apostolic teaching and usage.” Quoted from “Campbellism—what is it?” by J. W. Chism, page 208. Mr. Chism says on page 209: “This shows for itself that this was acknowledged by them (the-Campbells) to be THE BEGINNING OF THE PRACTICE OF THE PURE GOSPEL OF THE SON OF GOD.” When, according to Chism, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, was the beginning of this “baptism for remission” in modern times? Why, sir, it was in 1827, when Walter Scott baptized William Amend!

J. W. CRUMLEY

At Odessa, near Gotebo, Oklahoma, in May 1918, I held a debate with Mr. Crumley, who was then (now dead) a leading defender of the Campbell Party, and he affirmed the following proposition:

“The Scriptures and History teach that the Church of Christ ceased to exist on earth as an organized body, and was restored as such by Campbell, Scott and others in the beginning of the 19th century. I pressed Mr. Crumley on Campbell’s Baptism not being “in order to remission,” and forced him to sign the following:

STATEMENT

“Matthias Luce said that he baptized Alexander Campbell into Jesus Christ; and thus Campbell was baptized in order to remission of sins. Walter Scott was also baptized for the same purpose.” Signed: J. W. CRUMLEY.

“ROW BOOK OF THE REFORMATION”

Eld. J. D. Tant also said in our Oakland debate that this proof is “IN THE RAW BOOK OF THE REFORMATION.” I AM NOW READY FOR THE PROOF, MR. TANT. GET DOWN TO YOUR KNITTING.

QUESTION

Mr. Tant, when you said at Oakland that the exact date when the church was restored after she apostatized was 1827, if you did not refer to the practice of “baptism in order to remission” beginning when Mr. Amend was baptized by Walter Scott, just what did you mean?

C. A. SMITH

1308 South 12th Street, Chickasha, Oklahoma
March 7, 1933.
precisely after “Apostolic pattern.” If you will turn to apostolic pattern you will find that Jesus predicted salvation on faith and baptism. Mark 16:16. He will also tell that Peter predicted remission of sins upon repentance and baptism. Acts 2:38. And Apelles in Acts 21:16 predicted washing away sins on baptism. These are apostolic patterns which Campbell followed and which Graves says are unscriptural.

I only present the above as preliminary to bring me to the main issue.

1. Beg to state that all scholars of the church for the first four hundred years after Christ, who wrote on baptism, represented it as being for the remission of sins. Alexander Campbell was familiar with all these writings. (Proof I’ll give later). I now skip 1200 years of scholarship which is not germane to the subject and affirm that all schools and creeds for the two hundred years immediately before Campbell taught baptism for the remission of sins.

Now if these two propositions can be sustained, and they can, and we can find that Campbell was familiar with all their teaching on baptism as being a condition of salvation, as well as the same being taught in the Bible, it looks like he would be silly to turn away from all Bible pattern and all history to get Baptist baptism which is no where taught in the Bible.

Let us follow history. Barnabas, Paul’s companion, whom Dr. Graves and Orchard say was like Paul, sound in the faith, in his Catholic epistle chapter eleven, speaking of baptism, says: “Blessed are they who put their trust in the cross, descend into the water. Why do they go into the water? That we go down into the water full of sin and pollution, but coming forth, hath fruit in our hearts the fear and hope which are in Jesus by the Spirit.” No Baptist will take that kind of a man but the early church did.

In the second century, Hermas in his book of Similitudes chapter 16, speaking of baptism, says: “And I said to him, I have even now heard from your teachers that there is no other repentance besides that of baptism when we go down into the water and receive the forgiveness of sins!” This shows that these writers in the second century who Graves claims were sound in the faith, taught baptism as a condition of salvation.

Tertullian wrote in the third century condemning baptism, as they were baptizing children for remission of sins. “Let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need this godless age to make haste to the forgiveness of sins.” In his work, page 74. At that time they were baptizing children for the remission of sins. He condemned it and demanded children wait till they were older.

Origen says: “The baptism of the church is given for the remission of sins.” Not one of the apostolic fathers but who taught baptism was for the remission of sins. Campbell was familiar with all their teaching.

Passing over 1200 years what did the people teach before there was any Baptist church?

Beginning with the Episcopalians, founded in 1521, we find them plainly teaching the same condition of salvation. All Baptists refused to submit to any other practice than the condition of salvation. At the first Luce refused to baptize him contrary to Baptist doctrine. (3) After further discussion Luce stated, “I believe your idea is scriptural, but it is contrary to Baptist doctrine, but if you so desire I’ll baptize you and run the risk of censure. There were not, therefore, upon this occasion, any of the usual forms of receiving persons into the church upon a detailed account of religious feelings and impressions. There was no Baptismal church-meeting to which any such experiences could have been related.” Elder Luce and Orchard say was like Paul, sound in the faith, taught baptism as a condition of salvation, contrary to Baptist doctrine, but if you so desire I’ll baptize you and run the risk of censure. There were not, therefore, upon this occasion, any of the usual forms of receiving persons into the church upon a detailed account of religious feelings and impressions. There was no Baptist church-meeting to which any such experiences could have been related.

The Methodists started in 1729. Their Discipline on page 105 teaches baptism for the remission of sins. John Wesley, in his notes on the New Testament, teaches it even stronger than does the Discipline.

The Baptists, who formulated their creed in 1611, chapter 30, sec. 1, teach that baptism engrafts into Christ, into remission of sins, and of his giving up to God through Jesus Christ to live and walk in a new life.

With all the creeds for four hundred years before Campbell, including Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Wesley, teaching that baptism was for the remission of sins, with Hermas, Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen during the first four hundred years after Christ teaching the same thing, Campbell, being familiar with all their writings and seeking for the truth, and refusing to accept Baptist teaching on baptism, would have been a fool to go against the Bible and all modern and ancient history who taught baptism for the remission of sins.

What was he baptized for? It seems Campbell ought to know, so we call him on the stand.

I note in Dr. Richardson’s “Memorials of Campbell” p. 397-398 the following historical statement: “In his remarks he had quoted, among other scriptures, the command of Peter to the believers on the day of Pentecost: ‘Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,’ and had dwelt at length upon the gracious promises of God to all who should obey him. When he had concluded James Hacen, who with his wife, had also concluded to be baptized, took his child from its mother’s arm, and requested her to walk aside. He asked her what she thought of the declaration of Peter. You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,’ and how she understood it. Mrs. Hacen, being well acquainted with the scriptures, soon gave a satisfactory reply, and both were accordingly, baptized along with the rest, consisting of Alexander Campbell and his wife and with his wife and sister, Alexander and Harriet. AM. Elder had stipulated with Elder Luce that the ceremony should be performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament, and as there was no account of any of the first converts being called upon to give what is called ‘a religious experience,’ this modern custom should be omitted, and that the candidates should be admitted on the simple confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” These points he had fully discussed with Elder Luce during the evening spent in his house when he first went up to request his attendance and they had arranged as he desired. Elder Luce had indeed, at first, objected to these changes, as being contrary to Baptist usage, but finally consented, remarking that he believed they were right, and he would run the risk of censure. There were not, therefore, upon this occasion, any of the usual forms of receiving persons into the church upon a detailed account of religious feelings and impressions. There was no Baptist church-meeting to which any such experiences could have been related.

Conclusion: From the above statement I glean: (1) Baptist usage at that time required a candidate to relate an experience of grace and be voted upon by his fellowship as being a true believer. All Baptists refuse to submit to any other condition of salvation. At the first Luce refused to baptize him contrary to Baptist doctrine. (2) After further discussion Luce stated, “I believe your idea is scriptural, but it is contrary to Baptist doctrine, but if you so desire I’ll baptize you and run the risk of censure.” Elder Luce and Orchard say was like Paul, sound in the faith, taught baptism was for the remission of sins. John Wesley, in his notes on the New Testament, teaches it even stronger than does the Discipline.

The Baptists, who formulated their creed in 1611, chapter 30, sec. 1,
the pattern given in the New Testament, and had so stipulated with Luce the night before. (6) He refused to be baptized according to Baptist doctrine of relating an experience and of being baptized into the Baptist church, which says he was never a Baptist and Dr. Jarrell has declared was never a Baptist into the Baptist church, was not baptized by Baptist authority, was never a Baptist, never a member of any Baptist church. But both claim that his baptism was precisely after the pattern given in the New Testament.

This forces us to go back and find out the New Testament pattern of baptism. Graves and Jarrell both claim that Campbell was baptized into the Baptist church, and on which, and for which he lost his life, is truly the Christian confession and the true gospel. If any one can tell me who first said or held this doctrine and received persons into the church by this true primitive and apostolic plan, and then taught the disciples all that Christ commanded, I will think favorably of his pretensions to the peculiar honor of restoring the original gospel. This might lead us back to almost the beginning of the century, for my own part I was immersed on that very confession and for that grand object by special covenant and stipulation with the Baptist who immersioned me: and for adhering to that confession alone we have been separated from that community. They were not only baptized, but for all other blessings connected with the Christian covenant, which comes to any man making the scriptural confession that Peter made (Matt. 18:18), and being baptized for the remission of sins.

We note in this that Campbell dates his work before 1823 and 1827, back almost to the beginning of the century, 1812, when he was not only baptized for the remission of sins, but for all other blessings connected with the Christian covenant, which comes to any man making the scriptural confession that Peter made (Matt. 18:18), and being baptized for the remission of sins.

David Lipscomb, in commenting on this statement of Campbell's says in Gospel Advocate, Jan. 20, 1890: "This makes the case a little stronger than we had contended, in so far as Brother Campbell's own baptism is concerned. It shows he was baptized upon the proper confession, not only for the remission of sins, but as he states, for all the blessings of the Christian covenant. So we see his grasp of the truth at the time he was baptized was greater and reached farther than we have been contending in this paper. One should understand in order to valid baptism, it is not a matter of the design of baptism, in fact Brother Campbell understood the design of baptism at the time he was baptized by Mr. Luce—even greater than he contended was necessary in order to valid baptism."

Again in Millennial Harbinger, 1831 p. 48. Mr. Richardson asked Campbell: "Were you not baptized by a Regular Baptist and in a Regular Baptist way?" Campbell said: "I was immersed by a Regular Baptist but not in a Regular Baptist way. I stipulated with Matthias Luce that I should be immersed on that profession but he believed it to be scriptural. Fearless however, to be called to account for it by some of his brethren he solicited the attendance of Henry Spears."

Campbell claimed he was immersed on the simple confession that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and that he had never baptized any one only on that confession.

So far we have learned (1) Luce did go authorized from the Baptist church to baptize Campbell. (2) Luce agreed that Campbell's baptism was scriptural but was not according to Baptists practice. (3) If Campbell's baptism was scriptural, yet not according to Baptist practice, it folllows that Baptist baptism is not scriptural. Baptism is not scriptural, he that believes and is saved may be baptized if voted upon and accepted. Christ taught "That he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (4) Baptists who do not have and Campbell demanded, "baptism for the remission of sins." (Acts 2:38). (5) Campbell claims that his baptism dates before 1823 or 1827, back almost to the first quarter of that century. (6) He refused to be baptized according to Baptist doctrine of relating an experience and of being baptized into the Baptist church, was not baptized by Baptist authority, was never a Baptist, was never a member of any Baptist church. But both claim that his baptism was precisely after the pattern given in the New Testament.
make, and J. R. Graves said it was stipulated that it must be performed precisely as the New Testament pattern. (8) Campbell himself said he was not baptized for remission of sins only, but for all other blessings that come to man in the Christian covenant that follow a man's obedience. (9) Campbell states that his baptism must be according to New Testament pattern and not according to Baptist usage. (10) When Campbell refused to accept Baptist baptism because of remission of sins, or to get into the Baptist church, and demanded baptism after the New Testament pattern he had before him the scholarship of the world who for the four hundred years after Christ without exception taught baptism was for the remission of sins. He was also familiar with the writings of Luther, Calvin, John Wesley, and all reformers without exception who taught baptism was for the remission of sins. He also had the New Testament before him and demanded baptism for the remission of sins according to New Testament pattern, and before going down into the water he quoted Acts 2:38 which says to be baptized for the remission of sins, and Campbell could not have followed the New Testament pattern had he not been baptized for remission of sins.

J. D. TANT
2101 Southeast 14th Street
Brownsville, Texas
August 29, 1935

A REQUEST UNHEEDED

In my first affirmative I made the following request of Elder J. D. Tant: "I shall give a number of reasons, as affirmative arguments, setting forth my proof that Matthias Luce did not baptize Alexander Campbell in order to obtain the remission of sins . . . . I want Mr. Tant to labor to dispose my arguments, taking up each argument in succession, and weigh each point connected with each argument." Instead of this, Mr. Tant has agreed to not introduce any new matter in his next article, which ends the debate. So you have all that he can give on his side of the question, except to sum up, which he has already done! Friend Tant relates in his letter that the Chism funeral hindered him in his reply than he is in the historical facts concerning Mr. Campbell's baptism! You have his "facts", and judge ye, if he made my article "look like 30 cents"!
EACH ARGUMENT, BRUSHED THEM ALL ASIDE, BRINGING A LINE
OF REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS WITH NO REPLY TO A SINGLE
HISTORICAL QUOTATION I MADE—and that is debating! So, according
to his agreement; he cannot answer now! He wrote it under date of March the 2nd, 1935: "You can write your manuscript and
mail it to me, I'll answer—mail to you. You write a second and I'll reply
to it, putting in no new matter, and then you will have it."

WHY THIS DEBATE?

Mr. Tant has informed us that he has no interest whatever, in this
debate, that he can go to heaven without ever hearing of Alexander
Campbell. But, he cannot go to heaven without being in the Church;
this he has affirmed constantly! In our Oakland debate Mr. Tant affirmed
that "That Church of Christ apostatized, and was restored in the 19th
century, under Campbell, Scott and others." So, according to Mr. Tant, whether Alexander Campbell went to heaven or not, he got the church back so that Tant can get in it in order to go to heaven.

A QUESTION!

In our Oakland debate I asked Mr. Tant the following question: "If Christians composing the church of Christ apostatize, and die in that condition, will they go to hell?" His reply was "YES." So the church of Christ apostatized and went to hell; and for Mr. Campbell, according to Tant, there would be no church of Christ on the earth; and Mr. Tant says that one cannot go to heaven without being in the church! So "poor J. D. Tant", if there had been no Alexander Campbell; and "poor Alexander Campbell," if he was not "BAPTIZED IN ORDER TO OBTAIN REMISSION OF SINS!"

TANT AFFIRMED A FALSEHOOD!

Mr. Tant now informs us that what he said in the Oakland debate has nothing to do with the facts as to Campbell's baptism! If not, then Mr. Tant affirmed a falsehood at Oakland. He said at Oakland that God's Bible foretold of Alexander Campbell's work; and by the mouth of Daniel fixed the date when the church would fall and when she would be restored again. In Tant's arguments he ran the dates from B. C. 473 to A. D. 1827, 2300 years. J. D. Tant now says that the church was "Restored" back in 1812, with seven members, all Baptized by Matthias Luce "IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THE REMISSION OF SINS." Well, if this is correct Tant affirmed another falsehood at Oakland, and J. W. Chism in his 1827 date is wrong; and "Daniel the prophet missed the mark," Ha, Ha, Ha! But, Alexander Campbell was not a lost sinner and restored the Church; then Matthias Luce was the devil who administered the ordinance of heaven to get Mr. Campbell and his party into the church, and into salvation, according to Tant's theory of salvation! Was Matthias Luce already saved? No, not if Tant has told the truth; and not if "faith in Christ embraces design of baptism," as Mr. Tant has affirmed! If it takes faith in design, to put one into the Church where salvation only is obtained, as Tant affirms, and if Elder Luce did not "slip into the kingdom," and "slip into the kingdom," then Matthias Luce was a LOST SINNER, ACCORDING TO TANT'S DOCTRINE! If Matthias Luce was already saved, and one must be in the church, as Tant teaches, to be saved; THEN THE CHURCH, AND MATTHIAS LUZE AND MATTHIAS LUCE WERE IN IT. Then that would cut the Campbells out of "Restoring the Church" in the 19th century; for Matthias Luce was a Baptist minister, a very old man; baptized and ordained back in the 18th century. If he and his Baptist brethren were in the church away back in the 18th century, then contrary to Tant's theory of salvation, "FAITH IN DESIGN OF BAPTISM", is not necessary; and that would put all Baptists into the church! Tant denies with all his soul! So this puts things in a pretty mess! ! !

"LUCE WAS A CHILD OF THE DEVIL!"

I asked Tant the following question at Oakland: "In your judgment, was Mr. Luce, who baptized Alexander Campbell, a Christian at the time he baptized Mr. Campbell?" Mr. Tant had signed an agreement to answer each question 'yes' or 'no'. This one he tried to dodge! Why did he try to dodge it? "Mr. Tant wrote his answer down, in open violation of our signed agree­ment, and he didn't know! I immediately arose to a point of order, and de­manded the rejection of the third moderator. If the two present ones could not reach an agreement. Mr. Tant said: "I do not know whether Old Brother Luce was a Christian or not. I said: 'The question only calls for a yes or no answer. Mr. Tant replied, 'Well, I said yes, and this in the matter. Matthias Luce was just a poor old ignorant country Baptist preacher.' I replied: 'You do have an opinion, and you are going to rub this out and write 'yes' or 'no'. I know that your opinion is that Mr. Luce was saved; you are going to put it on paper. You have already signed a question in which you say one cannot become a Christian, or be saved, unless at the time of his baptism he believed that baptism was necessary to his salvation or remission of sins.' When Mr. Tant saw that he was caught, and during the recess hour he took the paper and erased his 'I don't know' out and wrote "NO". So, according to Tant; God did not have a child on earth that he could send Mr. Campbell to in order to get Christian Baptism; and he had to send him to one of the devil's goats to get his own church back on earth! You see, if Tant should admit that Elder Luce was saved, or Regenerated, that would say that the church of Christ was on earth, and need not be restored; for Tant says that one cannot be saved out of the church!

"CAMBPELLISM—WHAT IS IT?"

Elder J. W. Chism is the author of a book under the above title, and on preface page 3, he says: "If we can find in the prophecies that God has as clearly revealed this religious movement as he did the coming of the Christ and approved of the work in the prophecies as he did of the coming of the Christ, will it not then be an evidence that this work, which is so commonly called 'Campbellism,' is not 'Campbellism,' but the gospel of Christ restored?" He says on page 1: "There is a religious people in the United States of America and other parts of the Christian world who claim to be the people of God, and who are called by other religious teachers by the name 'Campbellite'; and since these people make such claims to be the people of God, we ought to examine their claims and the claims of other religious teachers with fairness and candor, and see if the name 'Campbellite' is a right name for them."

On page 108 Mr. Chism says: "We place the beginning of the twenty-three hundred days here at B. C. 473". On page 208, Mr. Chism runs out the 2300 days to Nov. 18, 1827, when Walter Scott baptized Mr. Amend, as the gospel then 'Restored'榫 the church. This position Tant first took at Oakland, but upon his theory, "Faith in design of baptism", I ran him away from it, and drove him back to 1812 when Campbell was baptized—to keep out of the awful predicament that he was caught in, and must admit that a child of the devil did restore the church, one Matthias Luce, by baptizing Alexander Campbell and six others on June 12, 1812! Since Tant admitted that he believed that a child of the devil did restore the church, then Matthias Luce is a lost sinner, according to Tant's theory of salvation, to slip into the kingdom, and will admit that the church "DID NOT APOSTATIZE," and knocks Campbellism into a "cocked hat!"
T. H. BURNETT

Mr. Burnett was a Campbellite preacher in Texas, but he did not believe that faith in design of baptism was necessary to remission, and would take baptism administered by Baptists and others, just so it was immersion on a profession of faith. On page 32 of "J. N. Hall's Campbellite Catechism" is published an article from the "Gospel Advocate, Dec. 2, 1897," written by T. R. Burnett: "Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott, and John Smith and Jacob Creath and all the pioneers were immersed before they learned that baptism was for remission of sins. Walter Scott baptized William Amend on Nov. 18, 1827, 'for the remission of sins,' and he was the first person in modern times so baptized. This was fifteen years after the baptism of Alexander Campbell and his father, Thomas Campbell, which occurred at Brush Run in 1812. Neither one of those gentlemen had baptized a believer in order to obtain remission of sins during those fifteen years."

"FAITH IN DESIGN"

The Campbellites were having it hot and heavy among themselves in those days, and A. McGary and T. B. Wilkinson had it over and under with Burnett; and Joe S. Warlick, J. W. Chism, J. D. Tant and C. Nichol were on McGary's side. Wilkinson wrote a poem on T. R. Burnett, "Shaking goats out of the Baptist Goat-pen," without baptizing them over, without "wetting his skin!" To this Burnett wrote the following, as published in Hall's book:

"But that's a fib, a fad, a fake:
None from the Baptist fold he'll take,
Or shake from out the Baptist pen,
Except they have been born again.

In Mark Sixteen the savior said:
'To all on earth whom he died:
Believe, baptize (the words he gave),
And you from sin and death I'll save.'

If Jesus here the truth hath told,
All such are in the blessed fold;
But hobby scribes won't shake or grip
Unless they'll take a second dip.

Not faith in Christ as God's own Son,
And buried with the Holy one
Is quite enough; it will not do;
They must have faith in water, too.

Nor does this end the bold digression;
You needs must have a new confession.
The old's too short by half a line;
It don't embrace "faith in design."

Say, bard, when did your church begin,
And from the first where has it been?
Did Campbell build it on the rock,
And is he daddy of the flock?

How long's your line? Threescore and ten,
And there it strikes the old goat-pen,
Where you must either shake or break;
And that's what makes your hobby quake.

"It once began at Pentecost,
But soon in fog and sin was lost;
And now it's short (the figures vary);
It runs from Campbell to McGary.

Ah, that is bad, that you can't trace
A true continuation of the race.
By light of star or moon or sun,
Beyond the goats at old Brush Run.

You can't go round, you won't go through;
And now you don't know what to do.
The goats were out, and put us in;
And that's the place where we began.

I know old Daniel once did say
The kingdom shall not pass away;
But he was not a prophet true,
And could not see the ages through.

'Twas our new hob., "faith in design",
That broke the church succession line;
And, in our mad sectarian spasm,
We've made an awful, bloody Chasm.

And in that gulf, forever doomed,
The hobby crowd is now entombed,
No more to sing in loud laudation
The glories of the Firm Foundation.

Here's Jackson, Jones, and Charlie Nichol,
And "Weeping Joe" in the sad pickle:
And Durst and Swinney, Tant and Chism
All buried in this bloody chasm.

This is the rock, as all admit,
On which the Rebaptismal boat was split;
Not one of all the mighty host
But here hath yielded up the ghost!

The question true they could not meet,
Though many times it did repeat,
At noon and night and early morn:
"Where was the church when C. was Born?"

Here lies the last of poor old hob,
He undertook too big a job:
He tried to kick the Baptists out,
And that's what brought this end about.

For then he could no further go,
Than Campbell's day, and could not show
A church or people in the line
That understood the one design.

Ho, every Adam's son and daughter
That makes an idol of the water,
Come back into the good old way
That leads to heaven and endless day!"

So you see that for years and years, the Campbellites themselves have been in a fight among themselves as to whether one must have "faith in design" when baptized in order to valid baptism; and such as J. D. Tant among them were having a hard go of it trying to show "faith in water too," was necessary! If not Baptists are "in the kingdom," and Tant, it seems, had rather go to hell himself than to admit this!
DAVID LIPSCOMB

Tant quotes from Mr. Lipscomb, where he commented in The Gospel Advocate, Jan. 20, 1898, on a citation from Alexander Campbell, where Campbell said in Millennial Harbinger, something about some one “about the beginning of the present century made the apostolic confession, and was immersed,”

“NOT FOR PERSONAL REMISSION OF SINS.”

“but for all the blessings of the Christian covenant.” I know that Tant is a big dodger, so I put Campbell's words in the above heading, to bring out, and to show that when Campbell was Baptized, it was not “FOR REMISSION”. Yet, Mr. Campbell did not say that this party was himself, but doubtless he wanted to make the impression on his followers that his baptism was a public one for he was being publicly baptized on “faith in design of baptism.” Then Mr. Campbell goes on and says: “For my own part I was immersed on that very confession and for that grand object by special covenant and simulation with the Baptist who immersed me.”

But he had also quoted: “The very confession of Peter, on which Christ built his church.” That Campbell got Matthias Luce to immerge him on the “confession of the Ethiopian eunuch,” the Memoirs of Campbell state; and it was not until Alexander Campbell brought out his edition of the New Testament, called “Living Oracles,” in which he discarded the 37th verse of the 8th chapter of Acts, did Mr. Campbell change passages to “Peter's Confession,” in Matthew 16:16. On page 23 of Tant’s book, Gospel X-Ray, Mr. Tant says: “The Apostles were saved long before Pentecost.” Then Peter must have been saved before he made the confession, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Was Peter saved before he made his confession? Mr. Tant? He had been baptized, had he not? Mr. Campbell, by force of scholarship, was forced to drop Acts 8:37, for he listed it in the back of his Testament under the heading of “Spurious readings.” It is said at Oakland that Campbell put the verse in a footnote, and I took the book and exposed him on it, and he just turned pale, and dropped it like it was hot!

THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER

The truth of the matter is, that Mr. Campbell got Brother Luce to consider the fact, that there was no church in Ethiopian eunuch, and he wanted that to be baptized like that; and finally got Luce to agree to that. This is all right when a missionary is sent out into heathen countries, to baptize without the voice of a church; but when other brethren are present they should be consulted, as in Acts 10:47. But at a word did Campbell say to Bro. Luce about being “baptized in order to remission;” but he and his Brush Run church did, the very next year (1813), that they would not have a Church. And so, Mr. Tant? He had been baptized, had he not?

“Paul’s sins were really washed away when he believed...formally forgiven in baptism?” Since Campbell said this 1½ years after Matthias Luce baptized him, then he told Matthias Luce that he was a Christian, and had been forgiven, and had the actual forgiveness of sins; but he wanted to do it “FORMALLY” as all Baptists do today! If not he contradicted himself—he believed it!

SMITH-TANT DEBATE

I knocked Chism and Tant “sky high” on this prophecy, but we must now hear Alexander Campbell on it. In Millennial Harbinger for 1832, he says: “Now this question is of peculiar easy solution; for no event in history is more notorious than the invasion of Asia by Alexander the Great, the first king of the Grecian Empire, triumphed over Darius and, broke to pieces the Medo-Persian dynasty. Now we cannot doubt he destroyed the symbol under the sign of the ‘goat’, (which, by the way, was the ensign armorial of the Macedonian people,) but we cannot, correctly than from the invasion of Asia by Alexander and his all-conquering army, in the year before Christ 334. Here, then, we are compelled, by force of historic facts, to date the vision under consideration. From this date we compute the 2300 days. And what is the result? The time of the end will be in the year of our Lord 1868—one hundred and twenty-three years yet distant. If, then, the Millerites, and all who agree with them in their times and seasons, seek to rid themselves of all the previous difficulties by taking the date of the vision proper, to which the 2300 days belong; if they prefer this horn of the dilemma, it is not as evident as demonstration that they have not all the facts at the dates, (to say nothing more), and that which they are now expecting in 1843, can not occur till 1868.” I just wanted to show how the founder of the Campbellite church differs from the times of his “New Party,” Elders J. W. Chism, Will M. Thompson and J. D. Tant!

“CHURCH SUCCESSION”

Did the church of Jesus Christ our Lord die out and pass into bades, as J. D. Tant, Will M. Thompson and J. W. Chism teach? In 1837, Mr. Campbell, in his Harbinger, in reply to a sister who had been much wrought up, said: “In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there are no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except” (as Tant says) “ourselves, or such as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed; but it is said that the church have” (upholding the “confession of faith,” upon his 3rd edition of the Red Stone Baptist Association. But David Lipscomb, as published in the “Firm Foundation, Jan. 11, 1898,” did say of Campbell: “Now, Mr. Campbell never understand baptism was for remission of sins at that time, nor for ten or twelve years afterwards. He stumbled on it in quoting the passage, Acts 2:38, in debate with Walker in 1820, but did not understand it. In the McCalla debate, 1823, he presented baptism and remission just as the Baptists do now. They are really forgiven, and were really forgiven in baptism.” (Hall’s Catechism, page 38). Turn back to my first affirmative, and read quotation from page 135, Campbell-McCalla debate; and see that Lipscomb told the truth. If Tant and Lipscomb, in the quotations and comments therein, which Lipscomb used, THEN LIPSCOMB AND CAMPBELL LIED IN THE TWO QUOTATIONS WHICH I GAVE. If Campbell did not lie, on page 135 of his debate with McCalla, and Lipscomb, in the quotations and comments thereto which Lipscomb used, THEN LIPSCOMB AND CAMPBELL LIED IN THE TWO QUOTATIONS WHICH I GAVE.
less the former, rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation; the brand of "Pharisees among Christians," as Mr. Campbell calls them, has been preaching all over the country that faith in design as necessary to a Christian; which he perhaps did on some occasions, but not so here!

"BLASTED NUT BAPTISM"

That Campbell taught immersion necessary to salvation in some instances is proved by the following from page 521 of "THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST:" "I PUT BAPTISM FOR REMISSION OF SINS IN MY CREED IN 1823, BUT DID NOT BEGIN TO PRACTICE IT FOR SOME TIME AFTERWARD." This I quoted fully in my first affirmative. So this "blasted nut" doctrine puts Campbell in hell; but Mr. Campbell "blasted" his own "blasted nut" doctrine! In 1843, in his debate with Mr. Rice, Mr. Campbell (page 919) says: "I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case." So here Mr. Campbell not only "blasted" his "nut" doctrine; but actually "BLASTED" baptism itself! In speaking of the "sects," on page 16 of his book on Baptism, Mr. Campbell says: "Among them all, we thank the grace of God that there are many who believe in, and love the Savior, and that, though we may not have Christian churches, we have many Christians.

CAMPBELL "EXPLAININS!"

In the year that Mr. Campbell wrote his "blasted nut" article on Feb. 2, 1829, he also wrote on April 12th, an article on "The Three Kingdoms." These he specified as (1) The Jewish Kingdom, (2) The Kingdom of Favor, (3) The Kingdom of Glory. He says: "The nature of the kingdom of God amongst the Jews is very different from the nature of the kingdom of God amongst the Christians, and both are different from the kingdom of Glory." Again he says, "I have discovered that the objections offered against the scriptural design and import of christian immersion, are based upon a misapprehension of the nature and privileges of these three kingdoms. They cannot enjoy the blessings of the second kingdom: in other words, they cannot enjoy that light, peace, liberty, and love, which are the natural privileges of all who intelligently enter into the third kingdom, or kingdom of glory." In answer thereto Mr. Campbell says: "I doubt not but many Pedobaptists of all sects will be admitted into the kingdom of glory. Indeed all they who obey Jesus Christ, through faith in his blood, according to their knowledge, I admit the opinion will be introduced into that kingdom. But when we talk of the forgiveness of sins which comes to Christians through immersion, we have no regard to any other than the second kingdom, or the kingdom of favor." So, to get into heaven itself, Mr. Campbell explains, is by other principles than to get into the church on earth. That

"THE DESIGN OF CHRISTIAN IMMERSION"

is necessary to "enjoy that light, peace, liberty, and love," here on earth; but mistakes as to the mode and design of Christian Baptism will not cut one out of the "admission into the everlasting kingdom."
since we have already been bathed in heart." Does Mr. Tant believe that one is bathed in heart by the blood of Christ, which alone can really "WASH AWAY SINS", before the body is bathed in water? NO!! So why quote Tertullian? Mr. Tant, the Daddy of your "NEW PARTY" says that all the "Fathers" were unreliable as to their opinions. So why quote them? They are but a thing to do in praying or the ritual of Baptism! But Tant had no history to disprove my proposition, hence he had to lug in everything at his command for "Filler!" Hard pressed!

"BAPTISTS"

On page 66 of Tant's book, "THE GOSPEL X-RAY", he says: "In 1742 others became dissatisfied and started the Baptist church." Further down he says that in 1812, all Baptists were "Primitive Baptists", that "they had no missionary Baptist church on earth at that time." But page 85, Davis History of Welch Baptists, says that in 1785 Welsh Baptists met at Swansea, and "From the messengers at Llantirsaint, also creeping into the Red Stone Association, with such a written declaration of the Baptist, soul, unselfed soul, so that they thought they were receiving to their bosom one of like faith and order" to their own. Over this exclusion Mr. Tant poured out his wrath, because he had limited his opportunities of destroying the Church of Jesus Christ. But the point is, was Campbell a "Baptist"? Dr. Jarrell says on page 414: "If Campbellism is true, the father and founder of the Campbellite Church and many of the leading Campbellite preachers are in perdition. Why? Because they had been baptized with Baptist baptism and were not re-baptized." So, your witness, Mr. Tant, says your daddy Campbell had only Baptist baptism, and therefore went to hell according to your "Faith in design of baptism" doctrine! YOU HAD BEST LEPT DR. W. A. JARRELL OFF!

DR. J. R. Graves

This is another Baptist "star witness" introduced by Mr. Tant to disprove my proposition. So we will now see about this witness! I say again, Mr. Tant should fairly represent his authors. Tant goes to page 193 of Tant gives us the following: "THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH IN AMERICA," by Graves & Adlam, which is a compendium from the articles of faith of this Newport church: "Christ freely offered himself as a substitute to suffer and die in behalf of all men. Thus he became a perfect savior by whom all who will may be saved." On page 198 we read: "The ordinances of the church are Baptism and the Lord's supper. Baptism is the first formal act of the Christian life." Yet J. D. Tant had the gall to say that "All schools and creeds for the two hundred years immediately before Campbell taught baptism in order. If then I have caught Tant on another point which he avow so loudly, WATCH HIM DROP THIS TOO! Tant argued "a case in point", since all the "others" taught Baptismal Regeneration for 200 years before Campbell. But Mr. Tant had taught that Baptismal Regeneration, that Campbell could not have conceived the idea of salvation before Baptism, hence he is ADMITTED THAT THE BAPTISTS OF CAMPBELL'S DAY DID NOT BELIEVE IN BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. Baptists then were a very large denomination. Do you suppose that some of their ideas might have gotten around close to Mr. Campbell?

DR. W. A. Jarrell

Mr. Tant introduces this Baptist brother as a "star witness" that Mr. Campbell was "BAPTIZED FOR REMISSION," in-as-much as Dr. Jarrell says: "The Campbells, therefore, never were Baptists nor members of any Baptist church." But Mr. Tant should be fair to his author! Dr. Jarrell had just been summing up his evidence, and his "therefore" refers to his point Eleven: "Campbellism is an off-shoot from the Presbyterian Church." Dr. Jarrell goes right on below where Tant quoted, that this "disaffected, apostate Presbyterian Church," wrote from their faith so as to deceive the Red Stone Baptist Association! On page 85, Dr. Jarrell says: "We thus see that Campbellism originated from the Presbyterian Church, that its origin is in no way, of the Baptist Church." On page 49, Dr. Jarrell says, after quoting Campbell where he baptized the account of his baptism by Matthias Luce, "Mr. Campbell omits, in this connection, to state that, near two years before, the Campbells had organized a new Church." In summing up, point Fourteen, page 63, Dr. Jarrell says: "Having thus got a hold among Baptists, like his namesake, Alexander the Father and founder of the Campbellite Church and many of the leading Campbellite preachers are in perdition. Why? Because they had been baptized with Baptist baptism and were not re-baptized." So your witness, Mr. Tant, says your daddy Campbell had only Baptist baptism, and therefore went to hell according to your "Faith in design of baptism" doctrine! YOU HAD BEST LEPT DR. W. A. JARRELL OFF!
Mr. Tant’s witness say that Mr. Campbell was “BAPTIZED IN ORDER TO REMISSION?” Right in between the two statements from Dr. Graves, which Tant jammed together as one, making Dr. Graves say that he did not say, is the following from Graves: “Mr. Campbell and his father continued members of the Brush Run Society, which he had organized previous to his immersion by Mr. Luce, until the next year, when it, with all the Campbells, upon the presentation of a satisfactory creed or confession, were received as a Baptist Church into the Red Stone Baptist Association. NOT UNTIL 1823 DID MR. CAMPBELL COMMENCE PUTTING FORTH HIS PECULIAR VIEWS OF BAPTISM IN ORDER TO THE REMISSION OF SINS, and his new system of Christianity, and in 1827 the Baptists expelled him and all who embraced his unscriptural views.” So, according to this witness, which Tant introduced to disprove my affirmative, Campbell was baptized 1½ years before putting forth his views, baptism in order to remission.” This takes Graves from Tant, and leaves “poor Tant” stranded! But on page 195, Dr. Graves says: “Mr. Luce never immersed him for any such purpose. No Baptist Church or Baptist minister ever baptized to bring the blood of Christ in contact with the conscience of his subject, or to procure for him the remission of sins or regeneration of his heart. MR. CAMPBELL HIMSELF, AT THIS TIME, 1812, DID NOT KNOW OR BELIEVE ANY SUCH DOCTRINE. He had never thought of it in his wildest imagination. IT WAS YEARS AFTER HIS BAPTISM BEFORE HIS PREACHING OR WRITINGS WERE TAINTED BY THIS HERETICAL CONCEPTION.” So much for this witness! Tant says: “Dr. Jarrell and Dr. Graves says Campbell did not have Baptist Baptism.” Weight what I have given from both these men, and see if Mr. Tant told the truth about their position! Tant says further concerning Jarrell and Graves: “But both claim that his baptism was precisely after the pattern given in the New Testament.” Neither said such a thing! So Tant “makes one out of whole cloth!” Read carefully what they both said, and judge for yourself! Tant makes two other like references to these two men, as glaring and as false as anything can be! “As Graves and Jarrel both claim Campbell had the New Testament pattern, which they claim is not according to Baptist doctrine,” is about the sum of both those untrue statements! Shame on a man who will be caught and exposed like this!

A FUNNY THING!

Mr. Tant says: “The Baptists, who formulated their creed in 1611, chapter 39 (quite a big creed!), “section 1” (Boy, it is so big it had to be divided up into sections), “teach that baptism engrafts into Christ, into remission of sins.” Tant now surrenders his 1812 theory and says “THE CHURCH WAS RESTORED IN 1611.” If they immerseCampbell, then the church was restored in 1611; for Tant says that that was why the church was restored in 1821! So Tant has not only “slipped back” from 1827 as the date of restoration, to 1812, but now has “slid back” 201 years before that date. His “Baptist Creed” must be a “stray relic”, because Mr. Tant neither put it in quotations, nor did he give the Book and page tellings its “whereabouts!”

BIBLE PROOF

Mr. Tant makes a number of references to the New Testament, citing Acts 2:38, Marks 16:16, Acts 22:16 and Gal. 3:27. He can not find his position by the word of God. I have offered to deny the following proposition, if he wishes to try his hand on the Bible:

PROPOSITION: “The Scriptures teach that baptism in water, to a proper subject, is for (in order to) the remission of past sins.”

If Mr. Tant refuses to sign up for this debate on the Bible, it will show that his brag and blow about proving things by the Bible has all been knocked out of him in this debate on “Campbell’s Baptism.” I will not sum up my evidence given in my first Article; for Tant did not attempt a reply. So reader, just remember that J. D. Tant did not try to disprove my evidence; and go back and read it for yourself. Mr. Tant, please attempt an answer to my question at the close of my first affirmative!

C. A. SMITH
1308 South 12th Street
Chickasha, Oklahoma.
September 18, 1935

SMITH-TANT DEBATE

PROPOSITION: “I affirm that Matthias Luce did not baptize Alexander Campbell for (in order to) the remission of sins, according to history.”

C. A. SMITH, Affirms;
J. D. TANT, Denies.

J. D. Tant’s second negative:
Elder Smith is very positive to remind me that I can not make any new arguments. And why should I want to make any new arguments until the ones I have made have been answered?

I want to inform Elder Smith that I am in no way interested in what Campbell did or taught. There will be thousands of people in heaven who never heard of Campbell. As my salvation does not depend on what Campbell did or taught I am no more interested in him that I am in any other great man.

I was at a loss to know why Smith wanted to debate this question with me, but since he has challenged me to meet him on baptism for remission of sins (which challenge I gladly accept), I can see through it now!

In my past debate with Smith at Oakland Baptist Church he seemed unable to meet the gospel knockout drops I gave him in every talk I made. Smith spent most of his time in telling how he cleaned up on Thompson and what kind of a debater Thompson was, and what kind of a liar.

In my second debate with Smith at Springdale, he spent half his time in telling what Tant said at Oakland, and how he demoralized Tant there! Now he challenges me for a written debate, hoping I may say something in this debate that he can use his surplus time on in our oral debate, and get by as a great debater among the Baptists. But such does not interest me.

In Smith’s second reply to me he takes up seven pages, about 4,500 words, to show that Tant, Thompson, and Chism are all liars, and then goes to T. R. Burnett’s doggerel (which is false along all lines) to help him out! But what does all that have to do with Campbell’s baptism?

I showed from a number of early writers, Barnabas, Hermas, Tertullian, and others, and could have quoted from twenty more if necessary, for all without exception taught baptism as a condition of salvation. I showed that Campbell was familiar with all their writings and could not mistake their position. It would be useless to go over their works again.

I then showed that the creeds of all churches for two hundred years before Campbell’s day taught baptism as a condition of salvation. Campbell was familiar with their writings. I then showed that Dr. J. R. Graves, Dr. W. A. Jarrell, the leading Baptist preachers of the South, both denied
that Campbell was ever a Baptist or that he ever had Baptist baptism. As all know that Baptists deny baptism for the remission of sins, and Graves and Jarrell both claim he did not have that kind of baptism, and there being only one other kind, namely baptism for the remission of sins; then the only thing to decide is to let Campbell tell his own tale!

I find that Philip was teaching and baptizing under the last commission which plainly says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." And Campbell says he would only accept baptism upon the simple confession the Eunuch made, and Luce agreed to give that kind of baptism, declaring at the time it was contrary to Baptist doctrine. In the next place I learned that just before Campbell was baptized he made a talk in defense of his baptism and actually quoted Acts 2:38 in defense of his act. I then turn to Acts 2:38 and find Peter demanded them not only to repent but to be baptized for the remission of sins. As Alexander Campbell quoted that command and then made the scriptural confession and was baptized for the remission of sins, or that he might be saved as Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This is proof sufficient!

Most anyone would be surprised that Smith would deny Campbell being baptized for the remission of sins, if they did not know he denied the Bible also. But as he wants Tant to affirm that Baptism is for the remission of sins (and Tant will affirm it), and after he reads the very thing in so many words in the Bible: and Tant is not an infidel because he believes just what the Bible says; but Smith says he will deny it, which shows that he is in accord with all Baptist preachers who deny the plain statements of God's word!

I shall be glad to affirm just as Smith stated on baptism and shall want two days on it, and shall be glad for Smith to affirm same length of time the Baptist doctrine of total depravity or the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion. I should also be glad for Smith to find a place in his country where my brethren and the Landmark Baptists want the debate, and let us agree on some time which does not conflict with my already dated time, and I'll be there.

As I have gone up there almost a thousand miles to meet Smith in two debates, I would be glad to locate this debate near my home; but my part of Texas is much like Heaven, as we have no Landmark Baptists here, and have to go up there to find them.

J. D. TANT
2101 Southeast 14th Street
Brownsville, Texas.
January 18, 1936.