PORTER - MYERS DEBATE

Between

W. CURTIS PORTER
Monette, Arkansas
Representing Church of Christ

and

B. SUNDAY MYERS
Opelika, Alabama
Representing Pentecostal Church of God

A Written Discussion

Is The Church Of Christ A Denomination?
or
Is It The Exclusive New Testament Church?

Published by
PORTER'S BOOK SHOP
P. O. Box 195
Monette, Arkansas

TLC

Copyright 1956
By W. Curtis Porter

Printing By
Allen-Sweet Publishing Co., Lufkin, Texas

TLC

INTRODUCTION

This book, as you have likely noticed, is a written discussion. It might be of interest to the reader to know something of the circumstances that brought it about. On January 29, 1949, a challenge was mailed at Arcadia, Florida, directed to Bro. A. E. Emmons, editor of WAY OF LIFE, at Birmingham, Alabama. Bro. Emmons at the time, however, had moved from Birmingham and was working with the Heights Church in Houston, Texas. The letter containing the challenge was forwarded to him there. Bro. Emmons wrote me a letter, sending along the challenge he had received, and suggested that I take up the matter and arrange the discussion if I so desired. Following is the challenge that was mailed to Bro. Emmons:

CHALLENGE!

> The so-called "Church of Christ" teach that they are not a religious denomination. They incessantly condemn what they call "denominationalism." Are they logically and Scripturally justified in this? I contend that they are not! And I, B. Sunday Myers, do this day challenge them, to select from their connection any representative of their choice, to engage with me in a written debate with the agreement to publish the papers in book form. I make the claim that the Modern Church of Christ is just as much a denomination as the other churches which they condemn as reprobate and false. Who will accept the challenge, and lay his argument along side of ours in order that the candid and honest seekers may have both sides in their hands to study and compare which is most logical and Scriptural?

WHY A POLEMIC - -

> Because a polemic can produce the best argument possible from both sides. Second, it eliminates to a great extent the religious prejudice which accompanies public debating. Third, it eliminates nervous tension resulting from psychological effects characteristic of oral debating, and gives the writer a chance to produce a better argument. Fourth, it gives both writers plenty of time to condense his thoughts to as few words as

TLC

possible, thus giving the reader the point in a nutshell. Fifth, it eliminates much of the heavy expense of publishing. Sixth, the debate in book form will last to the end of the age, and consequently will be read by thousands, whereas an oral debate will soon be forgotten.

In addition to the above matter contained in the challenge, propositions were sent along that Mr. Myers suggested that we discuss. I got in touch with him and soon arrangements were completed for the discussion to begin. He desired to be given the privilege of publishing the debate in book form. The propositions Mr. Myers submitted, with but a slight change in one of them, were accepted. The propositions and agreements for the discussion, accepted by both men, are as follows:

PROPOSITIONS

1. Resolved, that the religious order in earth today called by the name "Church of Christ" is a denomination, originating in the personal interpretations of Barton Warren Stone, Thomas Campbell, and Alexander Campbell about the year 1801.

   Affirmative — B. Sunday Myers
   Negative — W. Curtis Porter

2. Resolved, that the religious order in earth today called by the name "Church of Christ" is the exclusive New Testament church, originating on the first Pentecost after the death of Christ.

   Affirmative — W. Curtis Porter
   Negative — B. Sunday Myers

Contract:

That a series of polemic papers be written between B. Sunday Myers and W. Curtis Porter; that these be agreed upon for publication by B. Myers; that we publish the papers verbatim; that the number of papers, and the number of words in each paper be decided upon by Mr. Porter.

B. Sunday Myers
W. Curtis Porter

Further Agreement:

That Mr. Myers will submit to Mr. Porter page proofs of the debate before the book is published; that Mr. Porter will assist in the sale of the book; and that he will be furnished whatever number of books he desires at wholesale

TLC

prices.

B. Sunday Myers
W. Curtis Porter

Relative to the matter of publishing the book, Mr. Myers, on Feb. 26, 1949, wrote me a letter in which appeared the following paragraph:

> "Concerning the publication of the book, I plan to have it published as my personal property. However, the Church of God publishing house in Cleveland, Tennessee, will do the work for me. And I will advertise the book through this press. This book I'm sure will be widely read in the connection with which I operate: and I thought you or some one other of your brethren would be willing enough to spend the time and trouble to get your doctrine in the hands of our readers. I am one of the representative writers for the church, and you may verify this from Mr. J. D. Bright, Montgomery Ave., Cleveland, Tennessee."

It was his intention, according to a letter mailed to me on April 12, 1949, to publish as many as 5,000 copies of the book, and he stated he might publish as many as 10,000 copies. Preparation of material for the debate ran through most of 1949 and 1950. When Mr. Myers' final negative was received, it contained, as the reader will be able to see, a lot of material that had not been previously introduced in the debate. I wrote him about this, calling his attention to the fact that it is contrary to the rules of honorable controversy to introduce new material in a final negative when one's opponent has no opportunity to reply. He wrote me and offered to delete any new material he had introduced, but as we had agreed to publish the discussion "verbatim," it was my decision to go ahead and publish it just as it was.

By the time the discussion had been finished it began to appear that my opponent would not be able to publish the book as he had planned to do. In a letter to me, Dec. 11, 1950, he stated:

> "As touching the publication of the articles, I haven't yet made the first step. In fact I have had several financial reverses in the past few

TLC

months which has thrown me behind. For this reason I can't say just when I will be able to publish the papers. I plan in the near future to see if I can find some book publishers that will publish my polemics on the royalty plan."

Relative to this matter I wrote him the following on Jan. 1, 1951:

"Sorry that you have had financial reverses that have delayed the publication of the book. Of course, if you are unable to publish it, and it is turned to some publisher to do on the royalty plan, then I shall automatically become eligible for 50% of the royalty inasmuch as I am co-author of the book. Not many publishing companies could afford to pay two authors a royalty on one book."

On January 15, 1951, which, I believe, is the last communication I had from him concerning the publication of the book, Mr. Myers wrote me as follows:

"As touching the book no doubt it will be a long time before I can get it published. If you desire to publish it you may do so upon the agreement that it is published verbatim, and allow me all the copies I desire at 40% discount."

As a number of years has passed and Mr. Myers has not published the book, and as he gave me the privilege of putting it into print, the material is now being turned to the printer. And he, of course, can have all the copies he wants at wholesale price. The book is just as timely now as it would have been if published five years ago. It is a debate that is entirely different. I know of no debate like it that has ever been published, and as it is sent forth on its mission, it is my prayer that the readers may be blessed by being given a better understanding of the great principles of divine truth. May it result in the salvation of souls and in the glorification of the Savior's name.

W. Curtis Porter
Monette, Arkansas
September 17, 1955

TLC

Proposition No. 1. Resolved, that the religious order in earth today called by the name "Church of Christ" is a denomination, originating in the personal interpretations of Barton Warren Stone, Thomas Campbell, and Alexander Campbell about the year 1801.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE BY B. SUNDAY MYERS

ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AS A DENOMINATION

The religious system originating in the personal interpretations of Barton Warren Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, is denominated "The Church of Christ." Comparatively few people have read the history of their beginnings as a denomination. It should therefore be of interest to many to receive of this information. The following dates and events are taken from five booklets, a historical presentation of the movement, published by men in their connection.

It started with the "Cane Ridge Revival," conducted by Barton W. Stone in the state of Kentucky, in the year of 1801. It was in this revival that Stone propagated certain interpretations on water baptism and the operation of the Spirit in regeneration which conflicted with the Presbyterian system, the church of his connection. Being keenly censured he separated himself and organized "The Independent Springfield Presbytery." This "Springfield Prebytery" was a small denomination to begin with, embracing only six ministers; namely, Barton Stone, Richard McNemar, John Thompson, John Dunlavy, Robert Marshall, and David Purviance. From "Restoration History," page 4, Par. 1, we read: "This revival marked the beginning of a movement for the return to the New Testament church." Note, he calls it the "beginning of a movement," I call it the beginning of a new denomination. Surely it must have been a new denomination because the Bible church of Christ was established upon the Rock of Ages above 1800 years before this, and the gates of hell

TLC

had never one time prevailed against it. Professors apostatized, but the true church, Christ's mystical body, has never apostatized and never will.

In the year of 1803 Stone and his band of five ministers published a book, called, "The Apology of the Springfield Presbytery." In this book they presented their position. Hence, the book may properly be called their official creed, since it presented the terms of fellowship in their communion. This is exactly what any church creed does. However, in this book they claimed to have denounced all human creeds: but what they did in reality was to propagate their own creed and denounce all others. Notwithstanding they played upon terminology, not calling their book a creed but rather an apology. What is the difference? A creed is an authoritative statement of belief designed to defend one's interpretations, and this is exactly what their apology was. So in reality this little six-preacher-denomination said, "Let all others throw away their creed and accept ours; it is as perfect and unalterable as the literal written Bible." This is what they taught substantially, and their adherents still teach the same thing. But what a high estimation one has of his personal interpretations!!! The Pope of Rome loves to jingle his keys in this direction. Alas!

DECIDES TO CHANGE NAMES

In the year of 1804 Stone and his five clerygymen met and dissolved the denominational title of "Springfield Presbytery" and adopted the name "Christians". They simply sectarianized the name "Christians" and by this identified their denomination. My opponent will agree that there is such a thing as sectarianizing Bible names and titles.

CAMPBELL JOINS THE BAPTIST

In the year of 1802 Alexander Campbell and his father adopted the mode of immersion in baptism, and in the year of 1813 united with the Baptist. In the year of 1824 Stone met Alexander Campbell and the two men exchanged views on certain doctrinal points. In this exchange Campbell

TLC

adopted Stone's views on faith and the operation of the Spirit in conversion. Consequently he began to propagate his "new ism" in the Baptist church. He, like Stone, denied any direct and tangible effect of the Spirit in regeneration, and substituted "baptismal regeneration." His adherents are still teaching that baptism saves and washes away sins.

CAMPBELL EXCOMMUNICATED

Campbell's system being superficial and materialistic did conflict greatly with the fundamental Baptist ministers who taught that in regeneration the Holy Spirit wrought a definite and miraculous change upon man's nature. Campbell transferred religion's centre from the heart to the head, and gave the Bible a mere metaphysical interpretation; i.e., existing only in thought and not in reality. This big difference of course occasioned a great clash between Campbell and the Fundamental Baptist. Many warm debates occurred, until finally, between the years 1825-1830 Campbell and most all of his disciples were expelled from the Baptist's communion.

CAMPBELL AND STONE UNITE

A considerable number of disciples followed Campbell out of the Baptist association. And Mr. Campbell, having already exchanged doctrinal views with Stone in 1824, decided, since he and his followers had no organization as yet, to unite with Brother Stone's denomination. And "in 1831 . . . . the two men and their followers got together at Lexington, Kentucky, and agreed to unite." (Restoration History, page 24, under caption, "Union With The Campbells.") When this merger was proposed it incurred considerable friction between the disciples of the two leaders, and "some of Stone's followers remained aloof, and to this day maintain a separate organization." (Restoration and Reformation, page 24)

CHANGED NAMES AGAIN

When Stone and Campbell united they decided to change their denominational title from "Christians" to "Disciples of Christ."

TLC

CAMPBELL'S PRE-EMINENCE

The high aim of Mr. Campbell was to become the pre-eminent leader of "The New Institution," as he later called it in his book, "The Christian System." (Page 200) And in his aspirations and ambition to excel he gained his point. He wrote his book, "The Christian System," which may be correctly called their official creed. Of course they do not call it a creed, but they use it as such. What is the difference? This book sets forth their system of interpretations on the doctrines, sacraments, and government of their church. THIS BOOK IS NOT THE HOLY BIBLE, IT IS JUST ANOTHER MAN'S INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE. It designates a system under which the disciples are to operate if they are to retain fellowship in their communion. Now, this is exactly what all other church creeds do. As previously stated, they do not call this book their creed, but they follow it as such. What is the difference? Why smatter? Any church must have a creed; that is, some definite statement of belief in order to enter its fellowship. It is nearly ignorant and wholly insincere to say that any religious body can exist without a creed; for such a body must believe in something, and hold to some form of doctrine; and whatever belief it regards as essential constitutes its creed. Now, do they have definite statements of belief which one must hold in order to maintain fellowship in their communion? Of course they do! Let one of their members deviate from their systematic school of interpretations at any given point and he loses his place in their communion.

My opponent claims his church has no creed but the Bible. This is equivalent to making his personal interpretations synonymous with the infallible Word of God. Do they have personal interpretations? If not why are some of their local congregations listed in their church directory as Pre-millennial and some Post-millennial? Here are two different interpretations in the same denomination.

REAL OBJECTIVE

Their real objective is to unchristianize all others and

TLC

force them to their personal ideas and opinions. Alexander Campbell had much to say on Christian union; but what was the method he proposed? No less than this: "Let all other churches throw away their interpretations and accept mine as perfectly correct as the written Word of God." Ah, I too can unite all churches—IF THEY WILL THROW DOWN THEIR INTERPRETATIONS AND BELIEVE AND DO AS I SAY. BUT (?).

Campbell's metaphysical method of unification failed to unify even his own house much less all others; and no wonder—the attitude of "I know it all" invariably ends in schism. The one and only Bible church "has no schism," ( ) but Mr. Porter's church has them just like all other denominations.

HOT REACTION

When great men of other churches read and heard of Campbell's egoism and materialistic method of unification they were disgusted, and quickly nudged it down the trash skid. The reaction caused Mr. Campbell's toes to tingle. He was moved with choler, and in his hot displeasure began trying to gratify his insatiate desire for leadership by preaching that his system and "New Institution" was not a denomination at all, but was the exclusive New Testament church raised from the dead. Their quibbling argument runs thus: The church was born at Pentecost, died in Catholicism, buried in the Dark Ages, and resurrected in the theological system of Barton Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell. If this gigantic philosophical phenomenon wasn't so amazing it would be amusing!

UNITY FAILS IN THE HOUSE OF GOD

In the first part of the 20th century a cancerous schism developed in the denomination over the use of instrumental music in the public worship. As a result the denomination split into two groups. What happened then? Exactly what always happens when different interpretations are proposed—a new denomination was born. Different interpretations produce different denominations. This is what happened when Alexander Campbell proposed his

TLC

new interpretations in the Baptist church.

These two groups are distinguished by the two terms "Conservatives," and "Progressives." After the split the Conservatives decided upon the denominationl title—"Church of Christ." The Progressives, being most numerous and pre-eminent, managed to retain the original title of "Disciples of Christ." Since then they too have changed their name to "The Christian Church." Both of these claim they are not a denomination; and both claim they are the exclusive New Testament church. They have simply sectarianized Bible titles and are as much a denomination as the Negro's church down in Griffin, Georgia, and they call theirs: "THE CHURCH OF THE NEW JERUSALEM WHICH JOHN SAW COMING DOWN FROM GOD OUT OF HEAVEN."

DO THEY DENOMINATE?

The primary definition of the word "denominate" is to identify by one certain name. This is exactly what the Campbell system does; both in the Church of Christ and in the Christian Church. I will at this juncture show the honest reader a point blank contradiction in Mr. Porter's theology. When he and his brethren interprets the church in the Bible they say it is identified by many different names and titles; such as, "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," "family of God," "house of God," "church of the first-born," "church of Christ," "church of God," etc., etc. Now here is the question which uncovers an obvious contradiction: IF THE ONE BIBLE CHURCH HAS MANY DIFFERENT NAMES AND TITLES, AS THEY SAY IT DOES, THEN WHY DO THEY ALWAYS IDENTIFY THEIR CHURCHES BY ONE CERTAIN NAME? The question has but one answer—they denominate just like all others.

Hear what W. A. Black has to say in his "Brief History of Sixteen Churches," Paragraph 1, Page 5: "When the expressions: the churches of Christ, the church of God, the kingdom of heaven, the house of God, etc., are used in the Bible they all have reference to the people of the Lord. If you are in the church of God you are in the church of

TLC

Christ; if you are in the church you are in the kingdom." —Please allow me one candid question: This being the case, Why don't they write over the door of some of their churches, "Kingdom of God," or "Kingdom of Heaven," or "Church of God," or "Church of the Firstborn?" The reason is all too obvious, they denominate just like all others. Now if they weren't a denomination, and not trying to be one, they wouldn't be so certain to identify themselves by one name.

I have in my possession their 1946-47 "Year Book," compiled by John P. Fogarty, and Olan L. Hicks. In this book they give the names and addresses of all their ministers and their churches. In the "Introduction" we have these words: "Although we have not checked the total number it will exceed 10,000 churches." Now, I turn the pages of this "Directory" and I find that every one of these 10,000 churches are called by one exclusive name—"The Church of Christ." Allow me a question: Why do they teach that the church in the Bible is identified by many different names and they call their 10,000 churches by just one name? The reason is as clear as the sun—they denominate just like all others.

TLC

FIRST NEGATIVE BY W. CURTIS PORTER

I admire the courage of B. Sunday Myers in making an effort to prove that the "religious order" known as the "Church of Christ," existing on earth today, "is a denomination, originating in the personal interpretations of Barton W. Stone, Thomas Campbell, and Alexander Campbell about the year 1801." His judgment in the matter, however, does not merit my admiration.

I am glad to consider the evidence he gives from history to prove his contention. An amusing thing, however, occurs in the wording of his proposition, which he wrote himself, that puts him in a contradictory position at the very beginning. If this "denomination," as he calls it, "originated about 1801," how could the "personal interpretations" of the Campbells have anything to do with it? They were still in Europe and had no connection or contact with Barton W. Stone in 1801. Thomas Campbell did not come to America till 1807, and Alexander Campbell did not come till 1809. If it originated about 1801, that was approximately six years before Thomas Campbell came to this country and about eight years before Alexander came. Mr. Myers, will you clear up this matter for us? How could it originate with their "personal interpretations" in 1801, when, at that time, they were not even in this country and had begun a reformation nowhere? The reader will expect you to answer.

Mr. Myers says: "It started with the 'Cane Ridge Revival,' conducted by Barton W. Stone in the state of Kentucky, in the year of 1801." Very well, Mr. Myers, if "it started" with the "Cane Ridge Revival" in 1801 "in in the state of Kentucky," I am wanting to know what connection the Campbells had with it. They were not at the "Cane Ridge Revival." They were not even "in the state of Kentucky" at that time. They were not anywhere in America. How could it "originate" in their "personal interpretations" if it "started" at the "Cane Ridge Revival"? I supose it "originated" and "started" at the same place and time. Or did it "start" at one time and place and "originate"

TLC

at another? He quotes from Kershner's Restoration Handbook that "this revival marked the beginning of a movement," but Mr. Myers says: "I call it the beginning of a new denomination." If this was the "beginning" of a "new denomination," then this was its "origin." Did the "personal interpretations" of the Campbells have anything to do with "this revival"? If not, they had nothing to do with its "beginning." So it did not "originate" in their "personal interpretations." Mr. Myers has surrendered a big portion of his proposition—he has completely eliminated the Campbells. He will now have to confine the matter to Barton W. Stone.

"The Springfield Presbytery," which, Mr. Myers thinks, is the new denomination, was organized by Stone and four other ministers, but the Campbells had no connection with it. Furthermore, it did not come into existence till 1803. McNemar and Thompson were on trial before the Synod of Kentucky, in session at Lexington, Sept. 6-13, 1803. During this session a written document, dated, "Lexington, Ky., Sept. 10th, 1803," was presented to the Synod by these men. Among other things they said: "We bid you adieu until through the providence of God it seem good to your Rev'd Body to adopt a more liberal plan respecting human Creeds & Confessions." Quoted in The Disciples of Christ, p. 104. So they withdrew from the Synod of Kentucky and formed the independent Springfield Presbytery. Was this the new denomination? Mr. Myers thinks so. But it did not begin till 1803. Mr. Myers says the new denomination started in 1801. If the denomination began with the Cane Ridge Revival in 1801, it did not begin with the Springfield Presbytery in 1803. My friend is badly mixed up on this point. When did it begin—in 1801 or in 1803? I demand that Mr. Myers clear up his contradiction here!

"The Apology of the Springfield Presbytery," Mr. Myers says, "may properly be called their official creed." Keep this in mind and watch Mr. Myers contradict himself again before he is through with his first affirmative. Regarding this book Barton W. Stone said:

"In this book we stated our objections at

TLC

> length to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and against all authoritative confessions and creeds formed by fallible men. We expressed our total abandonment of all authoritative creeds but the Bible alone as the only rule of our faith and practice." Autobiography of Stone, Cane Ridge Meeting House, p. 170.

Mr. Myers admits that the men, in this book, "denounced all human creeds," but he insists they meant all except their own. He knows more about it, of course, than the men who wrote the book! They said they rejected "all human creeds" and took "the Bible alone," but my friend knows better. It is his word against theirs—take your choice.

"DECIDES TO CHANGE NAMES"

In 1804, Mr. Myers tells us, they "met and dissolved the denominational title of 'Springfield Presbytery' and adopted the name 'Christians'." He is appealing to "Restoration Handbooks" as his authority. He is either a careless reader or he intended to deceive the readers of this discussion. Why did my friend claim they "dissolved the denominational title"—or simply changed names? The very book he is using for authority says: "Later it was agreed *to dissolve this 'presbytery'* and to wear no name but 'Christian'." Restoration Handbook, Series 1, p. 24. They did not simply "dissolve the title"—they "dissolved the presbytery" itself. So if it was a denomination when it began, it did not long remain so, for the thing itself was *dissolved* in 1804. Why did you misrepresent this matter, Mr. Myers? The dissolution of this body was accomplished by "The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery," which was signed by the six ministers, dated June 28, 1804. In that document we have the following statement:

> "We will that this body *die,* be *dissolved,* and sink into union with the body of Christ at large." Autobiography of Stone, Cane Ridge Meeting House, p. 173. Printed also in many other books.

In "The 'Witnesses' Address," attached to the "Last Will and Testament," we find this:

TLC

"We, the above-named witnesses to the last will and testament of the Springfield Presbytery, knowing that there will be many conjectures respecting the causes which have occasioned the *dissolution of that body,* think proper to testify that from its first existence it was knit together in love, lived in peace and concord, and *died* a voluntary and happy death.

"Their reasons for *dissolving that body* were the following:" Autobiography of Stone, Cane Ridge Meeting House, p. 175.

Among the reasons given, we find this:

"As they proceeded in the investigation of that subject, they soon found that there was neither precept nor example in the New Testament for such confederacies as modern church sessions, presbyteries, synods, general assemblies, etc." Autobiography of Stone, Cane Ridge Meeting House, p. 176.

Instead of changing names, the organization was dissolved; it died; it came to an end. So if that is the denomination that Stone started, it *ended* within less than a year after its birth. Please tell us, Mr. Myers, why you changed the record and withheld these facts.

"CAMPBELL JOINS THE BAPTISTS"

The Campbells were immersed in 1812—not in 1802, as stated by Mr. Myers. The history of their baptism may be read in Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 1, pages 396-398. But Alexander Campbell never joined the Baptist Church. The only sense in which he and his group ever "united with the Baptists" was to "co-operate" with them in an Association. The Redstone Association pressed them for such co-operation. The matter was placed before the Brush Run church in 1813. Writing about this later Mr. Campbell said that they expressed "a willingness, upon certain conditions, to co-operate or unite with that Association, *provided always that we should be allowed to teach and preach whatever we learned from the Holy Scriptures, regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom.*" Millennial Harbinger for 1848—quoted in Reformatory Movements, p. 171. I challenge Mr. Myers to name the date when

TLC

and the place where Alexander Campbell ever joined a Baptist Church! Let him give us the information if he can.

The charge made by Mr. Myers that Alexander Campbell, upon an exchange of views with Barton Stone in 1824, adopted Stone's view against any direct operation of the Spirit in conversion, is not true. He reveals his lack of information on this point. It was in the fall of 1824, following the meeting of the Mahoning Association in September, that Campbell made his visit to Kentucky, during which he formed the acquaintance of Barton W. Stone at Georgetown. Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 2, pp. 103 and 118. But in the Christian Baptist, March 1, 1824—several months before he ever met Stone—Alexander Campbell published an article concerning "religious experiences." Refuting the position of a friend Mr. Campbell said:

> "Then it is some invisible, indescribable energy exerted upon the minds of men in order to make them Christians; and that, too, independent of, or prior to, the word believed. I read in the New Testament of many who were the subjects of energies and diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit, but it was 'after they had believed'."—Christian Baptist, Vol. 1, p. 49. "Now the influence of the Holy Spirit is only felt in and by the word believed."—Ibid.

In the June issue, 1824, he published an article by his father in which Thomas Campbell said:

> "Nor can it be shown, that since the gospel was first preached to the nations, from the day of Pentecost, (Acts 2:1) until this day, that any portion of the human family were ever reformed from their idolatries and disgraceful immoralities by any supposed physical operations of the Holy Spirit without the word."—Christian Baptist, Vol. 1, p. 66.

Other statements could be given, but these show that Mr. Myers is entirely wrong in his statement. These articles appeared in Campbell's paper before he ever "exchanged views" with Stone. All along Mr. Myers reveals the fact that he is woefully uninformed about the whole matter. And if Campbell must be charged with "baptismal

TLC

regeneration" because he taught that "baptism saves" and "washes away sins," then Peter and Ananias must be charged with the same thing. 1 Pet. 3:21; Acts 22:16.

Mr. Myers leaves the impression that Campbell was excommunicated from the Baptist Church. But let him first prove that he was ever a member of that church. Their "co-operation" in the Associations was broken up. From some of them Campbell and his associates withdrew, and, at least in one case, took nearly the whole association with them! I suggest that Mr. Myers discontinue making bare statements and give some proof of the things he presents. He would make a much better showing. Furthermore, if Campbell "transferred religion's center from the heart to the head," as Mr. Myers says, will he please tell us what the heart is that is spoken of in the Bible? Don't forget this, Mr. Myers, *for we want to know.*

"CAMPBELL AND STONE UNITE"

Mr. Myers says: "Mr. Campbell decided, since he and his followers had no organization as yet, to unite with Brother Stone's denomination." I want the reader to note his inconsistency here. Since Campbell's group "had no organization as yet"—1831—I want my friend to tell us how the "denomination" originated in their personal interpretations in 1801. That is what his proposition affirms. Yet thirty years after he claims they founded the denomination he declares they "had no organization as yet." Mr. Myers, you have entangled yourself in a difficulty from which you will not be able to extricate yourself. Yet I would like to see you try, and the reader certainly has a right to expect you to do it. We will wait and see. Furthermore, why do you now call it "Bro. Stone's denomination"? At first you claimed, in harmony with your proposition, that Thomas and Alexander Campbell helped to originate it. But now you assign it all to Stone. If the Campbells helped to originate it, why would it be "Bro. Stone's denomination"? Why would it not be equally the "Campbells' denomina-

TLC

tion"? We shall expect you to answer this question. If you do not, the readers will wonder why—unless they already know. So let us have your answer without any evasion.

"CHANGED NAMES AGAIN"

Here again my friend asserts without giving any proof. *Let us have some proof.* Barton W. Stone said: "They held the name Christian as sacred as we did." Autobiography of Stone—Cane Ridge Meeting House, p. 204.

"CAMPBELL'S PRE-EMINENCE"

My opponent indicates that Alexander Campbell admitted he was identified with a denomination of modern origin by calling it "The New Institution" in "The Christion System." But this shows again the careless manner in which Mr. Myers reads. Many times in Campbell's writing he refers to "the new institution." But any one who reads with any attention at all is able to see that he refers to the New Testament system and church as "the new institution" in contrast with the old institution of the Old Testament. Either my friend did not carefully read the language of Campbell or he endeavors to deceive by misrepresenting the matter. The statement to which he refers is found in a lengthy discussion of "Remission of Sins." It runs from page 153 to page 218 of the book. In this discussion Campbell referred to "the New Institution" a number of times. Attention may especially be called to pages 154, 155. If Mr. Myers will read this entire discussion, he will see that Campbell referred to the New Testament church and system as "the New Institution" and that he has misrepresented Campbell in his reference to him. If the expression were found only on page 200, to which my friend refers, it is easily seen that he had no such thing in mind as Mr. Myers indicates. The statement says:

> "The reformation we plead is not characterized by new and original ideas and institutions developed in the New Institution."

Campbell simply said they were not injecting human ideas and institutions into the New Institution. He was not advocating "new and original ideas" nor "new institutions"

TLC

—he was concerned only about "the New Institution" that was given by Christ and his apostles. Why did Mr. Myers completely change the meaning of Mr. Campbell? It must have been because he could do no better in support of his proposition.

But we are told that "The Christian System" may be "correctly called their official creed." He admits we do not call it a creed but claims we "use it as such." I challenge Mr. Myers to name just one congregation in all the Church of Christ that uses it as a creed! He will surely name one or retract his charge. Many congregations do not know that such a book exists or that it ever did. Men have never subscribed to "The Christian System" as a creed. It has never been so recognized—or used—from the day it was printed till now. My friend *cannot prove his assertion.* I challenge him to give proof for his assertion. To say that it states what Campbell believed is not sufficient, for Campbell himself never intended for any one to accept it as a creed. A book, to be an "official creed" of a group, must be adopted by the group. *This was never done.* Campbell himself said:

> "The *object of this volume* is to place before the community in a plain, definite, and perspicuous style, the capital principles which have been elicited, argued out, developed, and sustained in a controversy of twenty-five years, by the tongues and pens of those who rallied *under the banners of the Bible alone.*" Preface, p. 12.

Thus he states "the object of this volume." It was not to form a creed, but they were rallying under "the Bible alone" as their creed. This position they took, he says, "*irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments, and traditions of men.*"—Preface, p. 12. *But Mr. Myers knows better.* Let him prove it!

In the third paragraph of my friend's affirmative he says that "The Apology of the Springfield Presbytery" is that which "may properly be called their official creed." But "The Christian System," he now says, "may be correctly called their official creed." The reader will remember

TLC

that I foretold him of this contradiction. Which of these, Mr. Myers, is "their official creed"? Did they have two "official creeds" at the same time? If not, when did the first cease to be "official"? And when did the second become "official"? I demand that you answer these questions.

He admits that we claim to have "no creed but the Bible." But he says: "This is equivalent to making his personal interpretations synonomous with the infallible word of God." Well! Well! This is rather strange. If my claiming to have no creed but the Bible makes my "personal interpretations" equivalent to the word of God, then the same would be true with any other man who should make the same claim. If not, why not? In view of this, no man would be able to take the Bible as his only creed. If he claimed to do such a thing, it would make his personal interpretations equivalent with the word of God. Let me ask you this question, Mr. Myers: Is it possible for any man to take the Bible as his only creed? Please don't overlook this—give us an answer. According to your statement, it is not possible, but I want you to say something more about it. Tell us. *Is this course possible?*

"REAL OBJECTIVE"

Our "real objective" is not to "unchristianize" anybody, but we would like to see everybody become Christians. Men "unchristianize" themselves when they accept human creeds in religion instead of the word of God. Certainly any group who believes anything must have a creed, but it does not have to be a human creed. The method which Campbell proposed, Mr. Myers says, is this: "Let all other churches throw away their interpretations and accept mine as perfectly correct as the written Word of God." *No such method was ever proposed by Campbell.* I am constrained to believe that Myers knew this to be true. At least, he could have known it if he had made any effort to find out. Instead of this, Campbell said:

> "We speak for ourselves only; and, while we are always willing to give a declaration of our faith and knowledge of the Christian system,

TLC

we firmly protest against dogmatically propounding our own views, or those of any fallible mortal, as a condition or foundation of church union and co-operation. We take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion. Those who do not like this will please show us a more excellent way."—Preface to Second Edition of "The Christian System."

Campbell, therefore, denies emphatically that he ever proposed any such method as Mr. Myers claims he did. Mr. Myers could have read this in the very book that he claimed to be our "official creed." Why did he run over all this and then claim that Campbell proposed his interpretations as a standard as "perfectly correct" as the written word of God? Campbell did no such thing. Give us some proof, Mr. Myers, instead of your assertion.

My friend indicates that the Church of Christ is a denomination because it has been troubled with division. Look at this statement from him: "The one and only Bible church 'has no schism,' ( ) but Mr. Porter's church has them just like all other denominations." Did you notice those parentheses he used? And did you notice the blank space between them? Evidently, he intended to give a Scripture reference to show that the Bible church "has no schism," but he failed to find the reference. So he left it blank. It will still be blank when he finishes his next affirmative, for there is no such statement in the Bible. Paul declared, to the church at Corinth, "that *there should be no schism* in the body." 1 Cor. 12:25. But this is far from saying *there was none*. And in 1 Cor. 11:18 Paul said: "I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it." The word "divisions" in this passage and the word "schism" in the preceding one are from the same Greek word. This proves there were "schisms" in the church at Corinth. According to my opponent, this proves the church at Corinth was no part of "the one and only Bible church" but just a denomination like all others. Are you ready for this conclusion, Mr. Myers?

TLC

"HOT REACTION"

After Mr. Campbell's plan for unification had been "nudged down the trash skid," my friend tells us, he then began to preach that his system was not a denomination at all. Nothing is farther from the truth than this. This indicates that such a decision was reached after he had been rejected. But this is not so. From the very beginning they advocated no new denomination. In the prospectus to the Christian Baptist, Campbell's first religious magazine which was begun in 1823, Alexander Campbell said:

> "The 'Christian Baptist' shall espouse the cause of *no religious sect,* excepting that ancient sect 'called Christians first at Antioch'." Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 50.

Even before this, during the early years of his ministry, Campbell said:

> "I speak not against any denomination in particular, but against *all.* I speak not against any system of truth, but against all *except the Bible.*" Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 1, p. 354.

Their opposition to denominations was not a "hot reaction" at all, but they opposed such from the beginning. Mr. Myers could easily have learned this, but it would have been of no help to his cause. Consequently, he chose otherwise.

"UNITY FAILS IN THE HOUSE OF GOD"

It was in 1906 that the Government, in its Religious Census, gave separate listings to the two groups mentioned, but the division began much earlier. But in the division over instrumental music, the group which remained on original New Testament ground remained undenominational. I am certain as to which group did that. Proof can be given if necessary.

It is not true that the title, "Church of Christ," was decided upon following this division. From near the beginning of the movement to get back to the New Testament the term was used. When Alexander Campbell and others

TLC

were dismissed from the Brush Run congregation to form another in Wellsburg, a letter of dismissal, signed by Thomas Campbell, by the order of the church, August 31, 1823, makes the following statement:

> "Be it known to all whom it may concern, that we have dismissed the following brethren in good standing with us, to constitute a *church of Christ* at Wellsburg." Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 69.

When this church was received into the Mahoning Association, the minutes of said Association carried the following item:

> "At the request of the *Church of Christ* at Wellsburg it was received into this association." Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 100.

And concerning the union of the groups associated with Stone and Campbell, consummated in 1832, we have on record the following language:

> "Thomas M. Allen coming to Lexington, induced them to complete the union and to transfer to the new congregation, thus formed under the title of *'the Church of Christ,'* the comfortable meeting house which they had previously held under the designation of 'the Christian Church'." —Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 2, p. 384.

In view of such statements on record, how can my opponent claim that the title "Church of Christ" was decided upon after the division over instrumental music?

"DO THEY DENOMINATE?"

If by "denominate" my friend means only to call something by a name, then we would as well stack arms. In that sense of the term the Masonic Lodge, the Parent-Teacher's Association, the 4-H Club, and the Future Farmers of America are denominations. Yes, even a Ten Dollar Bill is a denomination. But that is not the sense in which it is used in reference to religious groups. Denominationalism, in the religious sense, refers to all the sects or parties that make up Christendom. Each sect or party, built up around some error or the undue exaltation of some matter, is a denomination which admits that one does not

TLC

have to belong to it to be saved and that it does not contain all of the redeemed. Denominationalism is based upon division; and as the New Testament condemns division, denominationalism, therefore, is wrong. Since denominationalism exists without divine sanction, a denomination must be a human institution. The Church of Christ, therefore, is not a denomination, and my opponent has signally failed so far to prove it is.

His use of "Brief History of Sixteen Churches" by W. A. Black proves the very reverse of what my friend intended. He is trying to prove that one term is used by us to the exclusion of all others. But the quotation given uses several designations and proves Mr. Myers to be wrong. His question concerning the "Year Book" by Fogarty and Hicks may be easily answered. For the sake of uniformity, in the deeding of property and in other matters, in the midst of many surrounding sects, the term "Church of Christ" is generally used. This also gives preeminence to Christ. But we accept all Bible designations. According to my friend, the thing that makes a denomination is the use of one certain name. Then one might establish a human religious institution, call it by two or more names, and it will not be a denomination. Mr. Myers, will you please answer a question for me? Here it is: If a human denomination, calling itself by one name, should discontinue this practice and use at least two designations, would it cease to be a denomination? I shall expect you to answer.

THEIR PURPOSE

The purpose of Stone, the Campbells, and others, who had part in what is called the restoration movement, can easily be learned. The following gives some idea of it:

1. They had no intention of establishing another denomination or beginning another sect.
2. They wished to *restore* men to the original foundation of Christ—to get back to the New Testament church in all of its purity.
3. To accomplish this they rejected all human creeds

TLC

and took the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice.

SOME QUESTIONS

I should like for Mr. Myers to answer the following questions for me:

1. Would it be possible for a group of men to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a denomination?
2. What course would they have to pursue in order to accomplish this?

TLC

MYERS' SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Denominatinal tenets, like the cat with seven lives, die exceedingly hard. If the opponent's arguments are hard to refute it's certainly not because they are characterized with forceful facts, but because they are so muddled with trifling quibbles. It is easier to tie a hard knot than to untie one; notwithstanding a few turns of the hand will eliminate a few of his kinks.

1. From page 1, I quote: "Mr. Myers, if it started with the 'Cane Ridge Revival' in 1801, in the state of Kentucky, I am wanting to know what connection the Campbells had with it? They were not at the Cane Ridge Revival. They were not even in the State of Kentucky. They were not anywhere in America."

I will let Mr. Kurfees, a prominent minister and writer, and a member of the same denomination as Mr. Porter, answer that question. In his "Continued Emphasis On The Restoration Of The Ancient Order," pages 26-27, we read—

> "But one of the greatest of all the *reformatory* movements of history was that inaugurated in the early part of the 19th century BY THOMAS CAMPBELL, ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, BARTON WARREN STONE, WALTER SCOTT, and others."

On one occasion Paul preached the resurrection and set his adversaries to fighting among themselves. I wonder if I have throwed fat in the fire, and caused Brother Porter to start a row in his own church? He used more than a whole page trying to prove that the Campbells had nothing to do with the origin of his denomination, quibblingly called,—"The reformatory movement," when his own brother clergymen positively assert that all the men I named "inaugurated" (the dictionary says this word means "to begin") this "movement." Mr. Porter better watch his step, he will have some of his own kinfolks on his heel.

2. Will Brother Porter allow that it started with the "Cane Ridge Revival" and leave the Campbells over in Europe? Had he rather it start with Stone than the Campbells?

TLC

THINGS THE OPPONENT DID RELUCTANTLY ADMIT

It was like pulling his eye-teeth, but here are a few things the opponent had to admit.

1. That there was such a thing as a "Cane Ridge Revival" in 1801.
2. That "The Independent Springfield Presbytery" was organized by Stone and four other ministers. On page 2 he says, "The Springfield Presbytery . . . was organized by Stone and four other ministers."
3. That this "Presbytery" was an organization, not originating with Jesus Christ at Pentecost, but in five men nearly 1800 years after Pentecost.
4. That this "Presbytery" wrote their "Apology." On page 2, the opponent says: "Regarding this book Barton W. Stone said," etc., etc.
5. That this organization actually did change names from "Springfield Presbytery" to "Christians." On page 3 Mr. Porter says: "Later it was agreed to dissolve this 'Presbytery' and wear no name but 'Christian'." Note, we will treat more fully on this point later.
6. That Alexander Campbell did actually join the Baptist church. On page 4 he says—"The only sense in which he and his group ever "united with the Baptist" was to co-operate with them in an Association." SPECIAL NOTICE: THE ONLY WAY ANYONE ELSE JOINS A DENOMINATION IS TO CO-OPERATE WITH THEM IN THEIR ASSOCIATION.
7. That Alexander Campbell did actually one time possess a "Group." In the above quotation he says: "He and his group . . ." Note—He didn't say, "Christ's group," but "his (Campbell's) group." Campbell's group still exists, and Porter is a member of it.

NOTICE: The opponent challenges Mr. Myers "to name the date when and the place where Alexander Campbell ever joined a Baptist church!" ANSWER: When . . . "the matter was placed before the Brush Run church in 1813" . . . and Campbell and "HIS GROUP" decided to "co-operate

TLC

with the Redstone Baptist Association." If Mr. Porter wants to know where I got my information, I got it on page 4 of his letter.

8. That Alexander Campbell, (as I said in my first installment,) actually did meet with Stone in the fall of 1824 and "the two men exchanged 'DOCTRINAL VIEWS'." (find this on page 4, last paragraph)
9. That Campbell was actually separated from this "Redstone Association." I called it "excommunication;" Mr. Porter said, "Campbell and his associates withdrew." (Page 5) The terminology is a bit milder, Campbell withdrew just before they turned him out. How could he withdraw unless he was a member?
10. His silence gives consent to my statement that Campbell and Stone did unite their groups in Lexington, Kentucky, in the year of 1831. Not one time did my opponent deny this merger. Come on, Brother Porter, tell the people—Is Kershner's statement true which reads: "In 1831 . . . the two men and their followers got together at Lexington, Kentucky and agreed to unite?" (Restoration History, page 24, under caption, "UNION WITH THE CAMPBELLS")

SPECIAL LETTER TO THE READER

Dear Reader:

The reason why Mr. Porter quibbled, smattered and juggled upon this point which has to do with the "Stone-Campbell Merger" is because he is trying his best to decoy you away from infallible facts relative to the denomination constructed in this merger. For the sake of Christ and your own soul believe him not.

Your sincere well wisher,
B. Sunday Myers.

11. He frankly admits his group has a creed. On page 9 he says: "Certainly any group who believes anything must have a creed, but it does not have to be a human creed."

NOTICE, he admits that his church has a creed, but says it is not a human creed. A polecat may call himself a pet kitten, but that wouldn't change his smell. Dear reader,

TLC

a creed is an authoritative statement of belief designed to defend a church's system of interpretation. A creed prosecutes terms of communion and fellowship in any church.

A CREED IS NOT THE BIBLE, IT IS A CHURCH'S INTERPRETATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

Certainly Porter's denomination has a creed, and it is not the "ipse dixit" of the Holy Ghost, it is a human system of interpretations proposed by the three or four men that Mr. Kurfees named as inaugurators of the "REFORMATORY MOVEMENT."

12. He admits that "denominationalism is based upon division." (page 11) And on page 10 he admits that such division characterized his denomination in 1906. I quote: "It was in 1906 that the Government, in its religious census, gave separate listings to the two groups mentioned, BUT THE DIVISION BEGAN MUCH EARLIER." And may I add, His group is still full of division. In their "Year Book," which lists all their churches in a group, we find that part of their churches are listed "Premillennial" and part "Postmillennial."

Dear reader: Let's see if Brother Porter can answer this question—Mr. Porter, Is part of the church which Jesus Christ founded Postmillennial and part Premillennial? Right here is where his "no denomination hobbyhorse" takes a fearful fall.

13. His definition of a denomination on page 11 perfectly refutes his theory. He says, ". . . a denomination . . . admits that one does not have to belong to it to be saved."

Note: I have a question for my opponent; to wit: Was Barton W. Stone saved and a member of Christ's church while in the Presbyterian body? Was Thomas and Alexander Campbell? Was Alexander Campbell a saved man when he was baptized and united with the Redstone Baptist Association?

1. IF THE DENOMINATION BEGAN WITH THE "CANE RIDGE REVIVAL," IN 1801, HOW COULD IT BEGIN WITH THE "SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY" in 1803?

TLC

ANSWER: Let the opponent accept a simple illustration, didactly. He himself teaches that Jesus gathered about himself a number of disciples during his earthly ministry, and later at Pentecost He organized them into his church. Now, Mr. Porter should be logical enough to understand that the "Cane Ridge Revival" produced the nucleus of the denomination organization two years later, and denominated, "The Independent Springfield Presbytery."

Dear Reader: It's nearly killing the opponent to have to admit that the body of people with which he is operating is the very same body that was in its beginning denominated, "The Independent Springfield Presbytery." But he can't deny it, because literature written by men in his own denomination admits of this fact.

2. IS IT POSSIBLE FOR ANY MAN TO TAKE THE BIBLE AS HIS ONLY CREED?

ANSWER: No, not in a concrete sense, because a man's creed is his personal interpretations of the Bible and not the Bible itself. I will let Mr. Kershner, who is very close akin, religiously, to the opponent, answer this question. On page 7, "Restoration Handbook," Series 2, we read: "It is incorrect to say that any religious body or organization can exist without a creed, for such a body or organization must believe in something and hold to some form of doctrine. Now, whatever belief it regards as essential constitutes its creed. Hence every church has, and must have, a creed."

NOTE: He clearly distinguishes between the Bible and a church's interpretation of the Bible. I say again, when the opponent says he has no creed but the Bible he is substituting his human interpretations for the written Bible. The Pope of Rome *TRIES* (in vain) to do the same thing.

3. IF A HUMAN DENOMINATION, CALLING ITSELF BY ONE NAME, SHOULD DISCONTINUE THIS PRACTICE AND USE AT LEAST TWO

TLC

DESIGNATIONS, WOULD IT CEASE TO BE A DENOMINATION?

ANSWER: Who said this was the only thing effecting denominationalism? This is not the only thing, but this is one thing which helps. There were false sects and false denominations in the Apostolic day; and may I ask my opponent: Did the Apostles identify the Bible church by one title as the opponent's denomination does today? No! His question is a Gnostic quibble. He asks: "Should it use two designations, would it cease to be a denomination?" No, if Mr. Porter should call his system by every title and name in the Bible it would not cease to be a denomination: for in that case he would be doing with all the titles what he is doing with one, he would be sectarianizing Bible names and titles.

I have a question for Mr. Porter: IS IT POSSIBLE TO SECTARIANIZE A BIBLE NAME AND TITLE?

On page 16 of Kershner's "Restoration History," which is an account of when and where Porter's denomination started, we read under the two captions, "The Church of God," "The Church of Christ:" "The term (Church of GOD-BSM) is used oftener than any other expression . . . the term (Church of Christ-BSM) is used less frequently than the expression 'Church of God'." Mr. Kershner adds: "It (Church of God) has been used very little in the modern age . . . . the reason for its disuse in the modern age is probably because the word 'God' is now applied in so many different ways that it has acquired ambiguity in many minds." The writer is as nimble as a monkey. In the first place, the term "Church of God" has not been disused in this modern age by none but denominations like the opponent's. And why does he disuse it? Because he is afraid he will get his denomination mixed up with others who call themselves by this term. He denominates just like all others.

4. WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE FOR A GROUP OF MEN TO GET BACK TO THE NEW TESTA-

TLC

MENT CHURCH WITHOUT ESTABLISHING A DENOMINATION?

ANSWER: You don't go backward to get to the New Testament church, you go forward—with plus ultra. Right here is where the opponent's error comes to the surface. He is trying to get men into the church through a back door. If this question was germane, and it was possible, it would still remain for him to prove his is that church. It takes a supernatural operation of the Spirit of God to place the soul into the "body of Christ:" but it did not take this to put Curtis Porter into the religious body, the literal organization heading up in the "Springfield Presbytery." Nay, all it took was a metaphysical acceptance of Alexander Campbell's "The Christian System," whether he has his name written on a church book or not. His "belief and system of interpretations" is his creed, substantially; and this he adopted in his mind, and not by a spiritual operation of Grace in his heart. Mr. Porter's Diana is in great danger, and unless he raises enough dust to detract the reader's mind from the point at issue, it will fall before the Ark of God and break its palms. If this makes him bleed at the nose, its the fault of his own doctrine. It don't have enough consistency to hold it together.

5. WHAT COURSE WOULD THEY HAVE TO PURSUE IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THIS?

ANSWER: Come over and accept the Christian System as interpreted by me. "Oh no," says Mr. Porter's church, "your church is a human institution!" Well, I'm only echoing the opponent's voice. You certainly can never accomplish this by adopting Alexander Campbell's metaphysical interpretations on faith and the new birth. The Bible church lays its foundation in the blood of Jesus Christ; Mr. Porter's denomination lays its foundation in the personal interpretations of Barton Stone, Thomas, and Alexander Campbell.

UNITY VERSUS SCHISM

When I failed to insert the reference of 1 Cor. 12:25 to show that the "body of Christ" has positively no division,

TLC

in distinction from the opponent's denomination which is an organism subject to splits and divisions, he took hold of this insignificant mistake and, like a squirrel in the cage, very nearly run himself to death; but stopped in his tracks where he started. The divisions at Corinth were the divisions of human opinions, not division of the "body of Christ." The "body of Christ" is indivisible. The hand never says to the foot, "you're not of the body." The eye never quarrels with the nose. This point of doctrine will be dealt with more fully in a future installment.

EFFIGY

Several years ago a group of people in a certain community got together, made themselves a dummy, named him "Old Man Depression," and with much ado had a happy funeral service. They buried "Old Man Depression." No more days of want; no more empty pocket-books; plenty of money now because "Old Man Depression" does not exist; he is dead, and happily laid to rest: notwithstanding, famine and hunger still stalks through the streets by midday, and is mowing down his countless thousands by night.

In like manner, on page three, Mr. Porter tells us of the time when his denomination actually did exist; but it did not long exist, because the men who organized it got together and told it to die with a happy and voluntary death. Now what they actually did, they buried its effigy. What was their design? A person with any brains at all can see what they did. Some of the Spirit-filled ministers of other connections had given them a "hot-foot" concerning their denominational tenets, and they knew they could never keep their intolerant "ism" camouflaged at all unless they abolish their "man made title," so they got together, adopted a Bible title, and with amazing sagacity claimed they were doing away with their denomination. My opponent claims they dissolved the organization, not simply the title. But I say, the organization still exists today; Brother Porter is a member of it, is trying his best to defend it. The very purpose of "dissolving the Springfield Presbytery," is expressed in my opponent's own words, and

TLC

I want you to read them with me—"It was agreed to dissolve this Presbytery, and *TO WEAR NO NAME BUT CHRISTIAN.*" Ah, if this Presbytery or organization was dissolved, why adopt another name. Porter can't slick out of this: This new name "Christian" was just as much their denominational title as "Springfield Presbytery" was before they preached its funeral.

Let's read the funeral sermon preached at the graveside of Mr. Porter's denominational effigy:

> "We will that this body die, be dissolved, and sink into union with the body of Christ at large. . . ." "We think proper to testify that from its first existence it was knit together in love, lived in peace and concord, and died a voluntary and happy death."

Now says the opponent: "Instead of changing names, the organization was dissolved; it died; it came to an end."

Dear reader: You can plainly see that the opponent admits that it was a denomination once upon a time, and his only way out now is to claim that it died. And notice, he says it "lived in peace and died happy." If denominationalism is as sinful as he now preaches, how could it live in peace and die happy? I'll tell you why it died happy—effigies don't ever die hard. Fake funerals are voluntary, and never characterized with tears. The opponent's denomination is the only one on record that lived in peace and died happy. This is the most amusing quibble in the history of religion. Dear reader, let us not be hoodwinked and bamboozled by modern Gnosticism. The denominational titles by which this human system has been identified from start to finish are these—"The Independent Springfield Presbytery," "Christians," "Disciples of Christ," "Church of Christ," "Christian Church."

DENOMINATIONALISM DISCOVERED

Mr. Kurfees lets the cat out of the bag

I have in my possession a small booklet entitled, "The Need of Continued Emphasis on the Restoration of the Ancient Order." It was written by one of the opponent's

TLC

own brethren. It was originally a series of three articles published in their "Gospel Advocate" several years ago. These were written for the benefit of their own members who were at that time biting and devouring each other in a wrangle over pre- and post-millennialism. These three articles were really an effort to hold the denomination together and keep it from splitting again. And doctrinally it did split, for part went postmillennial, and part premillennial.

Now in Mr. Kurfees' struggling efforts to hold the denomination together he spilled the beans and let the cat out of the bag. On pages 26-27 of his book let us notice how he tells us that his is a GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES UNDER A GENERAL BOARD OF OVERSEERS AND MANAGERS. Mr. Kurfees don't like this GENERAL ORGANIZATION of course, but this doesn't keep it from being one. I don't like the way a polecat smells, but that don't keep it from smelling. Follow the quotation carefully:

> "But one of the greatest of all the *REFORMATORY MOVEMENTS* of history was that inaugurated in the early part of the 19th century by *THOMAS CAMPBELL, BARTON WARREN STONE, WALTER SCOTT*, and others, under the immortal slogan, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent. . . . "
>
> ". . . if all their successors from that day to this, had loyally and uninterruptedly adhered to that mighty slogan, the walls of denominationalism. . . . would long since have crumpled to the earth . . . . but alas for human weaknesses! After about forty years of faithful adherence to the supremacy and independence of the local church . . . . they, like their predecessors in reformatory lines, made the fatal mistake of beginning to compromise with error; and in 1849 they called a Convention which met in Cincinnati and *ESTABLISHED A GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES* under a general board of overseers and managers—a thing as before shown, wholly foreign to the New Testament.

TLC

The first thing I want you to notice in this quotation is the fact that he calls his church a *REFORMATORY MOVEMENT*. He calls it a "movement," I call it just another denomination added to the long list. He uses the word "movement," we use the word "denomination." Can Mr. Porter prove the difference? This is mere playing of words, a kind of childish pun with which to cover his denominationalism. Reminds me of what I heard a Russelite say. He said, "We don't have churches, we have Kingdom Halls." But I notice that their kindom halls are made of the same brick and mortar as our churches. This same Russelite said, "We have no church members, we have witnesses." What is the difference? Now the opponent uses the very same trick in relation to his denominationalism. He is not a denomination, he is a reformatory movement. He has no members; but I challenge you to attend one of his evangelistic campaigns and watch him write down the names of his converts. Of course if you were to ask him what he was doing he would perhaps snatch a ready quibble, and say, "We are only writing down the names of those who accept the Lord in salvation." "Salvation," they say, "added them to the Lord's church, and I'm only writing their names and addresses here in the book so I can visit and feed God's lambs." "Thy prophets are like foxes." (Ez. 13:4) Albert Batts tells us what God meant by calling them foxes. He says, "Foxes have been known to run into a heard of sheep when being pursued by hounds, thus frustrating the flock, and then jump on the back of one running away in order to lose its tracks to the chasing dogs." All false religions quibble, prevaricates, and plays upon words: they jump on a sheep's back and ride to safety (?).

The next thing you are to observe is the fact that in the Cincinnati Convention they established a *GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES*. When was it established? In 1849. Where? Cincinnati, Ohio. Who established it? They. They who? The ministers of the religious system originating in Barton Warren Stone, Thomas, and Alexander Campbell and others. Are they sectarian? Alas!

TLC

RESULTS OF MR. CAMPBELL'S "HEAD UNITY"

My opponent's churchmen incessantly harp on "Christian Union." Division and disunity, they say, is a denominational trait. If this is the case they are obviously a denomination, because they are as far from "true unity" as any I know, and much farther. Mr. Campbell, who became the preeminent leader in this school, built his system upon the residuum of the body and mind which survived the fall. This is why it is materialistic and metaphysical. He taught that "Christian Union" may be attained by metaphysical means; i.e., by each and every one understanding the letter of Scripture alike. This is perfectly good as far as it goes; but Christian unity requires more than a mental theory: there must be a moral and Spiritual power working with God's word and bringing into unison the inward motives and motions of the heart. This is that "good old way," "the unity of the Spirit."

HUMAN OPINIONS AND DENOMINATIONALISM

This is a continuation of the preceding caption. Ask Mr. Porter what is the primary cause of different denominations, and he will tell you it is the fruit of personal interpretations and human opinions diverse from others. He is exactly right: and under this heading I wish to give you a perfect specimen of such characteristic of my opponent's denomination. I want to show the reader a sample of dogmatism, religious bigotry, and human opinions gone to seed. In the "Need of Continued Emphasis On the Restoration of the Ancient Order," Mr. Kurfees says, on page 32:

> "Since men do not always see alike or have the same opinions on certain religious subjects, *HOW IS UNION IN SUCH A CASE POSSIBLE?*"

I want you to notice how he answers this question:

> "It is possible by every man preaching the word and keeping his opinions strictly and always to himself, as the Bible distinctly and positively requires."

A candid analysis of his answer will give you a perfect illustration of what causes so many different denominations

TLC

in the world. In effect he said just this: "If the Bible is to be interpreted, I am the one to do it. Your interpretations are 'human opinions,' mine are as perfectly correct as the written letter of the Bible. So keep your interpretations to yourself. You are not competent of propagating gospel truth. Keep quiet! Say not! I'm the one God wants to speak, and what I say is as perfectly correct as the literal written word of God." Isn't this a high estimation of one's ability? And who invested him with infallible authority when it comes to interpreting the Scriptures? The voice of one crying in the wilderness, "Everybody shut their mouth but me."

Mr. Kurfees is censuring one of his good Brother Preachers for not having the same view and opinion he has on certain unfulfilled prophecy. The controversy was on "millennialism," a subject comprehending fine spun theories. I'm giving this example to show you that Alexander Campbell's system of interpretations is characterized with human opinions and speculations exactly like all other denominations. I quote again from the book:

> "In these passages (Rom. 14:22; 1 Cor. 4:6; 2 Jno. 9) Christians are not only positively forbidden to go beyond the word of God in teaching the Bible, but I do not see how language could more plainly, pointedly, and specifically forbid their doing so; and yet, in spite of these plain and pointed inhibitions, that is exactly what they often do.
>
> "A most vivid illustration of this fact is found in the *DIVISION AND STRIFE* that have come in some of the churches in recent years over 'speculations' on unfulfilled prophecies and other Biblical utterances.
>
> "When these speculations started in Louisville, Kentucky, a few years ago, I made an earnest and vigorous effort to impress upon their principal leader that, if the said speculations were not checked they would be certain to lead to strife and division. I assured him that, so far as I was concerned, such opinions would not interfere with our fellowship and cooperation with each other in

TLC

the Lord's work, *PROVIDED HE WOULD KEEP THEM TO HIMSELF* 'before God' as the inspired apostle in Romans 14:22 distinctly requires, but I could not cooperate with any one in teaching and upholding such opinions. We must teach the word of God and not the opinions of men. Assuredly the division and strife that have followed the latter in this case most truly illustrate the wisdom of the inspired advice."

I capitalized two phrases in the above quotation for your special attention. I want you to notice what hangs on the word, "PROVIDED." He tells his good Brother that his interpretation is a mere "human opinion," but assures him it will not disrupt their fellowship, PROVIDED he will keep his mouth shut, and keep his interpretations to himself. In other words, his brother has the right to meditate upon his interpretations before God, but he had better keep sealed lips or he will be censured as a false prophet. And mark you this, the prophecy in question was such a complicated subject that part of the churches of Christ swung Postmillennial and part Premillennial; yet Mr. Kurfees calls his brother's interpretations "human opinions," and "speculations." Right here, in this very thing, is how different denominations get started. And actually the germ of a new denomination was planted in this *division and strife* which started in Louisville, Kentucky, because a new group began to denominate by calling themselves "premillennial."

I have a question or two for Mr. Kurfees and Mr. Porter. DOES THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, HAVE A WRITTEN CREED BY WHICH TO FOLLOW AN AGREED INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM? I hear them answer negatively. Then another question: IF YOU HAVE NO OFFICIAL CREED BY WHAT AUTHORITY DO YOU CENSURE YOUR BROTHER FOR PREACHING HIS INTERPRETATIONS OF SCRIPTURE? I hear you say, "Because his interpretations are not Scriptural." And may I ask, "Who said yours were Scriptural?"

How can a body of people propagate the same inter-

TLC

pretations without first deciding upon what they believe? And their decision upon what they believe becomes their creed, "for whatever a body or organization believes and regards as essential constitutes its creed." (Kershner, in "Restoration Handbook," series 2, page 7) And I might add, it's their creed whether they write it in a book or propagate it orally. A creed is nothing more than an agreed system of interpretations, and when Mr. Porter says he has no creed but the Bible he is making his human opinions and interpretations as infallible as the written word. This is identically the same principle that dominates the Vatican.

TLC

PORTER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Since I hold no "denominational tenets," my opponent's reference to "the cat with seven lives" proves only that a black cat crossed his path—and brought him some bad luck. Furthermore, the reader can decide whether "forceful facts" or "trifling quibbles" make it hard for Mr. Myers to meet the arguments. I think the reader will be able to make his own decision about this.

HIS SELF-CONTRADICTION

It is amusing to see my opponent try to explain how the "Church of Christ" originated as a denomination in the "personal interpretations" of the Campbells at "the Cane Ridge Revival" in the state of Kentucky in 1801, when neither of the Campbells had ever come to America at that time. He realized his predicament, saw that he could not explain this contradiction, and tried to fix it with a quotation from M. C. Kurfees. He wonders if he, in this way, has "caused Bro. Porter to start a row in his own church." Don't be disturbed, Mr. Myers; there is no conflict between anything I said and the quotation made from Kurfees. Kurfees *did not say* that the Campbells "inaugurated" the movement "at the Cane Ridge Revival in 1801." If he had said that, then my statements would be in conflict with his. But he did not say it. Yet that is what Mr. Myers said—that is what he tried to prove by Kurfees. But there is *not a word* in support of this idea in the quotation from Kurfees. My friend is still in his predicament, and he will never get out. I demand that he make another effort to clear up his self-contradiction.

The "Reformatory Movement," or more correctly, the "Restoration Movement," in the general sense, was made up of a number of movements in different sections when various men, in closely related times, adopted the idea of taking the Bible as their only creed and returning to the original ground set forth in the New Testament. This is why Kurfees could say that the movement was inaugurated by a number of men. And I say the same thing. But that is far from saying that a denomination was started at a

TLC

specific revival, in a definite locality, in a certain year. Yet this is what my opponent claims. He has yet to give his proof. If he has any, let us have it.

"THINGS RELUCTANTLY ADMITTED"

If pulling eye-teeth is comparable to the pain produced by my opponent's arguments, then a session in the dentist's chair would be an enjoyable experience. It is amusing to read his statement that I "had to admit" certain things, as though the admission was made because of pressure used by him. The fact is I did not "reluctantly admit" anything. Some of the things *I did not admit at all;* others were things which I never had any inclination to deny. Let us look at them as he has numbered them.

1. I knew there was a "Cane Ridge Revival" long before I ever heard of B. Sunday Myers. Nothing said by him had any influence upon my saying so.

2. I have never heard of any one who denied that "The Independent Springfield Presbytery" was formed by Stone and four other ministers. I was not forced to admit this—I never entertained any other idea of it.

3. I have never thought that this "Presbytery" originated with Christ at Pentecost. Even the men who formed it saw the unscripturalness of it and disbanded the whole thing. I have never offered to justify its existence.

4. Nor did I "reluctantly admit" that they wrote an "Apology." I showed that the men, in that "Apology," condemned all human creeds. *So it was not a creed.*

5. I did not admit, reluctantly or otherwise, that this organization "actually did change names." Neither do I now admit it. Mr. Myers *cannot prove it.* The words my opponent attributed to me were not my words at all, but the words of Kershner whom he introduced as his authority. But even Kershner *does not say* what he claims I admitted.

6. I did not admit that Campbell "did actually join the Baptist Church." But I challenged my friend to prove he did. I repeat the challenge, but I never expect to see the proof, for it cannot be found. Nobody knows it better

TLC

than Myers. They *did not join the Baptist Church* in 1813 but merely co-operated in the Redstone Association. But Mr. Myers says: "The only way anyone else joins a denomination is to co-operate with them in their association." He emphasizes this by putting it in capital letters. I wonder if this represents the extent of his knowledge about church membership. If so, I am sorry for him. There exists in the United States now what is known as the "American Baptist Association," in which many of their congregations co-operate for missionary work. Do men become members of the Baptist Church by co-operation in that Association? According to my friend, they do. But ask D. N. Jackson, Laurel, Mississippi, or Ben M. Bogard, Little Rock, Arkansas, or any other Baptist preacher. Each church exists, with all its members, before it ever enters into co-operation in the Association. And it may withdraw from the Association at any time. When it does, it is still a Baptist Church, and it still has members. So men do not join the Baptist Church by entering the Association, and they do not cease to be members when they withdraw from it. I am still calling for the proof that *Campbell ever joined the Baptist Church.* I will be calling for such proof when this debate closes, for Myers cannot produce the proof.

7. When I referred to Campbell "and his group" I simply meant the group associated with Campbell in his work. But Myers twists it into meaning it was not "Christ's group" but Campbell's denomination. Now that I have referred to "his work" I wonder if Myers will twist that into meaning that it was not "Christ's work." He could do this as well as he did the other. And men will do anything to uphold a false position. But my friend forgot that he said in his first affirmative that in 1831 Campbell "and *his followers* had *no organization* as yet." (Under heading: "Campbell And Stone Unite") Now, if Campbell could have "followers" and still have "no organization," why could he not have a "group" without an organization? Maybe my friend will tell us. But I doubt it.

8. No one ever denied the meeting of Campbell and Stone in 1824. I was never *forced* to admit this.

TLC

9. Neither did I admit that "Campbell *was actually separated* from" the Redstone Association. I said that he *withdrew himself from them.* Myers says: "Campbell withdrew just before they turned him out." In other words, they *turned him out after he withdrew.* Some excommunication, wasn't it? But "how could he withdraw unless he was a member?" He withdrew from co-operation in the Association, but he was still a member of the same church to which he belonged before he ever entered the Association.

10. I did not "reluctantly admit"—for I have never had any inclination to deny—that the groups associated with Stone and Campbell united in Lexington, Kentucky. But it was in 1832, Mr. Myers, and not 1831, as you claim. But how would this prove that a denomination originated in 1801 at Cane Ridge, Kentucky, in the "personal interpretations" of Campbell, inasmuch as you admit that thirty years later "Campbell and his followers *had no organization* as yet"? *Will you please answer this question?* The reader has a right to expect you to do it. But I doubt that you will even try. The "Special Letter To The Reader" which my friend inserts here is but his way of whistling as he passes the cemetery. But keep it in mind—it may backfire a little later.

11. I was not forced to admit that we have a creed. For many years I have preached on "Our Creed"—long before I ever knew that Myers lived. If I have a *human creed,* as he claims, *let him prove it. I challenge him to name one thing that I teach that originated* with Stone, Campbell, or with any other uninspired man. Until he can do that, his charge falls flat.

12. I have always contended that "denominationalism is based on division." But denominationalism does not necessarily begin the moment division begins. When division is pushed to its ultimate end, denominationalism is the result. Yes, there can be Postmillennial and Premillennial factions in the church. But I belong to neither. There were factions in the true church at Corinth.

13. He wants to know if Stone was saved in the

TLC

Presbyterian church. No, he had not even met the fundamental requirements of salvation when he took part in the Cane Ridge Revival. And Campbell? He specified his baptism must be "performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament." Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. 1, page 398. If so, it was all right. But if not, it would in no way affect me, as I am not following Campbell. The position he advocated—getting back to the original foundation—was right. That is the course I am pursuing today.

HIS ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS

1. He tries to explain how the "denomination" *began* with the Cane Ridge Revival in 1801 but *did not begin* till the forming of the Springfield Presbytery in 1803. I wonder if "forceful facts" or "trifling quibbles" made it hard on him here. He tells us that Christ gathered about him his disciples during his personal ministry but later organized them into his church at Pentecost. Certainly so. But suppose you say: "He organized his church at the beginning of his ministry." And later you say: "He organized his church three and a half years later at Pentecost." Could both these statements be true? Neither can both your statements be true. Your proposition says the denomination "originated in 1801." Yet you say it began with the organization of the Springfield Presbytery in 1803. You cannot hold to both statements. One of them *must be false.* And both of them are.

2. I asked him: "Is it possible for any man to take the Bible as his only creed?" He says it is not possible—that "a man's creed must be his personal interpretation of the Bible and not the Bible itself." There you have it. My friend *does not even claim* to take the Bible for his creed. He says it is impossible for him to do it. That will explain, I suppose, some of the things he teaches. To Moses God said: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it." Deut. 4:2. But Mr. Myers says it *could not be done*—Moses would *have to add* his personal interpretations. Isaiah said: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according

TLC

to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. But my friend says *it can't be done*—they would have to speak "according to their personal interpretations" of the word. Paul said: "Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:2. But my opponent says that *such is impossible*—that a man must preach his "personal interpretations" of the word instead of the word itself. And Peter declared: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4:11. But Mr. Myers declares it is *utterly impossible to* do so—that no man can speak anything but his "personal interpretation" of God's oracles.

My friend quotes from Kershner's "Restoration Handbook." After giving the quotation he says: "He clearly distinguishes between the Bible and the church's interpretation of the Bible." There is no such distinction even hinted at in the quotation. I am under no obligation to defend Kershner. He belongs to the Christian Church—not the Church of Christ. But he does not say anything that resembles Myers' conclusion. He implies that Kershner said there is a difference between the Bible and our creed, but it is a baseless misrepresentation. However, don't be surprised at my friend. When a man says it is impossible for him to take the Bible for what it says, but must use his own personal interpretation, you need not expect him to take what an uninspired author says. He will just give his "personal interpretation" of what the author says. That is what my opponent has done with Kershner. He began the quotation with the second sentence of the paragraph. I wonder why he skipped the first sentence. Read it and see what you think. Here it is: "The distinction between human creeds and the divine creed must always be kept clearly in mind."—Restoration Handbook, Series 2, page 7. Do the words of Kershner in this sentence sound like Myers' "personal interpretation" of him? He said the very reverse of what Myers implied.

3. If a human denomination, calling itself by one name, should discontinue this practice and use at least two designations, would it cease to be a denomination?

My opponent answers this question in the negative.

TLC

He says we might use every designation used in the Bible and still be a denomination. Thanks, Mr. Myers— you have *given up one of your major affirmative arguments.* In your first affirmative you endeavored to prove that the "Church of Christ" is a denomination because they "identify by *one certain name.*" This is found under the heading, "Do They Denominate?" He used more than a page with this argument, quoting from Black, Hicks and Fogarty. But now he has *surrendered the whole argument* by saying a denomination is not such because it uses *one certain name.* It may use *every name in the Bible and still be a denomination.* He has, therefore, lost one of his major arguments by his own admission. I wonder if this resembles pulling an eye-tooth.

At this point my friend asks: "Is it possible to sectarianize a Bible name and title?" Answer: Yes, I think so. In a letter to me Mr. Myers admits that he uses the term "Church of God" in a denominational sense, a sense in which he says it is not used in the New Testament. So I have no doubt that he sectarianizes, according to his own admission, a Bible name.

4. Would it be possible for a group of men to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a denomination?

How did he answer this? He said: "You don't go backward to get to the New Testament church, you go forward." This is but a play upon words, a mere subterfuge, an unadulterated evasion. Why did he not answer the question? He did not do so, and no one knows this better than Myers himself. He saw the "handwriting on the wall" and decided to side-step the whole thing. When I spoke of men's getting "back" to the New Testament church I had in mind, of course, the fact that men had gone away from it. Certainly, then, they could "get back" to it. And they would not have to go "through a back door." Mr. Myers, are you afraid of the question? If not, *please answer this:* Is it possible for a group of men to get to the New Testament church—either backward or forward—without establishing a denomination? Now, don't evade it this time. *Come on with your*

TLC

answer. The reader will expect you to tell us. And I will not let you forget it if you don't. So you would just as well get busy and answer. If you don't, it will haunt you throughout this discussion. I know it puts you in a hard place, but "forceful facts," and not "trifling quibbles," brought it about.

5. What course would you pursue in order to do this? Here again he definitely evaded. He claimed to answer by "echoing the opponent's words." But I *have never uttered any words* that have *any resemblance* to the "echo." Why did you not just tell us how it can be done, if it can? You say that it cannot be done by "adopting Alexander Campbell's metaphysical interpretations." Well, I did not ask you how *not to accomplish it*. I want to know how it can be accomplished. So why don't you tell us? *Are you afraid?* It certainly has that appearance. If not, then let us have your answer without evasion. If "Mr. Porter's denomination," as my friend calls it, "lays its foundation in the personal interpretations of Barton Stone, Thomas, and Alexander Campbell," let him produce some principles we teach that *originated with any of these men*. Until he does so his idol has already fallen before the ark of God and broken its neck, instead of its palms.

"UNITY VERSUS SCHISM"

In Myers' first affirmative he claimed the church I represent is a denomination because it has schism in it, whereas the true church had no such thing. He left a space for his reference to prove it but failed to insert it. He now says I took hold of this "insignificant mistake" and nearly ran myself to death. "Insignificant mistake" indeed! It is so significant that he has not found his proof yet. 1 Cor. 12:25 does not say it. Paul said there "should be no schism," but he did not say *there was none*. In 1 Cor. 11:18 he showed there was. So his whole argument on this point is gone unless he is willing to say the church at Corinth was a denomination. What about it, Mr. Myers? "The divisions at Corinth," my opponent says, "were the divisions of human opinions, not division of the 'body of Christ'." Then, according to my friend, Paul should not have con-

TLC

demned, for after all, they *could not do otherwise* than to hold "human opinions" or "interpretations." They could not hold to the word of God but to their interpretations of that word. Do you remember? Tell me why Paul condemned them for the "divisions of human opinions." We shall await your answer to this problem.

BURYING A DUMMY

Mr. Myers claims that the Springfield Presbytery was never dissolved but only the name changed. He illustrates by the burial of a dummy named "Old Man Depression." But I am afraid this does not help him. Whatever it was they organized is the thing they dissolved or put to death. If it was only a dummy they buried, then the Springfield Presbytery was only a dummy to begin with. So the organization, according to this, never actually existed—it was only an effigy. Hence, no organization really existed, and my friend has lost his point. But it did exist in reality and was actually put to death. I gave abundant proof of this in my first negative. That proof has not been set aside. There was no fake death, fake funeral or fake burial. The body *was actually dissolved.* It does not exist today; Porter is not a member of it and never was; and he is making no effort to defend it. The charge of my opponent is groundless. Just because the men who organized it continued to live after it was dissolved is no proof that the organization continued. In 1861, some Southern States, seceding from the Union, formed the Confederate States of America. The Civil War resulted. The North was victorious and the Confederacy was dissolved. But there are men living today —more than 80 years since the dissolution of the Southern Confederacy—who were members of that Confederacy. Does this prove that the Confederate States of America still exists? It does, according to my friend's reasoning. Myers again quotes the language of Kershner and calls it "my opponent's own words." Why not keep the record straight? He knew those were not my words but Kershner's. But even they say *the Presbytery was dissolved.* I don't think the readers are going to be "hoodwinked and bamboozled" by any such fake arguments as my friend tries

TLC

here.

He says that I admitted that the Springfield Presbytery "was a denomination once upon a time." I challenge him to produce the statement that shows such admission. I have admitted *no such thing*. My friend is not telling you what I said—he is giving his "personal interpretation" of what I said. Don't expect too much of him. It would be impossible for him to do otherwise, even with the word of God, according to his own statement. The Springfield Presbytery *was not a denomination*. The men who formed it were still members of the Presbyterian denomination. It was simply an organization within that denomination. A Presbytery was a judicatory which governed a number of congregations in a limited geographic district. I have *never admitted* that the Springfield Presbytery *was ever a denomination*. I challenge my friend to give proof for his assertion.

But he wants to know how it could die a voluntary and happy death. That is very easy. When the men who had formed it discovered "that there was neither precept nor example in the New Testament" for such confederacies, they gladly, voluntarily dissolved it. Hence, it died a voluntary and happy death.

"DENOMINATIONALISM DISCOVERED"

Mr. Myers thinks M. C. Kurfees "let the cat out of the bag" in his booklet, "The Need of Continued Emphasis on the Restoration of the Ancient Order." The quotation concerns a convention in Cincinnati in 1849 that "established a general organization of churches." Regarding this quotation Mr. Myers says that Kurfees "tells us that his is a general organization of churches under a general board of overseers and managers." Kurfees tells us *no such thing*. This is a base and baseless misrepresentation of what Kurfees said. It is another sample of Myers' "personal interpretation." Kurfees said such an organization was established, but he did not say it was "his." Maybe my friend does not like the way a polecat smells, but he doesn't have to adopt one as a pet for his home. Neither did Kurfees accept any such organization as that convention established.

TLC

It became characteristic of the Christian Church but not the Church of Christ. In the quotation my friend made Kurfees said that such an organization was "a thing, as before shown, wholly foreign to the New Testament." I could produce the statements which were made before, according to this reference. But there is no need. This statement itself shows that Kurfees did not subscribe to any such organization. Why, then, Mr. Myers, did you call it "his"? Are you trying to "hoodwink" and "bamboozle" somebody?

He wants to know the difference between a "Reformatory Movement" and a "Denomination." If he does not know the difference between a "movement" to get back to the New Testament ground, *rejecting all human creeds and systems,* on the one hand, and a "denomination" *founded upon human creeds and systems,* on the other hand, I am sorry for him. The reader has enough intelligence to see the difference, even if my friend is unable to do so.

His charge that we claim to have no members is another misrepresentation. I wonder if Myers cannot get anything straight. Is he one of the foxes which seek to hide their tracks by riding away on a sheep? It looks suspicious.

"RESULTS OF MR. CAMPBELL'S 'HEAD UNITY'."

If the division within the church of Christ is caused by Mr. Campbell's "head unity," then I wonder what is wrong with all these groups which claim "Spiritual power" has been working to bring "into unison the inward motives and motions of the heart"? There is more division among "spiritual power" claimers than among nearly any others on earth. Somehow, "that good old way" does not seem to work.

"HUMAN OPINIONS AND DENOMINATIONALISM"

My opponent again quotes from Kurfees to show how "human opinions" are to be treated. He gives two short quotations from page 32 of the afore-mentioned book, and rather a lengthy quotation from page 34. Relative to these quotations my opponent said this: "In effect he said just this: 'If the Bible is to be interpreted, I am the one to do it. Your interpretations are 'human opinions,' mine are as

TLC

perfectly correct as the written letter of the Bible. So keep your interpretations to yourself. I am the one God wants to speak. Everybody shut their mouth but me'." I wonder if the reader can find anything in any of the quotations given in which Kurfees "in effect said just this." Read the quotations carefully. Read them a hundred times if you wish. And if you can find *any statement* in *any of them* that you think *even resembles* my friend's conclusion, I suggest that you see a Psychiatrist. What is the matter with Mr. Myers? He is giving you his "personal interpretation" of what Kurfees said. But Kurfees said no such thing. Kurfees contended that "every man"—he himself as well as others—should keep "opinions strictly and always to himself." He did not even intimate that "you hold yours to yourself" and "I'll shout mine from the housetops." But don't censure Mr. Myers too severely. According to him, he cannot even tell you *what God says* but will have to give you his "personal interpretation" of what he says. You couldn't expect him to do any better with *what Kurfees says.*

HIS QUESTIONS

1. "Does the Church of Christ have a written creed by which to follow an agreed interpretation of the Christian System?" Answer: We have the written New Testament; nothing more, nothing less.

2. "If you have no official creed by what authority do you censure your brother for preaching his interpretations of Scripture?"

Answer: We have an official creed—the New Testament, given by divine authority. It says: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4:11. If men speak human opinions instead, they are under divine censure.

QUESTIONS ON PERSONAL INTERPRETATIONS

I have some questions for my friend to answer concerning this matter. Here they are:

1. Are human creeds acceptable to God?
2. As you say that no man can take the Bible for his

TLC

creed, but must use his personal interpretations, will God accept one man's personal interpretations in preference to another's?

3. If all human creeds—personal interpretations—are not acceptable to God, how can you determine whose is?

4. If all human creeds—personal interpretations—are acceptable to God, then would it be possible for God to condemn a man for believing and practicing error?

I shall expect my friend to deal fairly with these questions. They are vital to the issue involved, and the reader has a right to expect him to answer.

QUESTIONS ON DENOMINATIONS

Here are also some questions on denominations. Let him answer without evasion.

1. Are all denominations human institutions?
2. Are all denominations acceptable to God?
3. If not, how can you determine which are?
4. Can one be a Christian and belong to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination?
5. If so, how can such be accomplished?

QUESTIONS COMPLETELY IGNORED

Some of my questions my opponent tried to answer; some he definitely evaded; others he completely ignored. I wish to state again some that he completely ignored and demand again that he answer them.

1. If Campbell "transferred religion's centre from the heart to the head," will you please tell us what the heart is that is spoken of in the Bible?

2. Since "Campbell and his followers had no organization as yet"—in 1831—how did a denomination originate in his interpretations in 1801?

3. Will you name one congregation in the Church of Christ that uses the "Christian System" as a creed?

4. Since you said "The Apology of the Springfield Presbytery" is our "official creed," and yet you said "The Christian System" is our "official creed," do we have two official creeds?

5. If not, when did one cease to be official and the other become such?

TLC

MYERS' THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

The opponent is amused in my efforts to explain how the Campbells started his denomination in the Cane Ridge Revival, in 1801, when neither of the Campbells had ever come to America at that time. Such a silly quibble is prima facie evidence that he is desperate for material to refute infallible facts. The reader has enough intelligence to read the proposition, and see for himself that it does not say that the Campbells are the exclusive starters of his denomination. The proposition names Barton W. Stone as the first to draw out a nucleus around which Thomas, Alexander Campbell, Scott, and others became coadjutors and builders a few years later.

NOW SINCE THE PROPOSITION NAMES STONE AS FIRST IN ORDER IN THE STARTING OF THIS "NEW MOVEMENT"—WHY DOES MR. PORTER NOT TRY TO DEFEND STONE?

He keeps crying about the Campbells being in Europe when Stone had his "Cane Ridge Revival." I don't care where the Campbells were, in Europe or Ishe-mu-kooley, when Stone started his denominational expedition! The opponent seems to be afraid I am going to touch a sensitive nerve in Campbell's system—and I wouldn't be much surprised if I do.

HAD HE RATHER IT START WITH STONE THAN THE CAMPBELLS? If so, I will concede the point and leave the Campbells over in Europe.

My opponent says: "Kurfees did not say that the Campbells 'inaugurated' the movement at the Cane Ridge Revival in 1801." Well, I didn't say that Kurfees said it was inaugurated in this revival in 1801. But Kurfees did say that the "movement" was inaugurated by the very men I named. He didn't say where; but why quibble over the location. Kurfees didn't give the exact date these men inaugurated it, but he did say "in the early part of the 19th century." He didn't say what year, but if I were to guess I would say about 1801, during the Cane Ridge Revi-

TLC

val. Mr. Porter's religious dogmata at this point is wearing an apron of fig leaves. His denominational bed is too short, and the cover too narrow.

GOD'S CHURCH OR REFORMATORY MOVEMENT? WHICH?

I repeat the opponent from page 1—"The Reformatory Movement . . . was made up of a number of movements in different sections when various men in closely related times, adopted the idea of taking the Bible as their only creed and returning to the original ground set forth in the New Testament. This is why Kurfees could say that the movement was inaugurated by a number of men."

Mr. Porter teaches that conversion from alien sins makes one a member of Christ's church. He says that this and this only can make one a member of Christ's body, which is the church. All right—in the above quotation he tells us that a group of men who were already Christians, (consequently in Christ's church according to his argument) started a religious movement in the early part of the 19th century. Now can't you see, their salvation made them a member of Christ's church, while the inauguration of this "new movement" made them a member of a denomination. My opponent says, "They adopted the idea of taking the Bible as their only creed." This is just another way of saying they adopted the idea of making another denomination, because all Evangelical denominations claims the Bible as the basis of its creed; i.e., as the basis of its interpretations of the Christian System. If the opponent tries to refute this point he will make himself an object of laughter.

IF THESE MEN WHOM KURFEES NAMED AS INAUGURATORS OF THE NEW MOVEMENT WERE ALREADY IN CHRIST'S CHURCH BY VIRTUE OF THE NEW BIRTH—WHY DID THEY GET TOGETHER AND BEGIN A NEW MOVEMENT? WHEN THEY SET UP A MOVEMENT IN ADDITION TO THEIR CONVERSION IS WHEN THEY ESTABLISHED A NEW DENOMINATION. THIS NEW MOVEMENT WAS BEGUN BY

TLC

A GROUP OF MEN, MR. KURFEES GIVES THEIR NAME, BUT THE CHURCH YOU READ ABOUT IN THE BIBLE WAS INAUGURATED BY JUST ONE MAN —CHRIST, THE GOD-MAN.

DISBANDED? OR CHANGED NAMES?

The opponent still denies that the "Springfield Presbytery" changed names. He claims that the Presbytery itself was dissolved. His reason in this point of argument is obvious—he knows, just like those knew who held the fake funeral and buried its denominational effigy, that if he fails to show where this "new organization" faded out of existence, people will know it still exists. I will therefore show the reader by point of logic where this organization, wearing the title of "Springfield Presbytery," was not dissolved but changed names. I will prove it by Mr. Porter's own words. Here is what he has to offer as argument—"They decided to wear no name but Christian." Now, if the organization itself was disbanded how could they decide to wear another name? Dead folks nor disbanded organizations need no other name. Can't you see dear reader, all they did was hold a sham funeral, bury their denominational effigy, sectarianize a Bible title, all with a cunning design to cover their frowzy theory. Candid and intelligent people know better than to swallow such tomfoolery!

The opponent says—"The men in that 'apology' condemned all human creeds. So it was not a creed." Ah, come on now, the Russellites condemn all human churches, but this doesn't prove that their kingdom halls are not made of the same brick and cement as our churches. I repeat, a church's creed is its interpretations of the Christian System, and when Brother Porter says he has no creed but the Bible he is saying in effect that he doesn't interpret the various doctrines of Scripture. Every person of honesty knows this is false. He does have his own views and interpretations. If you don't believe it visit his services and see if he don't do more than read the literal Scripture. He will read the Bible, and like all others he will proceed to explain what he thinks the text means. Now, his explanations compose his creed, whether it be propagated orally or written.

TLC

Yea, and his explanations or interpretations are subject to mistake and alteration, a thing certainly untrue of the letter of the Bible.

When my opponent and his brethren say they have no creed—personal interpretations—they are saying in effect that their system and the Bible is one and the same thing. They are simply trying to fit the infallible, unchangeable Word of God into a human system and school of uninspired views, opinions, and interpretations. This peculiar mental twist was characteristic of that Clerical wiseacre, Alexander Campbell, whose "ipse dixit" depicted him a prophetical wizzago, but only turned out to be an ignis fatis, manque, mala fide—so far as fundamental religion is concerned. In short, he shot at the moon and hit the wood-pile.

ANSWERING THE OPPONENT'S QUESTIONS
On Personal Interpretations

1. "Are human creeds acceptable to God?" Answer: Yes, if they propagate moral truth.

2. "Will God accept one man's personal interpretations in preference to another's?"—Answer: Yes, because, some interpretations allow sin in the life, a thing which God cannot tolerate.

3. "If all human creeds—personal interpretations—are not acceptable to God, how can you determine whose is? —Answer: By letting God be the Judge, rather than Alexander Campbell, Curtis Porter or any other human being. Right here, on this very point, is where the Devil hoodwinked the originators of the opponent's church—they elected themselves to be the judge of all men's standing before God, judging who are saved and who are lost.

4. "If all human creeds—personal interpretations—are acceptable to God, then would it be possible for God to condemn a man for believing and practicing error?"—Answer: I will give you a Bible example to follow, and let's see if you will follow it: Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, illuminated with miraculous inspiration to write the Holy Scriptures, is yet possessed with such mental incapacities as to believe and preach that the Gentiles must be circum-

TLC

cised in order to be saved. He was a truly saved man and at the same time believed and taught error until God enlightened him. This illustrates all men's relationship to God—that is, the degree of knowledge they have on revealed truth. If the opponent could ever reach that place where his mind is broad enough to preach what he honestly thinks is right, and condemn what he honestly thinks is wrong, without judging others in their soul salvation, he then could call them Brother rather than a Popish "Mr." and "my friend."

ON DENOMINATIONS

1. "Are all denominations human institutions?"—Emphatically not! I'm not a Roman Catholic Priest—Why ask this? Every institution that preaches Christ and him crucified comprehends a divine element which God accepts, whether every point of doctrine is accepted or not. Did not Simon Peter have a point of doctrine (concerning circumcision) which God rejected? And yet God accepted Simon as a true Christian, saved from sin and hell. If God had been like Curtis Porter when Peter argued with him about circumcision, He would have denounced him as a mere "Mr." and cast him headlong into hell.

2. "Are all denominations acceptable to God?" The truth propagated by all denominations is acceptable to God. And every person in every denomination, regardless of race or language, who has true faith in Christ's vicarious sacrifice is acceptable. The body of Christ is made up of all those who have responded to the call of the Holy Ghost, separated themselves from sin, and dedicated themselves to God, regardless of rank, race, class, or sex. Salvation is personal, and every individual in every denomination who has true faith in Christ is accepted. (Acts 10:35)

3. "If not, how can you determine which are?"—What he is trying to do in these questions is make me admit that the "body of Christ" may be identified in a certain religious denomination. This is impossible! And right here is where the heresy of the opponent's theory centers. This is exactly what he tries to do—identify the body of Christ all in his group. The "body of Christ" is a composition of blood-

TLC

washed saints from all classes, nations, and denominations. IF ALL DENOMINATIONS WERE NOT ACCEPTED OF GOD, THAT WOULDN'T PROVE THAT MR. PORTER IS NOT IN A DENOMINATION!

4. "Can one be a Christian and belong to the New Testament Church without belonging to a denomination?" Yes, personal faith in Christ made Mr. Porter a member of Christ's body (?), but his adoption of Alexander Campbell's interpretation of the Christian System made him a member of his denomination. After the opponent proves that one can be saved without belonging to any denomination, *IT STILL REMAINS FOR HIM TO PROVE THAT HE IS NOT IN ONE.*

5. "If so, how can such be accomplished?" This question has already been answered under question 3.

QUESTIONS COMPLETELY IGNORED

1. "If Campbell transferred religion's center from the heart to the head, will you please tell us what the heart is that is spoken of in the Bible?"—I made this statement only for didactic purposes, only as a point of historical matter designed to inform the reader of the issue between Campbell and the Baptists and others. The question is not nearly germane, and if I should answer it it wouldn't help him to prove he is not in a denomination. Campbell substituted intellectual faith for spiritual faith, spirituality for legalism, and supernatural realities for metaphysical dogmata. If there's anything else you want to know about this preeminent Clerical wiseacre, let me know.

2. "Since 'Campbell and his followers had no organization as yet'—in 1831—how did a denomination originate in his interpretations in 1801?"—This is the same quibble question he has asked a dozen times. He leaves the reader under the impression that I said his denomination originated exclusively by Campbell; but he himself says on page 1 of his letter that—"the 'Reformatory Movement' was made up of a number of movements in different sections." This answers his own question. One of these movements was the "Springfield Presbytery" organized by

TLC

Stone in the "Cane Ridge Revival," in 1801. Another of these movements was Alexander Campbell's group that followed him out of the Presbyterian and Baptist churches. And, "in 1831 . . . the two men and their followers got together at Lexington, Kentucky, and agreed to unite." (Restoration History, page 24, under caption—"Union With The Campbell's.)

3. "Will you name one congregation in the Church of Christ that uses the 'Christian System' as a creed?"

I can name 10,000 churches in his organization that uses it as a creed. "Every organization must believe in something and hold to some form of doctrine; and whatever belief it regards as essential constitutes its creed." Now this form of doctrine and system of interpretation is laid down in Campbell's "The Christian System," and every church in Mr. Porter's denomination, or as he calls it "The Reformatory Movement," uses it.

4. "Since you said 'The Apology of The Springfield Presbytery' is our 'official creed,' and yet you said 'The Christian System' is our 'official creed,' do we have two official creeds?"

Does my opponent expect intelligent human beings to be blinded by such a trifling pun? The "Apology of The Springfield Presbytery" was the creed of Stone's denomination before it merged with Campbell's "GROUP" in Lexington, Ky., in 1801. Campbell then became the pre-eminent leader, and wrote his "Christian System," a system of interpretations which the whole denomination now follows. IT IS EVIDENT, FROM THE VERY DRIFT OF THE OPPONENT'S MATERIAL THAT HE IS DESPERATELY TRYING TO DEFEND ALEXANDER CAMPBELL. I laid as much blame on Barton Stone as I did Campbell, but all the way through he has been crying, "CAMPBELLS, CAMPBELLS, CAMPBELLS." Why does he leave poor old Stone out in the cold?

5. "If not, when did one cease to be official and the other become such?"

They two became one in the merger between Stone and

TLC

Campbell. You see when Campbell and Stone visited each other in 1824 and exchanged doctrinal views of the Christian system, then and there the two denominations were betrothed; and in 1831, at Lexington, Kentucky, the two men and their followers came together and were happily married. From thence their two creeds became one flesh.

DENOMINATIONALISM DISCOVERED

When I took the words of Kurfees, one of the opponent's own brother ministers, to show where they established a "General Organization of Churches," in the Cincinnati Convention, 1849, (see Second Affirmative, pp. 8-9) the opponent nearly burned to the ground. He couldn't deny facts, so he very sagaciously tried to lay the blame on the "Christian Church." Adam laid the blame on Eve, and Eve on the snake; but this didn't alter facts nor vindicate their cause. Mr. Porter says—"It became characteristic of the Christian Church but not the Church of Christ." But dear reader, THIS GENERAL ORGANIZATION WAS ESTABLISHED ABOVE 50 (fifty) YEARS BEFORE THE SCHISM OVER INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC. Moreover, when the church split IT WAS NOT OVER THIS "GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES."

Says the opponent—"Kurfees said such an organization was established, but he did not say it was his." Dear reader, surely we have twisted the squirrel out of his hole. Kurfees did say that it was in his organization. He said it was "The Reformatory Movement" that was inaugurated by Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone that called the Convention and established this "General organization." Mr. Porter says—"Neither did Kurfees accept any such organization as that convention established." Well, I guess there are many things that happens in his denomination he cannot accept.

A REVIEW OF MR. BREWER'S "IS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST A DENOMINATION?"

I ordered much of their literature from several of their publishing houses in search for the best treatise relative to the subject in question, and I verily believe the above

TLC

named booklet, by Mr. G. C. Brewer, is the best argument they have in print.

This little booklet is a three-cornered controversy between Stranger (Baptist), Partyman (Methodist), and Brewer (Church of Christ) in trialogue form. In the course of the controversy Partyman, the Methodist is asked to give his definition of a denomination. Mr. Brewer accepts his definition, but proceeds to prove in the light of it that his is not a denomination. Now since the Church of Christ seems to accept Partyman's definition, I shall present it at this juncture, and then I shall analyze the various characteristics of the opponent's system to see if it really fits Partyman's definition.

Partyman: "A denomination is a body or party of religious people who are in agreement in doctrine, uniform in worship, and wear the same name. They are separate and distinct from other organizations or bodies of religious people, and as a corporate body they own property and carry on religious enterprises, educational, charitable, and missionary. Now I find in here at Lubbock an organization of religious people wearing the name of 'Church of Christ.' They are different from the several other denominations of town in name, in doctrine, in worship. They have their official board, own property, employ a preacher of their own faith, and carry on religious activities. Now I do not find any other body in this town of the same faith and order, but I move to Sweetwater, and there is a body there of the same people. Same in name, in doctrine, in organization, in worship, and in claims. In Fort Worth I find another body of the same people. In Dallas I find them again. I go over the state and I find them in every county and in nearly every town. I find that they have a school at Abilene, and a paper—a party organ—at Austin. They also have one or two orphanages. I go on through Oklahoma and Arkansas and I find the same people. I cross the Mississippi and in Tennessee and Kentucky I find them everywhere and everywhere the same in name and claims. They are all in agreement and a preacher that is acceptable with one is acceptable with all. And yet, I find that these

TLC

people—this band, party, cult, or denomination of people—universally and uniformly have the unmitigated audacity to claim they are not a denomination. To me this is absurd—too absurd to talk about—therefore I must go—"

Now in the light of partyman's definition of a denomination let me ask? 1. DOES MY OPPONENT BELONG TO A DISTINCT BODY OR PARTY OF RELIGIOUS PEOPLE? Certainly so! If you don't believe it just look in their "Church Directory" and you will find 10,000 churches all called by the same name and unified in the same system.

2. ARE THEY SEPARATE AND DISTINCT FROM OTHER RELIGIOUS BODIES?

When this point was pressed upon Mr. Brewer he quibbled, and said, "We are in a body to ourselves, but we are forced to be because others separate themselves from us by going into parties." (P. 15) Now dear reader, this is not true to the facts at all. You can see, his answer is the same as saying, "My interpretations are as perfectly correct and unalterable as the written letter of the Bible, and he who disagrees with my views and interpretations separate themselves from God, His Word, and His church." Brother Brewer separates himself from others by disagreeing with their interpretations just as much as they separate themselves from him by disagreeing with his. But he would have you to believe that if a man disagrees with his interpretations he separates himself from Christ and His church. The Roman Catholic Pope loves to claim this same high and divine authority concerning his interpretations.

Let me tell you curtly, all the great fundamentalists of the age didn't separate themselves from Christ, His Word, and His church just because they refused Barton Stone's and Alexander Campbell's interpretations of the Christian system. Alexander Campbell's interpretations are not infallible, nor do we separate ourselves from Christ and His Holy Church by disagreeing with them; nor with Curtis W. Porter's. Such a claim is a Popish dogma.

3. DO THEY OWN PROPERTY AND CARRY ON

TLC

RELIGIOUS ENTERPRISES, EDUCATIONAL, CHARITABLE, AND MISSIONARY?

Of course they do! Their "Church Directory" lists above forty periodicals all published by their denomination. It names 17 educational institutions owned and supported by the Church of Christ. It names 21 orphanages and homes for the aged, all owned and supported by the Church of Christ. It names above 10,000 church houses all owned and supported by one body of people.

4. IS THERE SUCH A THING AS TAKING THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE AGGREGATE?

If not, pray tell me how can they bundle 10,000 churches together in their "Church Directory" and call all of them by one name—"The Church of Christ?" Hear what Mr. Hicks says in his "Foreword:" "From the outset the chief aim was to make possible such information as would give all concerned a wholesome view of the church." Note —he uses the article which makes his statement to refer to their 10,000 churches as one. Is this not taking the churches of Christ in the aggregate?

5. DO THEY HAVE A COLLECTIVE CONNECTION?

Says Mr. Brewer in his "Is The Church of Christ A Denomination:" "They have no collective connection or organic union . . . they have no central head and therefore no headquarters . . . each congregation is independent."

Please read with me a statement found in their "Church Directory," Section 2, page 2—"We live in a time when stronger churches are interested in helping weaker churches. Nearly all the churches are more conscious of the ties between them." Note, he here speaks of their 10,000 churches in some way being tied to each other. Now let him explain in what way they are tied together, and I will tell you how they have a collective connection.

6. DO THEY HAVE AN ORGANIC UNION? Positively yes, established in the Cincinnati Convention of 1849. Mr. Porter wants to lay this on the "Christian Church,"

TLC

"a denomination of denominations," not just one, but as many as there are local congregations. This is going from bad to worse. An independent church, one that belongs to no general organization with a centralized head, cannot prove by this they are not a denomination; for in this case they become a denomination all of their own. They identify themselves by one certain name, they follow a certain system of interpretations of the doctrines, sacraments, and government of the Christian Economy, and this makes them a denomination as if they had a thousand congregations all unified in the same system.

DESIGN

Mark you this: when a Church of Christ minister sets out to prove that his is not a denomination, he invariably resorts to the method of proving that the church in the Bible is "one body," thus leaving the reader under the impression that many denominations would effect schism in "Christ's mystical body." His design is to confuse the spiritual aspect of the church with the literal. You see dear reader, the spiritual aspect of the church is an "organism," the "body of Christ," consisting of every saved soul of all ages: while the literal organization upon earth is broken up into many local bodies. In his theory he applies the "spiritual organism" to his literal organization, and contends that his organization is the EXCLUSIVE "body of Christ." In this he hides his denominationalism under the Bible doctrine of the mystical body of Christ. This is exactly what the Roman Catholics do. Both Mr. Porter and the Roman Catholic Pope preaches that his organization is the EXCLUSIVE "body of Christ." This is why they denounce all others as on their way to hell.

But keep this in mind, dear reader, after he has carried his point and proved that the church in the Bible is "one body," IT STILL REMAINS FOR HIM TO PROVE THAT HIS DENOMINATION IS THAT ONE BODY, EXCLUSIVELY. After he has proven that there is but "One Vine and its many branches," don't forget—his is only a branch, it is not the Vine itself.

TLC

Now someone will ask—"What makes us a branch in this True Vine?" I answer, "Faith in the blood of Christ, and not the adoption of Alexander Campbell's personal interpretations." Amen.

TLC

PORTER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

The affirmative is visibly irritated because I keep insisting that he explain how a denomination could have originated in the "personal interpretations" of the Campbells at the Cane Ridge Revival in Kentucky in 1801 when neither of the Campbells had ever come to America at that time. He calls it a "silly quibble" used to "refute infallible facts." Yet he is willing to "concede the point and leave the Campbells over in Europe." Surely he would not be willing to concede the point if it is made of "infallible facts." The very fact that he is willing to "concede the point" shows that he realizes he has lost the point, for anyone knows the Campbells did not start a denomination in Kentucky before they came to America. The argument itself is a "silly quibble" that my opponent cannot prove. So he is willing to "concede the point." If in three affirmatives he has not been able "to touch a sensitive nerve in Campbell's system," I "wouldn't be much surprised" if he doesn't.

No one claimed that he said the Campbells were "the exclusive starters" of the denomination, but he did say that it originated in *their personal interpretations* in 1801. His proposition says so. But he has now found out that he is wrong. Let him admit that he was mistaken about this, and I'll quit pressing the matter; but until he does I shall keep his feet to the fire. I do not care whether Stone or the Campbell's started the movement of getting to the Bible alone for the rule of faith and practice. That principle was right, regardless of who started it, and I am not following the interpretations of any man. I am not defending any man—I am merely defending that principle.

Mr. Myers now admits that Kurfees did not say that the Campbells "inaugurated" the movement "at the Cane Ridge Revival in 1801." Then why did he quote from Kurfees? It was on this very point. I was demanding proof that they had any connection with the Cane Ridge Revival.

TLC

How could *they* start a denomination there? My opponent said: "I will let Mr. Kurfees answer that question." Then he gave the quotation. But now he admits that Mr. Kurfees did not "answer that question." Then, my friend, were you trying to "hoodwink" somebody when you used his quotation to prove what you knew he did not say? But while Kurfees did not say they started it then, if my opponent "were to guess," he would say "during the Cane Ridge Revival." His "guess" would be as far wrong as his "argument," for he could no more "guess" the Campbells into the Cane Ridge Revival before they came to America than he could "argue" them there. The inconsistency of this cannot be covered with "an apron of fig leaves," nor with any kind of denominational blankets.

"GOD'S CHURCH OR REFORMATORY MOVEMENT? WHICH?"

The affirmative quotes a statement from my second negative concerning "the reformatory movement" and then states that we believe that conversion makes one a member of Christ's church. Then he states:

> "In the above quotation he tells us that a group of men who were already Christians, (consequently in Christ's church according to his argument) started a religious movement in the early part of the 19th century. Now can't you see, their salvation made them a member of Christ's church, while the inauguration of this 'new movement' made them a member of a denomination."

Did I say that these men were "already Christians"? Read the quotation and see if I said that. *I said no such thing*. Mr. Myers is not telling you *what I said*—he is giving his "personal interpretation" of what I said. But don't blame the poor fellow, for he says he cannot even tell you *what God says* but must give his "personal interpretation" of what God says. So you should not expect him to do any better with *what Porter said*. The fact is that they were not first Christians and then started a movement. But the

TLC

"movement" of taking the Bible as their only creed was the thing that *led to their conversion.* Stone advocated this principle as early as 1798, and it led to his baptism in 1807 —*nine years later.* The principle, adopted by the Campbells in 1809, led to their baptism in 1812—*three years later.* So they were not "already Christians" and started a movement later, and Mr. Myers is wrong, as usual. The "movement" was not a denomination, for no denomination was ever started by *moving to the Bible alone.* Denominations are started by moving away from the Bible into the field of human opinions. A man who does not know the difference between "taking the Bible as their only creed" and taking "the Bible as the *basis of it's creed;* i.e., as the *basis of its interpretations,*" as my opponent says "all Evangelical denominations" claim, is already "an object of laughter," if not an object of pity.

"DISBANDED? OR CHANGED NAMES?"

My friend is still unable to see the difference between dissolving the Springfield Presbytery and the burial of the dummy of "Old Man Depression" in the illustration he gave. I am sure I can state it so the reader will see the difference whether Mr. Myers can see it or not. The men who buried the dummy of "Old Man Depression" were not the men who started "Old Man Depression." As they were not the originators of "Old Man Depression" they did not have power to stop him. So the only thing they could do was to bury a dummy. But the men who dissolved the Springfield Presbytery were *the very same men* who started it; they had the power to start it, and they had the power to stop it. So it was not necessary for them to hold a fake funeral as did the men with "Old Man Depression," and I have shown from history where this organization "faded out of existence." But my opponent delivers himself after this fashion:

> "Now, if the organization itself was disbanded how could they decide to wear another name? Dead folks nor disbanded organizations need no other name."

TLC

Very well, Mr. Myers, but remember that the "folks" did not become "dead" when the "organization" was "disbanded." The "folks" who organized and disbanded the Springfield Presbytery continued as live, active beings after that dissolution had been accomplished, and having adopted the Bible as their only creed, these men—not the dead organization, but *these men*—"decided to wear no name but Christian." Since "candid and intelligent people know better than to swallow such tomfoolery" I am not uneasy about the intelligent reader swallowing the argument that my friend has tried to put over on this matter.

Our claim to "take the Bible as our only creed and to reject human creeds" he compares with the Russellite's claim to have no human churches but use "kingdom halls" made of "the same brick and cement." No doubt that their "kingdom halls" are made of "the same brick and cement" as church buildings. But does Mr. Myers mean to say that "human opinions" are "the same brick and cement" as the word of God itself? That is the position his illustration commits him to. Talk about a man claiming his "personal interpretations are as correct as the infallible word of God"—that is exactly what my friend has done in this case, for according to his illustration, human creeds and the word of God are made of "the same brick and cement."

But he says that we have our interpretations and do more than read the Bible in our services, and that Porter, "like all others will proceed to explain what he thinks the text means." A certain kind of explanation is certainly permissible, and I have never claimed that no explanation can be given. God's will is addressed to us in words we can comprehend, and we can certainly understand the meaning of those words. Otherwise it would not be a revelation. Concerning Ezra and his assistants it is said in Neh. 8:8: "So they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." But if they had "given their opinions" instead of "giving the sense," that form of interpretation would have been condemned. In other words, Paul said in Rom. 5:1 that we are "justified by faith." It would certainly be permissible

TLC

to tell an audience the meaning of the term "justified," if they did not know, as well as the meaning of the word "faith." But if I should go beyond that and *interpret* the statement to mean "justified by faith *only*," thus contradicting a plain statement of the Bible in Jas. 2:24, and adding a definite thought to the passage that is not there, such human interpretation would stand condemned before God. In 1 Pet. 3:21 Peter said: "Baptism doth also now save us." It would certainly be allowable to explain the meaning of "baptism," "save," or any of the words here contained. But if I *interpret* the passage to mean that "baptism doth *not* save us," thus contradicting the statement of Peter, I am resorting to human opinions instead of the word of God. So be assured of the fact that if the meaning of a text is so obscure that I must give what I "think" it means, no one is ever required to subscribe to my opinion—what I think about it.

TRIBUTES TO ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

At this point, as well as later in his affirmative, Mr. Myers refers to Alexander Campbell as a "clerical wiseacre." The word "wiseacre" simply means a "simpleton" or a "dunce." Compare this with some tributes to Mr. Campbell paid by great men of his time.

Henry Clay said of him: "Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability."

James Madison, once President of the U. S., said: "I regard him as the ablest and most original expounder of the Scriptures I have ever heard."

Jeremiah Sullivan Black, Attorney General of the U. S., said: "These are proof of intellectuality and moral force with which only a few of the children of men have been gifted."

General Robert E. Lee, a great military genius said: "A man who, if he had been delegated as a representative of his species to one of the many superior worlds, would have suggested a grand idea of the human race."

George D. Prentice, Editor of Louisville Journal, said: "His intellect, it is scarcely too much to say, is among the clearest, richest, profoundest ever vouchsafed to man."

TLC

The Cincinnati Chronicle, relative to his debate with Owen, said: "He is undoubtedly a man of fine talents, and equally fine attainments. With an acute, vigorous mind, quick perception, and rapid powers of combination, he has sorely puzzled his antagonist."

But B. Sunday Myers calls him a "clerical wiseacre."

I would simply ask the reader to compare the productions of Alexander Campbell with those of my opponent and decide for yourself. Read the twelve hour speech that he delivered during his debate with the great infidel Robert Owen, compare it with any production that ever came from the pen or tongue of my opponent, and then decide for yourself if B. Sunday Myers is competent to dispose of Alexander Campbell as a mere "clerical wiseacre"—a simpleton or dunce.

HIS ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS ON PERSONAL INTERPRETATIONS

1. "Are human creeds acceptable to God?" He answers: "Yes, if they propagate moral truth." Well, did Campbell's interpretations "propagate moral truth"? If not, what was immoral about them? Please answer these!

2. "Will God accept one man's personal interpretations in preference to another's?" He answers: "Yes, because some interpretations allow sin in the life." What do you mean by this? Do you mean that God's word teaches that it is impossible to sin?

3. "If all human creeds—personal interpretations—are not acceptable to God, how can you determine whose is?" He answers: "By letting God be the Judge." Well, how can you find that out? Where do you ascertain God's judgment? Has he revealed it in his word? You say one cannot take the word of God itself but must use his interpretation of it. So you would have to judge according to your interpretation, and, therefore, Myers becomes the judge instead of God. Or does God make known his judgment some other way? Be sure to tell us about this. I doubt that you will.

TLC

4. "If all human creeds—personal interpretations—are acceptable to God, then would it be possible for God to condemn a man for believing and practicing error?" He answers by citing Peter's attitude toward the Gentiles. I suppose he means by this that God would not condemn a man for error. If that is not what he meant, then why give this case? But after "God enlightened him" suppose Peter had refused to preach to the Gentiles? Would he still have been acceptable to God? God has already enlightened us in his word. So if we rebel against his word, no consolation can be found in the case of Peter. It is here that my opponent complains because I refer to him as "Mr." and as "my friend." Verily "the legs of the lame are unequal." In his third affirmative he called me "Mr. Porter" no less than ten times. And in his first affirmative he called me "Mr." more than once, even before I had written a word of this debate. But if he is not a "Mr.," I shall be glad to cease calling him that. And if he is not "my friend," let him say so, and I'll refrain from addressing him thus. But I refrain from calling any man "brother" who has not met the simple requirements that make one a member of God's family.

ON DENOMINATIONS

1. "Are all denominations human institutions?" He says: "Emphatically not." That is strange. He tells us in his second affirmative that different denominations are the "fruit of personal interpretations and human opinions diverse from others." If denominations are the "fruit" of "human opinions," why would they not be human institutions? Do "human opinions" result in "divine institutions"? I demand that you answer. You have contradicted yourself again—you can't hold to both statements. So clear up the matter for us.

2. "Are all denominations acceptable to God?" He evaded this by saying that "the truth propagated by all denominations is acceptable." I did not ask that. All "the truth" can be had independent of all denominations. You know that you did not answer the question—"Are all denominations acceptable?" The reader will expect an answer. But he says that "every individual in every denom-

TLC

ination who has true faith in Christ is accepted. (Acts 10:35)." But he gave the wrong reference. Acts 10:35 does not say that. It says that "in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Peter said: "In every *nation*." Mr. Myers says: "In every *denomination*." Do you think the two words mean the same? Then take your choice.

3. "If not, how can you determine which are?" He refuses to answer this and tries to tell you what I am trying to make him admit. But he is wrong as usual.

4. "Can one be a Christian and belong to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination?" He answers: "Yes." So keep this in mind—we will have use for it later.

"QUESTIONS COMPLETELY IGNORED"

1. I asked him the meaning of the word "heart" in the Bible. He says "it wouldn't help" me any if he answered. So he did not answer. But he did say that "Campbell substituted intellectual faith for spiritual faith." Do you mean that "spiritual faith" is not "intellectual"? I challenge you to answer. He also said that he substituted "spirituality for legalism" and "supernatural realities for metaphysical dogmata." It looks to me that such would be a good substitution; so if Campbell did that, you should commend him. I am of the opinion that he said the very reverse of what he intended to say. He was so rattled that he could not think straight long enough to write down what he intended.

2. "Since 'Campbell and his followers had no organization as yet'—in 1831—how did a denomination originate in his interpretations in 1801?" My friend complains—but that does not solve his difficulty. But he tries to explain by referring to the two movements. He says: "One of these movements was the 'Springfield Presbytery' organized by Stone in the 'Cane Ridge Revival' in 1801." And: "Another of these movements was Alexander Campbell's group that followed him out of the Presbyterian and Baptist churches." At last he has admitted that Campbell had no connection with the Cane Ridge Revival and no denomination origi-

TLC

nated in his "personal interpretations" there. Thank you, Mr. Myers; I thought you would give it up eventually. So it was Stone—not Campbell—who was connected with that revival. So those who "followed Campbell" did not follow him from the Cane Ridge Revival. But my friend blunders again. He said the "Springfield Presbytery was organized by Stone in 1801." This was another "insignificant mistake," I presume, for it was not organized till 1803. It seems that my friend cannot keep anything straight.

3. As to what church of Christ uses the "Christian System" as a creed, he says 10,000 of them do. But his assertion lacks proof. There is teaching in the "Christian System" to which no church of Christ on earth subscribes. Furthermore, let him name one doctrine taught by the church of Christ that originated with Campbell. I challenge him to do it. But I have challenged before without any results.

Answering questions 4 and 5 concerning the two official creeds Mr. Myers says: "When Campbell and Stone visited each other in 1824, then and there the two denominations were betrothed; and in 1831 . . . were happily married." What predicaments a false teacher will get into! The "two denominations" were "betrothed" in 1824, but he has already told us that in 1831 "Campbell had no organization as yet." Was Campbell's "denomination" betrothed seven years *before it was born?* It was, according to my opponent. He tells us now that the "two denominations" were married in 1831, but formerly he told us that Campbell had no denomination in 1831 and decided "to join Bro. Stone's denomination." I suppose he will call these "silly quibbles." But the reader can see his self-contradictions—and my friend sees them too. He will try to raise a smoke screen by shouting "silly quibbles" but he will *never try to clear up* the contradictions. Watch and see.

"DENOMINATIONALISM DISCOVERED"

He claims we cannot lay the blame for the "General Organization of Churches," as mentioned by Kurfees, on the Christian Church, for "this general organization was

TLC

established above fifty years before the schism over instrumental music. Moreover, when the church split it was not over this 'general organization of churches'." This statement he puts in capital letters for emphasis, but it reveals his lack of information. In 1849 the convention organized the American Christian Missionary Society—this was the organization—as restoration history shows. There had been opposition before to such organizations, and immediately following 1849 the opposition became intense, and when the split came this organization principle was a major issue comparable to instrumental music. When he says the division was not over this he reveals his ignorance of the whole affair. Furthermore, this was not fifty years before the division. Just another of his "insignificant mistakes," I suppose.

A DEBATE WITH BREWER

My friend started a debate with Porter in which he took the affirmative on this question. But midway in his third affimative he evidently decided he could do a better job of debating if he could change opponents and positions. So he turned away from his affirmative with Porter and started a debate with G. C. Brewer. He puts Bro. Brewer into the affirmative and he takes the negative as he starts a "review" of Bro. Brewer's booklet: "Is The Church of Christ A Denomination?" He quotes a definition of a denomination, as given by Partyman in the booklet, and says: "Mr. Brewer accepts his definition, but proceeds to prove in the light of it that his is not a denomination." If men were engaged in an oral debate, a man might misunderstand his opponent and unintentionally misrepresent him. But when the matter is in printed form, right before his eyes, there is no excuse for such a misrepresentation. Brewer *did not accept that definition.* On page 18, just following Partyman's definition, Brewer said: "Bro. Partyman's representation is not quite true to facts." Then he proceeds to point out some of its defects. All of this is in black and white right in connection with the definition that my opponent quoted. Yet in the face of it he said: "Mr. Brewer accepts his definition." Mr. Myers, did you delib-

TLC

erately misrepresent that in order to "bamboozle and hoodwink" the reader? Did you think you could get by with a thing like that? Furthermore, you say that "the Church of Christ seems to accept Partyman's definition." The Church of Christ accepts no such thing—and Brewer did not accept it. You have misrepresented the whole set-up. But we will take a look at your "review" and see if you have done any better with Brewer than you have with Porter. And remember that a thing that proves too much proves nothing. I shall number the points as Mr. Myers numbered them.

1. "Does my opponent belong to a distinct body or party of religious people?" He refers to our "Church Directory" to prove that we do. So his conclusion is that we are a denomination. But the apostles, in the New Testament, belonged "to a distinct body of religious people." Therefore, the New Testament church was a denomination. Will Mr. Myers accept this conclusion?

2. "Are they separate and distinct from other religious bodies?" He proves that we are and then decides we are a denomination. But the Lord's churches in the New Testament were "separate and distinct from other religious bodies." Hence, they composed a denomination. But my friend denies it. In this connection, as he has often done, he charges us with being on a par with the Roman Catholic Pope and his interpretations. But it is Mr. Myers who parallels the Pope. Catholics say: "God never intended for the Bible to be the Christian's rule of faith, but we must have the church's interpretation of the Bible." Mr. Myers said in his second affirmative that no man can take the Bible as his creed "because a man's creed is his personal interpretations of the Bible and not the Bible itself." My opponent, therefore, is the man who, like the Pope of Rome, substitutes his interpretations for the word of God.

3. "Do they own property and carry on religious enterprises, educational, charitable, and missionary?" He refers to "forty periodicals" and "17 educational institutions" which he claims are owned by the church of Christ. Not a word of this is true, however. But if the question

TLC

is to be answered in the affirmative, we must compose a denomination. Well, the New Testament church carried on religious enterprises, educational (1 Cor. 14), charitable (Acts 11:27-30), and missionary (Phil. 4:15, 16). Therefore, the New Testament church, according to my opponent, was a denomination.

4. "Is there such a thing as taking the churches of Christ in the aggregate?" He appealed to "Church Directory" again and to a statement by Bro. Hicks in which he used "the church" to include 10,000 congregations. This proves, he thinks, that we are a denominaton. In Eph. 5:25 Paul used the term "the church" in the sense of the aggregate—"Christ loved *the church* and gave himself for it." This certainly did not refer to some particular local congregation. Paul's language proves, according to the affirmative, that the New Testament church was a denomination.

5. "Do they have a collective connection?" Bro. Brewer said: "They have no collective connection." Bro. Hicks speaks of the churches being "conscious of the ties between them." So my opponent tries to throw them into conflict. But if he succeeded, would that prove we are a denomination? If they have no "collective connection," how could there be "ties between them"? We often sing: "Blest be the tie that binds." I wonder if Mr. Myers thinks that is an organizational connection. Congregations are tied together by their common interest in lost souls. But so were the New Testament churches. Phil 4:15, 16. Does this prove that they composed a denomination?

6. "Do they have an organic union?" He refers to the Cincinnati Convention of 1849. But this has already been exploded. He challenges me to deny that this was more than fifty years before the church split. I emphatically deny it and demand the proof.

7. "Is each congregation separate and independent?" He gives a lengthy dissertation on the congregational form of government. If this proves that we are denominational, then the New Testament church was, for it had a congregational form of government, Acts 20:28. My friends says:

TLC

"Denominationalism is not determined by a certain form of church government." Then why did he introduce this point to prove the church of Christ is a denomination? The quotation from Kerschner that no form of government is "mandatory upon Christians" is of no value, for he belongs to the Christian Church. And his statement is not true.

8. "Do their officials answer only to Christ?" Here he tries to throw Bro. Brewer into conflict with himself. It is said that "misery loves company," and my opponent has been in conflict with himself so much in this discussion, that he hopes to get Bro. Brewer for company. But suppose he succeeded. Would that prove that the church of Christ is a denomination? It seems that my opponent has forgotten what he is to try to prove.

"WHAT IF?"

He proposes to give us "the longest end of the rope" and agree that we have congregational independence. "In this case," he says, "each local congregation would be a denomination all of its own." We would, therefore, compose "a denomination of denominations." And this, he says, "is going from bad to worse." Again this proves too much. New Testament churches were independent congregations. Therefore they composed "a denomination of denominations." This must be "going from worse to worst."

"DESIGN"

When we try to prove we are not a denomination our design is, according to Mr. Myers, "to confuse the spiritual aspect of the church with the literal." He further says: "The spiritual aspect of the church is an 'organism,' consisting of every saved soul of all ages: while the literal organization upon earth is broken up into many local bodies." Since the local bodies are literal and "upon earth," will he tell us where the "spiritual aspect" is located? He talks about the "Bible doctrine of the mystical body of Christ." It would help his cause to give some proof from the Bible for his "mystical idea." A mere assertion does him no good.

TLC

ANOTHER QUESTION IGNORED

I asked my friend this question: "Is it possible for a group of men to get to the New Testament church—either backward or forward—without establishing a denomination?" And "if so, how can it be accomplished?" He sidestepped this in his second affirmative. I promised not to let him forget it. So this is a reminder. Mr. Myers, are you afraid of it? If not, please tell us about it. The reader is wondering why you said nothing about it. Are you going to let him continue to wonder? Your suffering cause is begging for you to do something with this question. Will you again be as silent as the voiceless dead? We await with interest your answer.

A FEW MORE QUESTIONS

1. Were the apostles of Christ members of any denomination?

2. When people obeyed the gospel, as taught by the apostles, did that make them members of a denomination?

3. What additional steps would have been necessary to make them members of a denomination?

4. If people now should do just what the gospel requires—no more and no less—would that make them members of a denomination?

5. Since you say that denominations are the result of human opinions, would not one have to go beyond or stop short of gospel teaching in order to belong to a denomination?

6. What doctrines are taught by the church of Christ that originated with Barton W. Stone, Thomas or Alexander Campbell?

These questions are vital to the issue. The reader will expect my opponent to answer.

ANOTHER "WHAT IF?"

In the second chapter of Acts we are told that the apostle Peter preached the crucified and risen Redeemer to

TLC

the world. His preaching pierced the hearts of the hearers, and they cried out: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" V. 37. In V. 38 Peter told them to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Some three thousand of them did that, according to V. 41. And these were added to the church by the Lord. V. 47. By this simple obedience to the gospel they became Christians—they were made members of the Lord's church, but they were not members of any denomination. If they were, let my friend tell us which denomination. As members of the Lord's church, being altogether undenominational, they continued steadfastly in their worship to God. V. 41. They worshipped as members of the church of the Lord but not as members of any denomination. I ask Mr. Myers to tell us if this course was acceptable to God. But *what if* two denominational preachers, a Baptist and a Methodist, appeared upon the scene—though there were no such things then. Each of them presented a plea for the Christians to join his denomination. Suppose one thousand of them followed the Baptist rules and joined the Baptist denomination; one thousand of them followed the Methodist rules and joined the Methodist denomination; but the other one thousand decided to remain just as they were. In this state they continued to worship God as they had done. While they are distinct from the other two groups who pulled away and joined denominations, they themselves do not compose a denomination. If they are denominational now just because the other two groups pulled away, why would not the whole group of three thousand be denominational to start with? Will my friend tell us to what denomination this thousand belonged after the other two thousand pulled away? The course followed by this last thousand is the course followed by the church of Christ today. We have simply obeyed the gospel as preached by Peter on Pentecost, without subscribing to any denominational rules. If such did not make men on the day of Pentecost members of a denomination, it does not make men so today. When we did what they did, we became exactly what they became, and were added to the church to which they were added. Therefore, the church of Christ is not a denomination, and my friend is wrong.

TLC

MYERS' FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

A Modern Jehudi Act

Mr. Porter's negativism is a modern Jehudi act. He does with my statements exactly what he does with God's word—he cuts them with a penknife. He lifts out of the sentence a few words with the design of misrepresenting. Such is gross pandering to deceive. He is quite subjected to caviling. His catachresis is a paltering haggle. His argument is a chaffering, a bent to bandy idle talk, and will thoroughly satisfy you if you live on punk and quibble. The negative says,

> "I am not defending any man—I am merely defending that principle."

But I say, it looks to me as though he is trying to defend the Campbells, ninety percent of his arguments are in defense of them. I quote again:

> "Mr. Myers now admits that Kurfees did not say that the Campbells 'inaugurated' the Movement at the Cane Ridge Revival in 1801."

This is a typical Jehudi act. I did not say that Kurfees designated the time and place; but Kurfees did say,

> "It was inaugurated in the early part of the 19th century by Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, Walter Scott, and others." (In "The Need of Continued Emphasis On The Restoration of the Ancient Order," pages 26-27)

The best argument the opponent has is a little "hide and seek game" on the place and exact time. He prevaricates on the non-essential part. His arguments are quite pusillanimous, and make depressed reading.

On page 2, Brother Porter denies that the men who started "his movement" were already Christians when they started it. I quote:

> "Did I say that these men were 'already Christians'? . . . . So they were *NOT* 'already Christians' and started a movement later, and Mr. Myers is wrong, as usual."

TLC

What an awful predicament the opponent is in. He tells us in the above quotation that the men who started his denomination were still sinners when they started it. We are getting down to facts now—facts that reveals why the so-called Church of Christ denies every fundamental doctrine in the Gracious Economy, it was inaugurated by men who were not even born of God's Spirit. He tells us that Stone was converted nine years after the movement started. He informs us that the Campbells were already in the "movement" three years before their conversion. What a monstrosity! He says,

> "The 'movement' was not a denomination for no denomination was ever started by *moving to the Bible alone.*"

But I say, It must be a denomination, a human denomination, because it was started, as Mr. Kurfees says, "by men in the early part of the 19th century," and Friend Porter says, "The men who started it were not yet Christians." It all amounts to this—a group of sinners started a religious movement, and had the unmitigated audacity to call it the Lord's church. What a monstrosity! At this juncture I wish to give the reader a quotation from the "Gospel Advocate," issue of December 9th, 1897. The "Gospel Advocate" is one of the most popular journals in Mr. Porter's denomination. It is published in Nashville, Tennessee. This quotation I am about to give will furnish intelligence of the miserable predicament of the opponent concerning the conversion of Alexander Campbell in relation to his human denomination. This quotation is the result of a burning argument between two factions in Mr. Porter's church. The leaders in these two factions were one T. R. Burnett and Mr. A. McGary. The quotation is as follows:

> "Now, let us observe the sad predicament of Mr. McGary. He denies that Alexander Campbell was in the church while with the Baptists, but left the Baptists and 'moved along a straight gospel line till he got there.' If Campbell was not made a Christian and baptized into the church of Christ when he was baptized into a Baptist church by a Baptist preacher he was never in the Church of Christ. All 'the moving along a gospel

TLC

line' Campbell ever did was the move he made in order to get into a Baptist church, He repented, believed, confessed, and was baptized into a Baptist Church, and when he left it and started to the McGary's sort of 'Church of Christ,' he went all the way and landing into it without obeying one iota of Gospel truth from the time he left the Baptist till he hit the 'objective point.'

"Alexander Campbell got into the church of Christ," says Mr. Burnett, "by being baptized into a Baptist church by Brother Luce, a Baptist preacher, or he never got into it at all as he was never baptized after starting from a Baptist church to what Mr. McGary calls the church of Christ. If he ever landed in any sort of church after starting from the Baptists, he landed there without baptism into it. Mr. McGary says in another answer that: 'Alexander Campbell and others had to get up a movement away from the Baptist church to be saved.' Then he was not saved when he left the Baptists, and as he never repented, believed, confessed, or was baptized afterward, he was a sinner. 'McGary doesn't know a sheep from a goat, and thinks that a lot of the devil's goats had authority to set up the church of Jesus Christ and administer its ordinances. Bah'!"

We have here in this quotation certain facts concerning the baptism, and salvation of Alexander Campbell. Mr. Burnett, a Church of Christ Minister, is honest enough to admit the inconsistency and error of the whole denomination concerning baptism and denominationalism. Campbell baptized by Brother Luce into the Baptist interpretation of the Christian system. Came out of the Baptist church, and was never baptized afterward.

WAS CAMPBELL A TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST MINISTER?

DID CAMPBELL'S BAPTISM BY BROTHER LUCE, A BAPTIST PREACHER, COUNT AS REAL CHRISTIAN BAPTISM?

WAS CAMPBELL BAPTIZED BY A DENOMINATIONAL PREACHER? WAS BROTHER LUCE A TRULY SAVED MAN WHEN HE BAPTIZED CAMPBELL?

TLC

WOULD MY OPPONENT ACCEPT THE BAPTISM OF A BAPTIST PREACHER AS GENUINE CHRISTIAN BAPTISM?

Mr. McGary is not the only one that doesn't know a sheep from a goat; and he is not the only one that thinks the devil's goats has the authority to set up the church of Jesus Christ, my opponent tells us that the men who set up the "Reformatory Movement," and called it "the Church of Jesus Christ" were still sinners when they inaugurated it. Alas!

When I pressed the point of "personal interpretations," Mr. Porter says,

> "A certain kind of explanation is certainly permissible, and I have never claimed that no explanation can be given."

I say, Yes, this is right, and in those "certain explanations" is where Mr. Porter's denomination has its roots. Different denominations are born out of different interpretations and explanations, and when the men named in the proposition hatched up their certain explanations a new denomination took root in the earth.

If Mr. Porter is in the "body of Christ" he got there by a spiritual operation of God's grace in his soul. But Mr. Porter did not get into Campbell's sort of church of Christ by a spiritual work of grace upon the soul, but by adopting Campbell's "certain explanations." His entrance into the body of Christ was metaspiritual, his joining the so-called Church of Christ—his denomination—was metaphysical.

Concerning the disbanding of the SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY, the opponent says:

> "I have shown from history where this organization faded out of existence."

The opponent has shown no such thing. The history he used was the word of men who were trying to juggle away the point at issue just like he is doing. The history he used

TLC

proceeded from a group of men in his own denomination who were trying to do what Mr. Porter is doing—camouflage denominationalism. My word is as good as his. The history he used is furbish.

Opponent says,

> "These men—not the dead organization, but these men, decided to wear no name but Christian."

Does my opponent think people have swapped their head off for green gourds? In this trifling quibble he jumps from the thought of a "denominational name," to a "human name," that is, a name used to identify them as a person. Surely any bumpkin can understand that the name "CHRISTIAN" was adopted to identify their religious system. They sectarianized the name "CHRISTIAN."

ANSWERING HIS QUESTIONS

1. *DID CAMPBELL'S INTERPRETATIONS PROPAGATE MORAL TRUTH?*—Some of them did, the Russellites teach some good things.

2. *WHERE DO YOU ASCERTAIN GOD'S JUDGEMENT?—HAS HE REVEALED IT IN HIS WORD?* Yes, but not in Mr. Curtis Porter's personal interpretations of God's word. The Pope of Rome justified his crimes with the Scriptures.

3. *IF DENOMINATIONS ARE THE FRUIT OF HUMAN OPINIONS, WHY WOULD THEY NOT BE HUMAN INSTITUTIONS?*—I answer, some of them no doubt are human institutions: this is the reason why I denounce the so-called Church of Christ as a human institution.

4. *ARE ALL DENOMINATIONS ACCEPTABLE TO GOD?*—He demands a clear cut answer, so here it is: "No, not all of them, because some of them have denied the basic and fundamental experience of regeneration and adopted the human opinion of 'baptismal remission'."

5. *LET HIM NAME ONE DOCTRINE TAUGHT BY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST THAT ORIGINATED WITH CAMPBELL?*—I answer: The Bible church of Christ does

TLC

not *teach any doctrine* that originates with Campbell. The Bible church of Christ was founded MANY CENTURIES before Campbell founded his denominational Church of Christ.

I can name some human opinions that are taught by Mr. Curtis Porter. For example he says of 1 Peter 3:21, "If I interpret the passage to mean that baptism doth *not* save us . . . I am resorting to human opinions instead of to the word of God." In other words Mr. Porter says he would be adding the word "not." Now reader watch this, Mr. Porter tells us that baptism here means "water baptism." He adds the word "water." What is the difference in adding the word "water" and the word "not"? If the Bible doesn't mention other baptisms than water I will concede the argument.

6. *IF ALL HUMAN CREEDS—PERSONAL INTERPRETATIONS—ARE ACCEPTABLE TO GOD, THEN WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE FOR GOD TO CONDEMN A MAN FOR BELIEVING AND PRACTICING ERROR?—* I have never said that *ALL* creeds and personal interpretations are acceptable to God. A church might condone false doctrine and yet have individual members in it that are pure and holy: and these are the ones that constitute the "body of Christ," the church. Like Roman Catholicism Mr. Porter is trying to locate "the body of Christ" in a certain visible organization.

7. *I ASK HIM THE MEANING OF THE WORD "HEART" IN THE BIBLE?— HE DID NOT ANSWER.* The question is not germane, but just to satisfy the opponent I will tell him what his heart is. Your heart is your spirit, your immortal self, filling your whole body. It is this part that fell utterly in the garden of Eden. The body did not fall utterly, as in that case Adam would have fell dead in his tracks. Nor did the physical mind fall utterly, as in that case Adam would have become an idiot. Now upon this residuum of body and mind surviving the fall the devil has built gigantic systems of materialistic and intellectual religion, which are nothing but greased planks to

TLC

hell being utterly destitute of Divine life. The doctrine of "baptismal remission" is a typical example.

The opponent wants to know if "spiritual faith is not intellectual?" It most certainly is, but "intellectual faith is not spiritual" because the devil himself "believes and trembles."

My opponent and his "system makers" try to make man's physical mind and his spirit mind one and the same thing. This demonstrates their trend toward legalism and materialistic infidelity. Mark the difference: "As a man thinks in his heart so is he." If he thinks in his heart to steal he is a thief before God. But a man can think on stealing from a metaphysical standpoint all day and not be condemned of God as a thief. Mr. Porter talks as though he doesn't know that man has a soul, an inner spirit.

As touching the way I used the word "substituted" I gladly admit that it is a grammatical error, and since these are subject to correction I thank you for calling my attention to it. But the fun you made of it only exhibits your lack of scholarly balance, and genuine material to support your position.

8. *WERE THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST MEMBERS OF ANY DENOMINATION?* I answer: Yes, "denominate" means "to identify by a certain name." "They were called CHRISTIANS first at Antioch." This name identified them and distinguished them from JUDAISM. Jesus Christ organized this great denomination of CHRISTIANITY. And about 1800 years later Barton Warren Stone, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell and others organized them a "REFORMATORY MOVEMENT" and they called it "the exclusive church of Christ." Their claim is a perfect humbug, a human ipsi dixit, that proves nothing but Popish bigotry.

9. *WHEN PEOPLE OBEYED THE GOSPEL, AS TAUGHT BY THE APOSTLES, DID THAT MAKE THEM MEMBERS OF A DENOMINATION?*— I answer "yes, but not one like Stone and the Campbells started."

TLC

10. *IF PEOPLE NOW SHOULD DO JUST WHAT THE GOSPEL REQUIRES—NO MORE AND NO LESS —WOULD THAT MAKE THEM MEMBERS OF A DENOMINATION?*—I answer: Yes, God's denomination —"the body of Christ"—but not a human denomination like the one Mr. Porter belongs to.

11. *SINCE YOU SAY THAT DENOMINATIONS ARE THE RESULT OF HUMAN OPINIONS, WOULD NOT ONE HAVE TO GO BEYOND OR STOP SHORT OF GOSPEL TEACHING IN ORDER TO BELONG TO A DENOMINATION?*—I answer: He would if he joined one like Barton Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell set up.

12. *WHAT DOCTRINES ARE TAUGHT BY THE CHURCH OF CHRIST THAT ORIGINATED WITH BARTON W. STONE, THOMAS OR ALEXANDER CAMPBELL?*—Since the opponent teaches that the church in the Bible is identified by many different names and titles will he allow me to re-arrange his question to read like this: WHAT DOCTRINES ARE TAUGHT BY *THE KINGDOM OF GOD* THAT ORIGINATED WITH STONE AND THE CAMPBELLS? I answer—NONE! If he should ask what doctrines taught by Campbell that did not originate in Jesus Christ, I will answer by saying—1. the doctrine of baptismal remission; 2. the doctrine that denies Revelation 20:6 which literally says the first resurrection will reign with Christ a thousand years; 3. the doctrine that says, "Christian baptism was not instituted before Pentecost"; 4. the doctrine that says, "The church was organized on the day of Pentecost"; 5. the doctrine that says, "Miraculous phenomena ceased in the church with the completion of the New Testament"; 6. the doctrine that says, "The Holy Spirit does not now operate tangibly and miraculously upon the soul of man in regeneration"; 7. the doctrine that says, "Only the twelve apostles received Holy Ghost Baptism on the day of Pentecost"; 8. the doctrine that says, "Holy Spirit baptism ceased upon Cornelius and his household"; 9. the doctrine that says, "The Bible does not teach inbred sin." All these doctrines are taught by Campbell and his "system makers."

TLC

GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES OR CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY?

Was the AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY a "general organization of churches"? Is there no difference in a GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES and a MISSIONARY SOCIETY instituted in that organization?

My opponent does not deny that they established "a general organization of churches," but he wants me to call that "GENERAL ORGANIZATION" by the name AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY. I can't help what he names it, Mr. Kurfees, a prominent minister in his own "Brotherhood," says it is "A GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES UNDER A GENERAL BOARD OF OVERSEERS AND MANAGERS." And I say again, the division was over "instrumental music."

THE DEBATE WITH BREWER

He makes a funny remark about me changing opponents. I didn't change opponents, I simply incorporated Brother Brewer for the purpose of helping the opponent—Mr. Brewer's arguments are so much better, and Brother Porter needs help, his Diana is in grave danger.

1. He says, "The apostles, in the New Testament, belonged to a distinct body of religious people. Therefore, the New Testament church was a denomination."

Well, here my opponent says the church in the Bible is a denomination. I may say—Since he claims to belong to no denomination this puts him out of the New Testament Church. And now we know perfectly who dropped "Sam boo" in the well.

2. He says, "Catholics say, 'God never intended for the Bible to be the Christian's rule of faith, but we must have the church's interpretation of the Bible'."

This is exactly Mr. Porter's position, he proposes his "certain explanations," as he called them, and then if others don't believe like him he says they do not belong to Christ's

TLC

church. Such papistical humbuggery is paradoxical in the extreme.

3. Is there such a thing as taking the churches of Christ in the aggregate?

Mr. Porter says, "In Ephesians 5:25 Paul used the term 'the church' in the sense of the aggregate."

Mr. Brewer says in his book—"In the first place, there is no such thing as 'taking the churches of Christ in the aggregate'." See here, we have two of their biggest preachers, one saying you can't take the churches of Christ in the aggregate, the other saying you can. Who shall we believe, Porter or Brewer? As for me I will believe neither. The opponent was run into a corner, and when he could not find a logical answer he run and stuck his head in the sand like that old silly bird and thinks he is hid. He run to a Bible reference of THE BODY OF CHRIST and tried to camouflage his churchism. Punk!

4. Notice again, when I used Mr. Brewer's denial that the Churches of Christ have no collective connection, Brother Porter takes issue with Brewer again and uses Phil. 4:15, 16 to prove that they do have a collective connection. Again he tries to hide his churchism under a Bible text. Mr. Brewer used seven things to prove that they are not a denomination, but along comes his Brother Porter and tries to prove that all seven of these things are taught in the Bible. Prattle-gabble-twaddle-bosh.

5. On my 6th point, Do they have an organic union? I gave positive proof that they recognized "a general organization of churches" in the Cincinnati Convention. But the opponent says, "This has already been exploded." But I say, He shot a boy's cap-buster which made plenty of noise, and that's all.

6. He denies that the split came fifty years after the "General Organization." He proves his point by showing that it happened about 43 years after. Well, 43 years is a long time, *isn't it?* The little difference in the time element will have very little bearing on the candid reader.

TLC

7. He also denies that the split was over music, but in his first letter, page 10, he says, "But in the division over instrumental music, the group which remained on original New Testament ground remained undenominational." I would be actually ashamed to make such plain contradictions.

A QUESTION FOR MR. PORTER

In "Restoration History," page 24, under caption, "UNION WITH THE CAMPBELLS" we read: "In 1831 . . . the two men and their followers got together at Lexington, Kentucky, and agreed to unite." Mr. Porter tells us in his third letter that Stone was converted in 1807, and the Campbells in 1812. This means that they and their followers were christians (and consequently already in the church by virtue of their conversion) nineteen years before "THESE TWO MEN AND THEIR GROUPS UNITED." Here is the question—"SINCE THEY WERE ALREADY IN CHRIST'S CHURCH AND CONSEQUENTLY ALREADY UNITED IN SPIRIT AND FELLOWSHIP WHY DID THEY GET TOGETHER AND AGREE TO UNITE IN SOMETHING ELSE?"

A QUESTION MR. PORTER FAILED TO TOUCH

1. DO THEIR OFFICIALS ANSWER ONLY TO CHRIST?—My opponent's "Brotherhood" incessantly from their pulpits condemn what they call, "Higher officials in the denominational world." Their claim is that their Ministers answer only to Christ. In my third letter I proved beyond reasonable doubt that this was a ridiculous empty show. They have what they call "the elderhood." These Elders they invest with the highest authority in church government. These elders represent the local congregation, and my opponent teaches that their "church officials" answer only to Christ; but in the same breath he turns and admits that they "must satisfy the local congregation always that they perform their Scriptural functions." He condemns others for answering to high officials, and turns right around in the same breath and admits that he answers to men in his local congregation. I say again, "What if the devil should get into the local congregation, as most surely

TLC

he does at times, and begin to exact measures not quite Scriptural?—WOULD MR. PORTER THEN BE ANSWERING ONLY TO CHRIST? I suppose if he revolted against his "elderhood" he would be denounced as an heretic. I say again, "When he says he answers only to Christ he invests the local congregation and the Elders with the exact authority of Jesus Christ, and this is Popish and Papistical bigotry. Mr. Porter's church is as full of human opinions as a pup is fleas.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR THE OPPONENT

My opponent claims his connection is not a denomination because it follows the New Testament examples verbatim. I have a few questions:

1. Does the opponent's church follow Acts 20:17-28? —Here it becomes clear that the office of the elder, bishop, and pastor was one; for there the apostle charges the elders of the church at Ephesus to feed (pastor) the church in which the Holy Ghost has made them bishops (cf. Tit. 1:5-7; First Peter 5:1-2).
2. The church at Cenchrea had a woman deacon (Romans 16:1). She carried on certain "church business" (verse 2). Can the opponent name the chapter, and the verse where women would cease to hold the same position as sister Phebe? Does the opponent's church have any women in it holding the same office as sister Phebe? If so, will he send me the names and addresses of two or three?
3. Does the opponent's connection call any of their officials "bishops?"—If so, will he send me the names and addresses of two or three?
4. In Acts 14:23 they ordained with prayer and fasting. Does the opponent's church follow this example? If so, will he send me the name and address of one elder they ordained with prayer and fasting?
5. When the Bible said they ordained elders in every

TLC

church, does that mean they were qualified to guide the local church in which they were ordained, or does it mean they were thus qualified to hold the Ministerial office elsewhere?—Give Bible proof please?

VERY IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR THE OPPONENT

1. If a church and its minister is spiritually dead, having heard the truth and failed to keep it—WOULD YOU CALL THAT CHURCH A DENOMINATION IF IT HAS FIVE SKY-BLUE CHRISTIANS IN IT?

2. Let us say, "In Birmingham, Alabama there is a church, a local organization, that has 100 members in its congregation which partakes of the Lord's supper every Lord's Day. 95 of these are in apostasy, with some of them holding a very false doctrine. The minister is not ignorant of this condition; in fact he himself is spiritually dead, he has turned from the truth as he first understood it. COULD THIS CHURCH HAVE FIVE TRUE CHRISTIANS IN IT THAT PARTAKES OF THE LORD'S SUPPER WITH THE OTHER PART OF THE CONGREGATION?—If this church can have five true Christians in it, WOULD YOU CALL IT "THE CHURCH OF CHRIST"?

3. Was John Wesley a true Church of Christ Minister?

4. Was Martin Luther a true Church of Christ Minister?

5. Can a minister preach that water baptism is not absolutely essential to initial salvation *in all cases* and yet be a true Church of Christ Minister?—If a Minister taught that it was not absolutely essential to the salvation of all men would he be a denom-

TLC

inational minister?—Would he go to hell in the event of death?

A REVIEW OF MR. KURFEES' ILLUSTRATION

In the three cornered controversy between Stranger, Partyman, and Brewer, we have a very amusing but fallacious illustration found on page 15. It is a suppositional illustration designed to prove that they are not a denomination, but instead of proving they are not it turns out to prove that they are, and why they are. I am willing enough to let this whole argument hang on this illustration. I am going to give the illustration and then review it. I quote: BREWER: "Let us suppose a case. The denominations of our town go into a union meeting. Let us suppose they secure some evangelist like Billy Sunday or Gypsy Smith. The purpose of this meeting is to convert people to Christ to make Christians, and then to allow them to join any denomination that they may choose. Now, let us suppose that the evangelist preaches a full gospel and that 500 people obey the gospel or become Christians. Now, after this meeting is over, let us suppose that these 500 Christians are gathered together under the union tabernacle, and all the preachers of town are there with cards for the people to sign, signifying their preference of denomination. Now, let us suppose that 50 of these Christians go into the Baptist church, according to the Baptist's way of receiving members. Seventy five of these Christians go into the Methodist church, take their vow, etc., and 100 of these Christians join the Presbyterian church. Thus these 225 new converts are not only separated from the other 275, but they are separated from each other by party names and doctrines. But now that band of 275 have no preference among the denominations, and they don't like to be divided, for they love each other. Therefore, they just decide to remain as Christians only and worship God together under that tabernacle, and to labor to get others to become Christians. Now, what denomination would that band of Christians belong to?"

STRANGER: "They would belong to one all their own."

TLC

Let me say with Stranger Baptist, "Yes, they made them a denomination of their own." Now, let me show you exactly where Mr. Brewer sidetracks the reader and leads him up a blind alley. When he said, "But now that band of 275 have no preference among the denominations." Let me say, they had no preference among the three denominations represented, the Baptist, the Methodist and the Presbyterian, but they did prefer a denomination which Mr. Brewer cunningly refuses to represent at the "CHURCH JOINING CAMPAIGN," and that denomination is Mr. Porter's church. They preferred to wait and join Mr. Brewer's denomination. You say, why didn't they join Mr. Brewer's denomination when the others joined the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterians? The answer is simple—there was no minister representing his church at the tabernacle. *Why didn't Mr. Brewer have a "Church of Christ Minister" at the Tabernacle to represent his system of interpretation?* He knew the 275 would do exactly what the other new converts did—join his denomination. Why did the 50 join the Baptist? Because they agreed with the Baptist's interpretation of the Christian system. Why did the 75 join the Methodists? Because they agreed with the Methodist's interpretation. Why did the 100 join the Presbyterians? Because they agreed with the Presbyterian's interpretation of the Christian system. And why did the other 275 wait and join Mr. Brewer's denomination? Simply because they believed Alexander Campbell's system of interpretations. Why smatter, juggle, and quibble?

Brother Brewer simply draws an illustrative picture of how new converts join the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, and leaves a group sitting there as if they never did join a denomination; but they did later join Mr. Brewer's denomination. How? By accepting his personal interpretations. "But they never did write their names on a church book," says Mr. Porter. What if they didn't? What difference would that make? I saw a chicken hawk once soar up and join a flock of ravens in their design of getting above a storm cloud. The hawk joined the ravens. Did he write his name on a book? No wonder God said, "Thy prophets are like foxes" (Ezekiel 13:4). Albert Batts

TLC

tells us why God calls them foxes. He said, "A fox has been known to run into a flock of sheep when being pursued by dogs, thus frustrating the flock, and then jump on the back of one running away in order to lose its track to the chasing hounds." All false prophets quibble, prevaricates, and hide behind their gnostic puns. They jump on a sheep's back and ride to safety.

Mr. Brewer's illustration is very incomplete. Let me finish it for him. He says, "That band of 275 have no preference among the denominations . . . therefore, they just decide to remain as Christians only and worship God together under that tabernacle."

Let us suppose that in the course of their scheduled worship under the tabernacle a certain minister begins to meet with them. I will call this minister Curtis W. Porter, for example. This minister is called upon to preach to this band of 275 Christians. Now, he does more than just read the letter of the Bible, he proceeds to interpret, to give "his certain explanations" of what he has read. And what are his interpretations? They are the interpretations of Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell. What happens? This band adopts this particular system of interpretations: and after doing so they say to the Minister, "We want to join your church?" Mr. Porter answers, "I have no church." They reply, "But you are the Minister of a church on such and such a street." "Yes," says Mr. Porter, "But that is not my church, it is God's church." "Well, we want to join your congregation, for we are in fellowship with your system of interpretations." Mr. Porter answers smilingly, "Good, but remember, we are not a denomination, and we have no church book on which to write your names; but we will be glad to fellowship you into the communion of the church next Lord's day."—Let me ask, "DID THESE 275 JOIN A DENOMINATION?" —Just as much so as those who joined the Baptist, Methodists, and Presbyterians. THEIR CONVERSION IN THE EVANGELISTIC CAMPAIGN DID NOT MAKE THEM MEMBERS OF BROTHER PORTER'S CONGREGA-

TLC

TION. NO, IT WAS THEIR ADOPTION OF BROTHER PORTER'S PERSONAL INTERPRETATIONS.

But really, do they have no church book? And do they not write the names of their converts? I challenge you to attend one of their meetings and watch their preacher write down the names of those converted to his particular system of interpretations. Of course if you were to ask him what he was doing, he would snatch a ready quibble, and say, "I'm not getting their names as members of my church, but as members of the Lord's church, and I must have their names and address so I may visit God's lambs and feed them."—This is exactly what other denominations do. Alas!

STRANGER BAPTIST JOINS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST DENOMINATION

Mr. Brewer's little catachresis is one of the world's most amusing quibbles. It illustrates how Partyman the Methodist is bias and intolerant toward the Church of Christ denomination, and never is converted. But Stranger Baptist, being bias at first, is wrought upon by Mr. Brewer's interpretations, accepts them finally, leaves the Baptist church and joins the Church of Christ denomination. But to hear Mr. Brewer tell it he never does join another church, but just remains a Christian only. However when the real facts are brought out he does no less than leave one denomination and join another. Here is the gist of the story:

> Stranger as a child is brought up in a Methodist home. His parents are devout Methodists. Stranger is not very concerned about his soul until the World War breaks out, and he is drafted, and begins to see service at the front. But when he looked death in the face—saw death all around—he became very seriously concerned about his soul. In the course of battle Stranger said, "I did not want to die unprepared, yet I did not know just how to prepare. I knew that Christian people prayed, and I knew they relied upon Christ to save—that they preached salvation in His name and through his merit. I wanted Him

TLC

and the assurance that He was my Saviour also. I did not know just how to approach him, or how to claim Him, but I prayed and I prayed with all my soul. I told the Lord that if He would be with me through those battles and spare my life to get back home, I would give all the rest of my life to His service. I repeated this every day and almost every minute during a battle."

So God spares Stranger and he comes back home with the solemn intent to carry out his vows to God. He begins to study his Bible, and learns about baptism from the New Testament, but the problem of who should baptize him arose. His parents wanted him to join the Methodist church, but he could not believe in sprinkling, infant baptism, and other things the Methodists taught. So he begins going to the Baptist church. He talks to the Baptist minister, and he informs Stranger that he was truly converted in France when he called upon the Lord with all of his soul. But Stranger informs him that God did not forgive him when he called upon him with all of his soul, but felt that he must be baptized in order to receive remission of sins. So the Baptist preacher is perfectly willing to baptize him, notwithstanding this was a slight deviation from the Baptist's belief in general.

Said Stranger to Mr. Brewer, "The preacher who baptized me always ask, 'Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and do you now take Him as your personal Saviour?' I certainly could say yes to that question." Then said Brewer: "And that, with your repentance qualified you for baptism." Said Stranger, "I had believed and repented in France and I had been praying ever since my first day at the front. I had quit everything that I knew to be wrong. and I was doing everything I knew to be right. I knew I had to be baptized, therefore I searched for a man to baptize me just as the New Testament teaches it. And I found him."

Then said Brewer, "Your case is similar to Saul's. Acts 9. You need nothing more in reference to baptism. You did all that the Lord requires in that commandment." Stranger: "Will your brethren accept me?"

TLC

Brewer: "I do not belong to any party into which anyone is accepted by vote of the members. I belong only to the church of the Lord and my Brethren are his humble followers. The Lord himself made the law of pardon or the terms of entrance into his body—the church. You have obeyed these. You are already in the church—the only institution of which we are members. But you are affiliated with a denomination. You are in a party and you wear a party name. You know that this denomination is not mentioned in the Bible, and you have learned from our study that Partyism, denominationalism, is wrong. You should sever your connection with the denomination—put off the human name, and be a Christian only.

Stranger: "I give you my hand. I am henceforth resolved to be a Christian only. I shall notify the Baptist church of this step, and I will let you tell the brethren here about me next Lord's day just as Barnabas told the church at Jerusalem about Saul, Acts 9:37. And I shall stand with you for pure undenominational Christianity."

Now dear reader, Can you not see how cunningly and sagaciously Mr. Brewer hides his denominationalism under the Bible doctrine of the mystical body of Christ? A few simple questions will clear the whole matter: 1. When did Stranger leave the Baptist church? The answer—when Mr. Brewer changed his views and interpretations on certain doctrinal points. 2. When did Stranger join Brewer's denomination?—The answer: When he adopted Mr. Brewer's views and interpretations on certain doctrinal points, and gave him his hand, Saying, "I will stand with you." And when he said, "I will let you tell the brethren here about me next Lord's day."

You see dear reader, other denominations receive members by vote of the whole congregation, while Mr. Brewer and his denominational "Brotherhood" receives them personally and individually, as he did Stranger, then recommends them to the whole congregation for membership in their communion. When Mr. Brewer accepted Stranger's hand he simply acted in behalf of the whole church. This is a little different method of receiving mem-

TLC

bers, but it's receiving them just the same. When Mr. Brewer said to Stranger, "You should sever your connection with the denomination and be a Christian only," he simply meant—"you should quit the Baptist denomination and join ours:" and poor Stranger did just that, whether he had sense enough to know it or not. Alas!

TLC

PORTER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

My opponent runs true to form. I have often noticed that many debaters, when their arguments are completely demolished, and they are left not a vestige of ground on which to stand, resort to personal reflection and abuse. This is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy. Mr. Myers has been threatening it for some time, and he really turned himself loose in his last affirmative. Note such expressions as "pandering to deceive," "paltering haggle," "chaffering," "bandy idle talk," "punk and quibble," "prevaricates" and "pusillanimous." If he wishes to descend to this level, it is his privilege, but I shall stay on a higher plane than such. Furthermore, he would accomplish more for his cause if he would conform to simplicity instead of trying to make a show of learning by using a lot of big words that he doesn't know much about and that his readers will not understand.

One thing that comes later in his affirmative I wish to notice early in my reply. I showed in my third negative that he became so rattled that he could not write what he meant when he referred to what Campbell "substituted." He says now: "I gladly admit that it is a grammatical error." And he suggests that he will correct it in the book. But such blunders are not subject to correction. He signed a contract to publish this debate "verbatim." That means "word for word." I have no objection to his correction of misspelled words—and there will be many of them to correct in his papers—for he did not agree to publish this "literatim"—letter for letter. I would even be lenient and not object to the correction of "grammatical errors" if no argument was based on the error; but when an error is used as the basis of an argument, it is altogether different. Besides, there was no "grammatical error" in the sentence. The sentence is grammatically correct, but Mr. Myers was just rattled and failed to say what he wanted to. So if he changes this in the book, the reader will know that he has broken his agreement. I wonder if he plans to correct a number of other blunders on the ground that they were "grammatical errors." In his first affirmative he said:

TLC

"The one and only Bible church 'has no schism' ( )." He left the space blank within the parentheses, as he found no Scripture to prove his assertion. Will he call this a "grammatical error" and correct it in the book? In his third affirmative he said the Springfield Presbytery was "organized in 1801." I called his attention to the fact that it was 1803. Will he call this a "grammatical error" and change it? If such blunders do not occur in the book, the reader will know that he broke his agreement to publish the debate "verbatim."

I am defending Campbell from misrepresentation. That is the only sense in which I am, as I am not following Campbell. Campbell is not authority among my brethren—neither is any other uninspired man.

My friend is still in trouble about the quotation from Kurfees. He says: "I did not say that Kurfees designated the time and place." But my question will be found near the beginning of his second affirmative. It reads: "If it started with the 'Cane Ridge Revival' in 1801, in the state of Kentucky, I am wanting to know what connection the Campbells had with it." My friend said: "I will let Mr. Kurfees answer that question." Well, Mr. Myers, "that question" had reference to "time and place." So if you did not intend to designate time and place, why did you use Kurfees to answer "that question"? You have thus admitted that he did not answer "that question" and you have lost the point completely.

"NOT ALREADY CHRISTIANS."

My opponent tells you that Porter said "that the men who started his denomination were still sinners when they started it." But Porter *said no such thing*—this is one of Myers' "personal interpretations." I said nothing about anybody starting "my denomination." I simply said they were not Christians when they started the movement to take the Bible as their only creed. That movement led to their conversion. I was not a Christian when I started a movement to the Bible alone. And every sinner on earth today ought to start a similar movement. But if they did,

TLC

it would not be equivalent to starting a denomination. Moving *to the Bible alone* is not the way to do it.

HIS QUOTATION FROM T. R. BURNETT

A lengthy statement by T. R. Burnett, in Gospel Advocate, Dec. 9, 1897, is given. What he found in this statement to prove the Church of Christ is a denomination he forgot to say. But the statements of Burnett are as far from the facts as the statements of Mr. Myers. Campbell was never "baptized into a Baptist Church by a Baptist preacher." When Campbell requested baptism of Elder Luce he stipulated that it should be "performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament." Luce objected that this was "contrary to Baptist usage" but finally consented to do it. Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 1, page 398. Baptism "contrary to Baptist usage" never put any man into a Baptist Church. So T. R. Burnett was just as far wrong as my opponent. Here Mr. Myers asks a number of questions about Campbell.

1. "Was Campbell a true Church of Christ minister?" Answer: If he was baptized "precisely according to the New Testament" and then preached the truth therein revealed, he was a true gospel preacher.

2. "Did Campbell's baptism by Bro. Luce, a Baptist preacher, count as real Christian baptism?" Answer: It did if performed "precisely according to the New Testament."

3. "Was Campbell baptized by a denominational preacher?" Answer: Yes.

4. "Was Bro. Luce a truly saved man when he baptized Campbell?" Answer: Not that I know of. But if baptism must always be administered by a truly saved man to be valid, then every man would have to trace his baptism through truly saved men all the way back to the apostles, or he would never know if he had valid baptism. Can Mr. Myers do this? I would like to see him try.

5. "Would my opponent accept the baptism of a Baptist preacher as genuine Christian baptism?" Answer: If he performed it "precisely according to the New Testa-

TLC

ment," I would, but not if he performed it according to "Baptist usage."

SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY AGAIN

The affirmative says that I failed to show from history that this organization faded out of existence, for the history I used was the word of the men who were connected with it. Well, that is the same history he used to try to prove it was a denomination. He even tried to make their "Apology" into a creed. But the history becomes no good when it is turned against him. He says: "The history he used is *furbish.*" I wonder if this use of the word "furbish" will prove to be a "grammatical error" that he will want to correct before it goes into the book. He needs to "furbish" up his English a little.

I showed that these men who dissolved the Presbytery continued to live and could wear the name "Christian." My opponent asks: "Does my opponent think people have swapped their head off for green gourds?" If I wanted to descend to the level to which he has gone, I could say: I didn't think so, but after reading my opponent's fourth affirmative, I am beginning to wonder if it isn't done sometime. I certainly never claimed they used the name "Christian" as a personal name. Using the phraseology of my opponent, I cannot understand how any "bumpkin" ever got such an idea from what I said. But if they used it as a religious name, he says, "They sectarianized the name 'Christian'." Maybe that wouldn't be so bad, according to my opponent, for he claims before he finishes this affirmative that the New Testament church "sectarianized the name 'Christian'." Surely the apostles would be a good example to follow.

HIS ANSWERS TO MY QUESTIONS

"Did Campbell's interpretations propagate moral truth?" He answers: "Some of them did." In his preceding affirmative he said that God would accept any man's interpretations that propagate moral truth. Then why do you condemn Campbell's if God accepts them?

"Has God revealed His judgment in His word?" He

TLC

says: "Yes, but not in Porter's personal interpretations of his word." Well, is it in Myers' personal interpretations? I had asked how we can know which interpretations God will accept. My opponent said: "By letting God be the judge." If that judgment is in his word, Mr. Myers cannot take it, for he has said such is impossible—he must have his interpretations of it.

"If denominations are the fruit of human opinions, why would they not be human institutions?" He answers: "Some of them no doubt are." Well, if human opinions make "some of them" human institutions, why not all of them? It would be amusing to see my opponent try to answer why.

"Are all denominations acceptable to God?" His answer simply means that all are acceptable to God except those who believe Peter's statement in Acts 2:38—"baptism for the remission of sins." If you believe that, you are not acceptable to God, according to Myers.

"Can you name one doctrine taught by the Church of Christ that originated with Campbell?" He made no effort to name one but said he could "name some human opinions that are taught by Mr. Curtis Porter." He says I add the word "water" to 1 Peter 3:21, which, he thinks, is as bad as adding the word "not." He indicates that the baptism that saves is not "water baptism" but some other kind. Then *he* would have to add the words "Holy Spirit." Would that be as bad as adding the "not"? Verse 20 shows that Peter was talking about "water." Baptism, according to verse 21, was "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." The Revised Standard Version translates this: "Not as a removal of dirt from the body." What baptism would one associate with "removing dirt from the body" but water baptism? So there is no opinion about it after all.

"What is the meaning of the word 'heart' in the Bible?" He answers: "Your heart is your spirit filling your whole body." Then why did you say that "Campbell transferred religion's center from the heart to the head"? If the heart "fills the whole body," would that not include the head?

TLC

Here he also admits that "spiritual faith is intellectual" but says that "intellectual faith is not spiritual." I wonder if he is trying to feed somebody on "punk and quibble."

"Were the apostles of Christ members of any denomination?" Note his answer: "Yes, 'denominate' means 'to identify by a certain name.' 'They were called *Christians* first at Antioch.' This name identified them and distinguished them from *Judaism*. Jesus Christ organized this great denomination of *Christianity*." There you have it! The New Testament church was a denomination, or sect, and they "sectarianized the name 'Christian'." But by this answer he contradicted his former statements. He says he would be ashamed of a plain contradiction. So it is time again for him to be ashamed. Concerning this point, in his second affirmative, he said: "Did the apostles identify the Bible church by one title as the opponent's denomination does today? No!" So one time he says "No" and the next time he says "Yes." He is also in conflict with his answer to another question in his third affirmative. The question was: *"Can one be a Christian and belong to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination?"* He answered: "Yes." But now he says the New Testament church is a "denomination" organized by Christ. If so, then *a man cannot be a member of it without belonging to a denomination.* He has met himself in a head-on collision. The questions in my third negative so upset him that he forgot what he had said in his former affirmatives. So in trying to squirm out of the place the questions put him into he stumbled into his own way.

His answers to the next two questions caused him to "butt heads with himself" twice more. The questions were: *"When people obeyed the gospel, as taught by the apostles, did that make them members of a denomination?"* And *"If people now should do just what the gospel requires—no more and no less—would that make them members of a denomination?"* To both questions he answers, "Yes." If this is so, then a man cannot be a Christian and belong to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination. So he surrenders his former position in an effort

TLC

to get out of trouble here. Mr. Myers, are you ashamed of these plain contradictions?

In answer to another question he lists nine points of doctrine which he says we teach that did not originate with Christ. But I deny his allegation. Some of these points will be attended to later.

GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCHES

My friend thinks the "General Organization of Churches" formed by the Cincinnati convention in 1849 was not the "American Christian Missionary Society." This simply reveals, to all who know anything about it, the lack of knowledge that is characteristic of Mr. Myers concerning these things. It still remains true that this organization was a feature of the Christian Church—it is not characteristic of the church of Christ at all.

THE DEBATE WITH BREWER

Regarding the charge that he turned aside from his debate with Porter and started one with Brewer Mr. Myers says: "I didn't change opponents, I simply incorporated Brother Brewer for the purpose of helping the opponent." I wonder if he thinks any one is foolish enough to believe he would turn to Brewer for the purpose of helping Porter. I wonder if he can make himself believe it. Anyone knows he turned to Brewer's tract because he thought he had found something upon which he could capitalize. But I showed he did no better with Brewer than with Porter. As to whether he changed opponents, I'll prove that he admits it before he finished his affirmative. But to the points he mentions.

1. He claims I said the New Testament church was a denomination, and since I say I am not a member of a denomination, that puts me out of the New Testament church. But every one knows I simply showed that the New Testament church was a denomination, according to my opponent's argument. I believe no such thing; I simply showed that his argument proved too much.

2. Neither am I the one who parallels the Catholics.

TLC

Catholics claim *you can't take the Bible* for your creed, but *must have* the church's interpretations. *Myers claims the same thing.* But I say *you can take the Bible* as your creed. The "papistical humbuggery" belongs to him—not to me.

3. When Brewer said *you can't* take the church of Christ in the aggregate he simply meant, as the connection shows, that there is no super-organization that has control over all the congregations. When I said *you can* take the church in the aggregate I simply meant you could use the term "church" to refer to all congregations. So there is no conflict between them. But my opponent says: "Which shall we believe, Porter or Brewer? As for me I will believe neither." So Myers doesn't believe that you can or you can't. Quite a position, isn't it? He is in the corner and can't go either way. He is not as fortunate as "that old silly bird" for he has no sand to stick his head into.

4. Neither did I contradict Brewer when I said the churches are tied by their mutual interest in lost souls. Such a tie is not a "collective connection" at all. Myers simply tried to put over his "prattle-gabble-twaddle-bosh."

5. He says I "shot a boy's cap-buster which made plenty of noise" when I exploded his argument on the "general organization of churches." Well, there wasn't any big game to shoot at—so a "cap-buster" was enough to do the job.

6. He admits he was wrong in his statement that it was over 50 years from this organization till the split. He says I proved it was 43 years, but the time element would have little bearing. It would be interesting to have my friend give my statement in which I said anything about 43 years. The man seems to be beside himself. I wonder if this was another "grammatical error." The "time element" may have little bearing, but it proves my opponent was wrong again.

7. Neither did I deny that the split was over instrumental music. The contradiction my friend thought he found was not there. I simply showed that organizations was "a major issue comparable to instrumental music"

TLC

when the split came. The split was over both issues, and one was, in importance, comparable to the other. But don't blame my friend for misstating what I said—he couldn't give you what I said but had to give his personal interpretation of it.

HIS "QUESTION FOR MR. PORTER"

Concerning the two groups—associated with Campbell and Stone—my friend asks: "Since they were already in Christ's church and consequently already united in spirit and fellowship why did they get together and agree to unite in something else?" Answer: They didn't. Who said they "united *in something else*"? They had been working as independent groups but when they found they stood for the same major principles, they decided to work together—in this way they united, but not "in something else."

THE "QUESTION MR. PORTER FAILED TO TOUCH"

The question: "Do their officials answer only to Christ?" Relative to this my friend says: "My opponent teaches that their 'church officials' answer only to Christ; but in the same breath he turns around and admits that they 'must satisfy the local congregation'." Who said this, Mr. Myers? "My opponent." Who? "My opponent." When did your opponent say this? "In the same breath." Now, who was it, did you say, that did this? "My opponent." Well, that ought to settle it. But if the reader will turn back to his third affirmative, he will find that this was a quotation from Brewer's tract, and Myers made the same charge in almost the identical words. Who said this? Bro. Brewer. But who said it, Mr. Myers? "My opponent." Oh, I see. Brother Brewer is now your opponent. So you did "change opponents" and started a debate with Brother Brewer. After flatly denying it, you have now admitted it. Thank you, Mr. Myers; you are very accommodating by the use of your quibbles. But when Brother Brewer said they answer only to Christ, he was simply showing that they answer to no "superior official or church dignitary." Page 19 of his tract. But a congregation who appoints elders may remove them without the help of "superior officials."

TLC

So there was no contradiction in Brother Brewer's statements. But if there had been, would it prove that I belong to a denomination that originated with Stone and the Campbells?

HIS "IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR THE OPPONENT"

1. "Does the opponent's church follow Acts 20:17-28?—Here it becomes clear that the office of the elder, bishop, and pastor was one." The "opponent" has no church, but the one to which he belongs does follow this Scripture.

2. "The church at Cenchrea had a woman deacon (Romans 16:1). Does the opponent's church have any women in it holding the same office as sister Phebe?" Answer: Paul said: "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife." 1 Tim. 3:12. If this woman was a "deacon," I wonder who "her wife" was. The passage says nothing about sister Phebe holding an "office."

3. "Does the opponent's connection call any of their officials 'bishops'?" Answer: Absolutely yes. The elders in any congregation near you are also called "bishops." You can easily get their names and addresses.

4. "In Acts 14:23 they ordained elders with prayer and fasting. Does the opponent's church follow this example?" Answer: Prayer and fasting would be appropriate at nearly any service. But the passage does not say they ordained elders "with prayer and fasting." My opponent gave his interpretation.

5. "When the Bible said they ordained elders in every church, does that mean they were qualified to guide the local church in which they were ordained, or does it mean they were thus qualified to hold the ministerial office elsewhere?" Answer: My friend seems to confuse the "office of an elder" and the "ministerial office." He doesn't know the difference between an elder and a preacher. Certainly elders were qualified to guide in the congregation where they were ordained.

TLC

HIS "VERY IMPORTANT QUESTIONS"

1. "If a church and its minister is spiritually dead, having heard the truth and failed to keep it—would you call that church a denomination if it has five sky-blue Christians in it?" Answer: The church in Sardis was spiritually dead, but there were "a few names even in Sardis" that were worthy, and it was still called the "church." Rev. 3:1-6. I suppose the same would be true in the other case.

2. He illustrates by a church having 100 members, 95 of whom are in apostasy, holding "a very false doctrine." Could there be five true Christians in it? Answer: With that many holding to a heretical doctrine I doubt if you would find five true Christians there. If so, they would constitute the true church.

3. "Was John Wesley a true Church of Christ minister?" Answer: Just how this is a very important question in proving the Church of Christ is a denomination is something unexplained. What difference would it make as far as the proposition is concerned? I have no reason to think that he was a true gospel minister.

4. "Was Martin Luther a true Church of Christ minister?" Answer: Same as No. 3.

5. "Can a minister preach that water baptism is not absolutely essential to initial salvation in all cases and yet be a true Church of Christ minister? Would he be a denominational minister and would he go to hell?" Answer: A man is not a true gospel minister who does not preach that baptism is essential to salvation for all alien sinners. Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; 22:16; Rom. 6:3, 4; Gal. 3:27; 1 Pet. 3:21. If he builds a group around this heresy, he fosters a denomination and will come under the curse of Gal. 1:8, 9.

"A REVIEW OF MR. KURFEES' ILLUSTRATION"

He starts a review of "Kurfees' Illustration" but it turns out to be "Brewer's Illustration." I wonder if my friend was still rattled or is this a "grammatical error"? No provision is made in our contract for Mr. Myers to correct such blunders. There is nothing grammatically

TLC

wrong with the statement. My opponent was just highly nervous. But you will notice that he is doing the "reviewing" instead of affirming. This proves again that he changed opponents and positions and started a new debate.

The illustration concerns 500 people who obeyed the gospel and became Christians. Some of them joined the Methodist denomination and some the Baptist denomination. The others stayed as they were. What denomination did they belong to? Mr. Myers says: "They made them a denomination of their own." When and how did they do that? Was it by obeying the gospel? If so, according to Myers, that was the "Lord's denomination"—not "their own." But he once said a man could be a Christian and not belong to a denomination—either the Lord's or his own. But he has changed all of that. What did these men do to "form a denomination of their own"? But my friend says the illustration was not complete, for no one of "Brewer's denomination" was there to present his claims. So he proposes for Porter to preach to them. They want to join "Porter's denomination" since they are already in "fellowship" with his "system of interpretations." But in the illustration given by Brother Brewer these decided "to remain as Christians only" and worship God according to the New Testament. If that put them in fellowship with my "system of interpretations," then my system must be a worthy one. It involves the principle of the Bible only and Christians only. That is exactly the position which I occupy and for which I have contended all along. That system will never make any one a member of any denomination. If Mr. Myers and all others had always stood for that "system," there would never have been any denominations in the world. And if they will get back to that "system," denominationalism will come to an end. We would then all be members of the church of the Lord, as men were in the days of the apostles, and religious unity would be accomplished upon the divine standard. I thank you, Mr. Myers, for admitting that such is my "system." It is far superior to any system that you have ever advocated.

Since these were already "in fellowship" with Porter's

TLC

"system of interpretations," as my friend says, then why were they not already members of what he calls "Porter's denomination"? Why would they even propose such thing as joining it? My opponent seems to be in another corner with no sand in which to hide his head.

"STRANGER BAPTIST JOINS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST DENOMINATION"

Here my opponent rehearses the story told in Brother Brewer's tract: "Is the Church of Christ a Denomination?" There is not one point in the story upon which he could base an affirmative argument. Yet he is supposed to be affirming. Why, then, did he use all this lengthy story from Brewer's tract? Every argument that he had made in his effort to prove that the Church of Christ is a denomination had been completely taken away from him, he ran out of material, and he had to have something to fill his space. So he turned and copied a large portion of that tract. Everything that he copied was against his position. It served only to prove that the Church of Christ is not denominational, and my opponent is left with nothing upon which to stand. He has completely failed to prove that the Church of Christ "is a denomination originating in the personal interpretation of Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell about the year 1801." *Not one vestige of proof that he offered remains undemolished.*

A QUESTION THAT REMAINS UNANSWERED

In my first negative I asked my opponent this question:

"Would it be possible for a group of men to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a denomination?"

He sidestepped the question by making a play on the word "backward," declaring you go forward, not backward, to get into the church.

I arranged the question in my second negative like this:

"Is it possible for a group of men to get to the New

TLC

Testament church—either backward or forward—without establishing a denomination?"

But he completely ignored it in his third affirmative, although I pleaded with him to say something about it. So I again asked the question in my third negative and begged him not to be "as silent as the voiceless dead." Not a word, however, came from my friend in his last affirmative. The question remains unanswered, although I begged, pleaded with and challenged him throughout the entire debate on this proposition to answer it. He could not have overlooked it as it was placed in a section to itself in my preceding negative. The reader will wonder why he said nothing about it. A straight-forward answer to it would have sounded the doom to his whole position. *So it remains unanswered.*

AN ARGUMENT UNNOTICED

In my preceding negative I based an argument upon the conversion of the three thousand in the second chapter of Acts. I showed that they simply obeyed the gospel and became Christians—they entered no denomination. Since they were members of no denomination, and we do simply what they did, then we enter no denomination. We stand on the original ground on which they stood and compose no denomination. Not a word did my friend say about this.

So we come to the end of the first proposition and the first half of this debate. I have definitely shown that Stone, the Campbells and others associated with them simply began a movement to get back to the original standard of the New Testament. They sought to establish no new sect but to be members of the church revealed in the New Testament—taking the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice. When such a course is followed it will not result in a denomination. Denominations are formed by moving away from the Bible into the realm of human opinions. The people who constitute the Church of Christ today, having done just what men did to become Christians in the days of the apostles, taking the Bible as their only creed, refusing to accept any man's creed in religion, do

TLC

not compose a denomination. It is utterly impossible to compose one by following this plan. So my opponent has signally failed in his affirmative. He evidently realized it when he changed opponents when a little more than half way through with this proposition. I ask the reader to read the discussion without prejudice and make his own decision. Eternal principles and consequences are involved.

If my friend insists on correcting "grammatical errors," it might be well to wonder why he would make any such thing in the first place. Surely a man who is inspired by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, by which he is enabled to speak languages that he has never studied and preach as the Spirit gives him utterance, should be able to use his own mother tongue without making grammatical blunders. The fact that he cannot proves there is something seriously wrong with such a claim.

TLC

Proposition No. 2. Resolved, that the religious order in earth today called by the name "Church of Christ" is the exclusive New Testament church, originating on the first Pentecost after the death of Christ.

PORTER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

It is not likely that very many will have any trouble in understanding this proposition. So I deem it unnecessary to define the various terms of it. If, however, there is any term in it that my opponent wishes to have defined, I shall be glad to do so if he will call my attention to it.

In order to sustain this proposition there are a number of points that I wish to prove. I shall not be able to get to all of them in one affirmative, but I will go as far as I can and then continue in following affirmatives. I, therefore, invite the reader's attention to the following things.

I. THERE IS AN EXCLUSIVE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

Before endeavoring to prove that the church which I represent is the exclusive New Testament church, it is necessary to prove that there is such a thing. The New Testament, of course, will be the standard to which we must turn for our evidence. The word "church" comes from the Greek word "ekklesia" and simply means the "called out." The church of the New Testament was composed of people—people who were called out of darkness into the light of the Son of God. Such a group of "called out" people in any locality was called the "church" in that community. Hence, we read of the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:2), the church at Thessalonica (1 Thes. 1:1), the churches of Galatia (Gal. 1:2) and such like. The church of the New Testament was, therefore, composed of literal human beings. The congregations that composed it were literal congregations on the earth. This idea that the church was a "mystical organism" composed of the saved in every denomination, as my friend has asserted, is without any foundation in the word of God. That there was an exclusive church in the New Testament is shown by the following:

TLC

1. *The church is the body of Christ.*

Paul, in Eph. 1:22, 23, said that God "gave him to be the head over all things to *the church, which is his body.*" He also said: "He is the head of *the body, the church.*" Col. 1:18. In one passage Paul says "the church" is "his body" and in the other he says "the body, the church." You may speak of it in both ways—the body is the church, or the church is the body. To all people who can and will take the Bible as their only rule it is evident that the church is the body of Christ. But men, like my opponent, who cannot take the Bible as their only rule, will have to interpret this to mean something else.

Not only does the Bible tell us that the church is the body of Christ, but it also tells us that there is an exclusive body—that there is one body. In Eph. 4 Paul listed seven elements in the unity of the Spirit—one God, one Lord, one Spirit, one hope, one faith, one baptism and one body. In the fourth verse he plainly says: "There is one body." If the "one God" is an exclusive God and the "one Lord" an exclusive Lord, then the "one body" is an exclusive body. In 1 Cor. 12:20 Paul declared: "But now are they many members, yet *but one body.*" Since there is "but one body" and "the body is the church," then there must be "but one church" of the New Testament.

2. *The church is the bride of Christ.*

John the Baptist said: "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." John 3:29. Paul told the brethren who composed the church at Rome that they had "become dead to the law" that they "should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead." Rom. 7:4. And to the church at Ephesus he said: "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body." Eph. 5:23. Thus we learn that Christ is the husband and the church is the bride. As there is just one husband, so there is just one bride. The church —the bride of Christ—is, therefore, the exclusive New Testament church.

3. *Christ owns but one church.*

Christ promised to build but one church when he said:

TLC

"Upon this rock I will build *my church.*" Mat. 16:18. In the language of Paul we are told that he died for but one: "Christ also loved *the church* and gave himself for *it.* Eph. 5:25. The words "the church" mean but one. And the pronoun "it" can refer to but one. So Christ loved *one* church; he died for *one* church; he built *one* church. Hence, he is the owner of *but one church*—the exclusive church of the New Testament. The plural form "churches" is never used except in reference to a number of local congregations in some section of the country, as "the churches of Judea" (Gal. 1:22), "the churches of Galatia (Gal. 1:2) and "the churches of Macedonia" (2 Cor. 8:1).

In my opponent's affirmatives he so contradicted himself that he made it possible to use him on both sides of this denominational question. In his fourth affirmative he said that "the body of Christ" is "God's denomination." Yet he had contended all along that a denomination is a religious group distinguished, by its personal interpretations, from other religious groups. I demand, therefore, that he give a straight-forward answer to these questions:

1. Was "God's denomination" in the New Testament distinguished from all other denominations?

2. Was "God's denomination" an exclusive denomination?

3. Was the "body of Christ" identified in "God's denomination"?

II. THE EXCLUSIVE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH ORIGINATED ON THE FIRST PENTECOST AFTER CHRIST'S DEATH.

Pentecost was an annual Jewish feast day that came fifty days after the sabbath of the Passover week. On the first of these after Jesus died the New Testament church was established. This is shown by many Scriptures, only a few of which can be used in this essay.

1. *The use of the term "church" before and after this day.*

Statements before this Pentecost pointed forward to

TLC

the church. A short time before Jesus died he put the origin of the church in the future when he said: "Upon this rock I *will build* my church." Matt. 16:18. All students of language know that "will build" is the future tense of the verb and shows that the church had not been built when Jesus made the statement. But beginning with the day of Pentecost the church was always referred to as present. It was on that day that "there were added unto them about three thousand souls" (Acts 2:41) and "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." Acts 2:47. It was never thereafter referred to as something to be built. This shows that day of Pentecost to be the time when the church was established.

2. *Prophecy pointed to that day of Pentecost.*

Isaiah said: "It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Isa. 2:2,3. A number of things are here predicted. (1) The mountain of the Lord's house—also called the house of the God of Jacob—was to be established. (2) It was to be established in the last days. (3) When thus established "all nations" were to flow unto it. (4) And the word of the Lord would go forth from Jerusalem. All of this was fulfilled on that day of Pentecost in Acts 2. (1) Peter referred to that time as "the last days." Acts 2:16, 17. (2) The commission that embraced "all nations" then became operative. Mat. 28:19; Luke 24:47, 49. (3) The word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem—they began in Jerusalem that day. Acts 2:16-42. Harmony between the prophecy and the fulfillment points out Pentecost as the day of its establishment.

3. *The kingdom came with power.*

The words "kingdom" and "church" are often used with reference to the same institution. If my friend denies

TLC

this, I will prove it. But we are told this: (1) The kingdom was to come "with power." Mark 9:1. This certainly means the kingdom and power would come at the same time—one would come *with* the other. (2) But the power was to come *when* the Holy Ghost came upon them. Acts 1:8—Revised Version. (3) But the Holy Spirit came "when the day of Pentecost was fully come." Acts 2:1-4. As the Holy Spirit came "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," the power came at the same time, for it was to come *when* the Holy Spirit came. But the kingdom was to come "with power." So the kingdom came "when the day of Pentecost was fully come."

4. *This Pentecost is referred to as "the beginning."*

When the Holy Spirit fell on Cornelius Peter compared it with the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost and said: "The Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us *at the beginning.*" Acts 11:15. This time, therefore, marks the origin of the New Testament church.

III. DENOMINATIONALISM IS SINFUL.

I use the term "denomination" in the sense in which it is used in religion to refer to a sect or party in religion—not merely something that is called by a name. My opponent has agreed with me all along that division is the foundation of denominationalism. In his first affirmative he said: "Different interpretations produce different denominations." So there must be different doctrines proclaimed in order to establish different denominations. This makes denominationalism rest upon division. Without the teaching of conflicting doctrines denominationalism could not exist. When, therefore, I prove that division is wrong I prove that denominationalism is wrong. Let us then consider some evidence of this:

1. *Denominationalism nullifies the prayer of Jesus.*

In his prayer for believers Jesus prayed: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." John 17:21. Denominationalism is the very antithesis of this prayer. When a man endeavors to build denominationalism he seeks to nullify

TLC

the prayer of Christ. Believers cannot be *one* while supporting denominationalism.

2. *Denominationalism repudiates the teaching of the apostles.*

Paul enjoined Christians: "That ye *all speak the same thing,* and that there be *no divisions* among you; but that ye be *perfectly joined together* in the *same mind* and in the *same judgment.*" 1 Cor. 1:10. No man can indorse denominationalism without repudiating this teaching. To support denominationalism men must "speak different things;" there must be "divisions;" and they must be "completely divided asunder." The teaching of the apostle Paul and the teaching of denominationalism are as far apart as the poles.

3. *Denominationalism makes infidels.*

Jesus prayed that believers may be one "that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John 17:21. Since unity among believers would lead others to believe, then division would produce unbelievers. When the world sees the divided state in religion today, with each denomination claiming to get its teaching from the Bible, it concludes the Bible is a book of contradictions and unworthy of acceptation. Therefore men become infidels.

4. *Denominationalism makes God contradict himself.*

This would be true even if we take only the denominations that Mr. Myers thinks God will accept. The Pentecostal "Church of God" denomination to which he belongs has its headquarters and publishing house in Cleveland, Tennessee. But in the same city another Pentecostal "Church of God" denomination has headquarters and a publishing house. Both of these groups claim to be baptized with the Holy Spirit and to preach as the Spirit gives them utterance. But they are led to preach conflicting doctrines. Mr. Myers will not accept much of the teaching of the other group—yet both of them claim to be led and inspired by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Can you not see that this would make God and the Holy Spirit contradict themselves. Anything that does so must be sinful.

TLC

Many other points could be given to show the sinfulness of denominationalism, but this will suffice. These fundamental principles are being given to show the ground occupied by the New Testament church. Then if I can prove I stand on the same principles, I show I do not belong to a denomination.

IV. MEN BELONGED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH WITHOUT BELONGING TO A DENOMINATION.

In my second negative of the preceding proposition I asked my opponent: "Can one be a Christian and belong to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination?" In his third affirmative he answered: "Yes." Of course, he has not been able to stay fixed about denominationalism, but until he was driven away from it this was his position. Since men could belong to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination, of course, they did. And if men could thus be Christians in the days of the apostles, they can be the same today. Why would any man want any more than this? If a man can be a Christian and go to heaven in the New Testament church, then why detour through some human denomination? My friend has admitted that men must turn aside after human interpretations in order to become members of human denominations. While at first he admitted that the New Testament church was not a denomination, he later revised that and said the New Testament church was "God's denomination." At least, then, the early Christians did not belong to any denomination except God's. They were satisfied with God's way. They belonged to no human denomination. Why, then, should we seek to join some human denomination? Why not be content with "God's denomination"?

V. MEN BECAME MEMBERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH BY GOSPEL OBEDIENCE.

The following question I asked my opponent: "When people obeyed the gospel, as taught by the apostles, did that make them members of a denomination?" He answered: "Yes." He had already said, as shown before, that men

TLC

could be Christians without belonging to a denomination. But when he got into deeper trouble he tried to shield himself by changing positions. But he did leave a distinction between "God's denomination" and human denominations. So it remains true that gospel obedience did not make men members of human denominations. The body of Christ—the New Testament church, he says, is "God's denomination." But he admits that the "Church of God" to which he belongs is a denomination, but it is not the body of Christ—the exclusive New Testament church. Then it is not God's denomination. Mr. Myers, please answer this question: Whose denomination is the church to which you belong? Now, don't overlook this like you have others. *Please give us an answer.*

1. The church in Jerusalem.

In the second chapter of Acts we have recorded the conversion of the three thousand. Peter preached Christ to them. Acts 2:16-36. When they heard they were pricked to the heart and asked what to do. V. 37. They were told to "*repent* and *be baptized* for the remission of sins." V. 38. They did that and were added that day. V. 41. So we are told the Lord "added to the church daily such as should be saved." V. 47. What denomination did this gospel obedience make them members of? None whatever, unless, as Mr. Myers now says, it was "God's denomination." Very well, then, gospel obedience did not make them members of any human denomination. They did not become Christians first and then go through some sort of ritual to become members of some denomination. The very acts of gospel obedience that made them Christians made them members of the New Testament church.

2. The church at Corinth.

The Lord had a church in the city of Corinth. 1 Cor. 1:2. But how did men become members of that church? When Paul preached the gospel in Corinth we are told that "many of the Corinthians hearing *believed,* and *were baptized.*" Acts 18:8. The same simple acts of gospel obedience that made men members of the church in Jerusalem had the same effect upon the people of Corinth. They were

TLC

Christians—they were members of the body of Christ—but they were not members of any human denomination.

3. *The church in Samaria.*

We learn from Acts 9:31 that the Lord had a church in Samaria. But how did men become members of that church? In exactly the same way that men became members of the churches in Jerusalem and Corinth. Philip went to Samaria and preached the gospel to them. Acts 8:5. Luke further adds: "But when *they believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, *they were baptized,* both men and women." Acts 8:12. This simple gospel obedience made them members of the Lord's church—they did not need to join any denomination.

And so goes the divine record of such matters. Various congregations of the Lord's church are mentioned elsewhere in the divine story. But in every case those congregations were established—and men became members of them—by simple obedience to the gospel of Christ. They did not join denominations; the Lord's church was enough. Now, I should like for my opponent to answer a simple question for me: *Since these simple acts of gospel obedience made men members of the New Testament church in the days of the apostles, would not the same gospel obedience make men members of the same church today?* And when you have answered that, then answer this: *Would it make them members of any other church?*

VI. A FALLING AWAY WAS FORETOLD

Inspired men made specific mention of an apostasy that they said should come. In giving his farewell address to the elders of the church at Ephesus Paul said: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts. 20:29, 30. And to the Thessalonian brethren he said: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed,

TLC

the son of perdition." 2 Thes. 2:3. The "day" referred to was "the day of Christ." V. 2. Before it could come there would be "a falling away." He showed how this would result in the development of the man of sin. And it had already begun, for he said: "The mystery of iniquity doth already work." V. 7.

This apostasy, however, did not necessarily result in complete destruction of the church. In view of a number of statements in the Bible I do not doubt that there have been Christians in every age and century since the church was established. Jesus said: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18. Paul declared: "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." Eph. 3:21. And John saw the woman in the wilderness as she was "nourished for a time, and times, and half a time." Rev. 12:14. All these statements seem to indicate continued existence. But in many centuries persecution against Christians was such that when they worshiped they had to hide in dens and caves of the earth. Their existence, therefore, cannot be traced through the dark meanderings of human history.

But the apostasy—the falling away—that was predicted did come. The falling away from the principles of divine truth led ultimately to the establishment of the apostate Roman Catholic Church, which, during many centuries, exercised sway over the world and brought death to hundreds who would not renounce their faith and accept the authority of the popes.

VII. A KINGDOM IS REPRODUCED BY ITS SEED

In the creation of the world God gave the immutable law of reproduction when he decreed that everything should bring forth after its kind. The germ of life by which a plant or a living thing is propagated was placed in the seed. The complete destruction of a plant would require the destruction of the seed by which it is reproduced.

For example, we might take the kingdom of wheat.

TLC

What would be necessary in order to accomplish the destruction of the wheat kingdom? A group of men might destroy every stalk of wheat upon the face of the earth without destroying the kingdom of wheat. They would also have to destroy every life-possessing grain of wheat in existence. If somewhere they should leave the seed of the wheat, containing the germ of life, they would not completely destroy the wheat kingdom. This grain of wheat could be planted in the soil and the wheat kingdom would be reproduced—it would produce the same kind of plant which that type of seed had always produced. In view of the law of reproduction—that every seed should bring forth after its kind—this seed would not produce barley, rye or oats but would produce only the wheat plant. It matters not who might plant the seed, or where, the product of the seed would still be wheat. Wheat, therefore, as the circling ages pass, is reproduced by its seed.

Or the kingdom of oaks might be used as an illustration. To destroy the oak kingdom it would be necessary to destroy all life-possessing acorns, as well as all oak trees. Every oak tree upon the earth might be cut down and burned without destroying the oak kingdom. If somewhere there is left the seed of the oak—the acorn—oak trees can be reproduced. The acorn can be planted in the soil, and the immutable law of reproduction will bring forth another oak tree. It will not produce the sycamore, the maple or the poplar. It will produce the same kind of tree which that type of seed has always produced—the oak, nothing more and nothing less. And it matters not who or what plants the seed, it always reproduces the oak. If a woodpecker should pick up the acorn, fly across the country and drop it into a plowed field, where it becomes covered, and it there germinates and begins to grow, what will it produce? A woodpecker? No! Not that. Woodpeckers might be instrumental in planting acorns, but planted acorns never produce woodpeckers. Since a seed brings forth after its kind, the only thing it can produce is the oak. The oak kingdom, therefore, is reproduced by its seed.

These principles are also true concerning the church

TLC

or kingdom of the Lord. Prophesying of this kingdom the prophet Daniel declared that it "shall never be destroyed" but "it shall stand forever." Dan. 2:44. Although there was a falling away, an apostasy, there was not a complete destruction. If every citizen of the kingdom, if every member of the church, upon earth were put to death, the kingdom or church would not be destroyed. In order to destroy any kingdom, the seed by which it is reproduced must be destroyed. But what is the seed of the kingdom? In the parable of the sower, which represented the kingdom of the Lord, Jesus plainly said: "The seed is the word of God." Luke 8:11. This seed must be destroyed before the church or kingdom is destroyed. But men have never been able to destroy the word of God. They have tried it through the ages but have failed. It is stated by the apostle Peter that "the word of the Lord endureth forever." 1 Pet. 1:25. Men, therefore, will never be able to destroy the word of God —the seed of the kingdom.

If every Christian—every member of the body of Christ—upon earth were put to death, other Christians would be produced by simply planting the seed. When the word of God, the seed of the kingdom, was planted in the hearts of men in the days of the apostles, it produced Christians—members of the church of the Lord. When it is planted in the hearts of men today, it will produce the same thing, for every seed bears after its own kind. The unadulterated word of God, the seed of the kingdom, will not produce denominations—Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Pentecostal or any other kind. It did not produce such, when planted in the hearts of men, in the days of the apostles, and it will not produce such now. It is the same seed now that it was then; and it will produce the same thing.

Furthermore, it matters not who plants it, nothing but Christians will ever be produced. In order to produce something else some other kind of seed must be mixed with it. If, therefore, in any century since the first, no Christians were found upon the earth, Christians could be reproduced by planting the unadulterated word of God. If Barton

TLC

Stone should plant that seed in the hearts of men in the century in which he lived, what would be produced? Stoneites? Not Stoneites but Christians. When Alexander Campbell planted that seed in the the hearts of men, did it make Campbellites? Not any more than an acorn, dropped by a woodpecker, would produce woodpeckers. The unadulterated word of God—the word of God as the only rule—when planted by Campbell, Stone, Scott, Curtis Porter or anybody else will produce nothing but Christians—members of the church of the Lord. The seed does not produce according to the man who plants it but according to the nature of the seed that is planted. Nothing but the church or kingdom of the Lord can be reproduced by preaching the simple gospel of Christ. When a man, therefore, preaches that, it will not result in the establishment of a sect or a denomination—it will result in the reproduction of New Testament congregations. When such men as Stone, Campbell, Scott and others called men back from human opinions to stand upon the word of God alone as their standard in religion, they did not build a denomination. Such a stand faithfully followed could reproduce nothing but churches of the Lord. They who followed that plan in centuries past constituted the church of the Lord, and we who follow that plan now constitute the same thing. They who subscribe to a gospel perverted by human opinions are members of denominations, but we who obey the simple gospel as taught by the apostles are members of the New Testament church—the exclusive church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The seed of the kingdom produces now what it always produced—Christians, without any denominational aspect. If it ever produced anything else, let my opponent tell us what it was.

TLC

MYERS' FIRST NEGATIVE

The opponent accuses me of resorting to personal reflection and abuse. The only thing I have abused is his bungled theory. Let me show you some real personal reflection and abuse. Of Martin Luther, Mr. Porter said—"I have no right to think he was a true gospel minister." He made this statement because Luther was not married to his "water-god." To show you how contradictory this group of "system-makers" are I will give you a quotation from Kurfees concerning the same Luther—"He had profound faith in God and childlike reverence for His word." (Emphasis On The Restoration, page 20) See how these two men in the same denomination butt heads? When speaking of the great reformation, which lifted the iron curtain of religious despotism which had flooded the earth with blood, rapine, and death for a thousand years, they label Luther "mighty in faith and possessed with childlike reverence for God's word;" but when trying to defend their papistical dogma of "water-salvation" they consign Luther to hell and 200,000,000 others with him of like faith. Why be as nimble as monkeys? Nothing is more detrimental to civilization than ecclesiastical humbugs.

QUESTIONS: 1. Did Kurfees make a denominational statement when he said—"Luther had profound faith in God and childlike reverence for His word?" 2. Do you conscientiously believe Luther is in Hell? 3. According to your interpretation of baptism are all Methodists in hell?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON CAMPBELL'S DOCTRINE

MYERS: "Was Campbell a true Church of Christ minister?" PORTER: "If he was baptized precisely according to the New Testament, and then preached the truth therein revealed." MYERS: Since your "IF" implies that you do not know whether or not Campbell's baptism was according to the New Testament, why did you try to prove it was in your Fourth Negative, page 3?

Since you say he was a true minister "IF" he preached the truth revealed in the Bible, may I ask—

TLC

1. Was Campbell a true Church of Christ minister if he did not preach precisely the same things you preach?

2. Do you preach all doctrines *precisely* like Campbell? If not, does that mean that two men can preach different doctrines and yet both be in the church of Christ?

3. If you and Campbell preached certain doctrines differently, does this mean that one or the other of you is guilty of denominationalism?

4. Tell me, can a man be a church of Christ minister if he preaches the following doctrine—"I cannot therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, NOT EVEN IMMERSION INTO THE NAME OF THE FATHER, OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY SPIRIT:" tell me, Is that man a denominational preacher? Don't smatter, come clean and say yes or no.

5. Mr. Porter, you have Brother Ministers all over this country denouncing the doctrine of premillennialism as "a denominational tenet." Now, in your own "Church Directory" you have listed as belonging to your own "religious order" a number of ministers and churches who believe in and propagate this doctrine. Tell me—Are these ministers and churches denominational?

6. Is premillennialism a denominational doctrine? I beg you to give me a candid and unbiased answer—Is premillennialism a denominational doctrine?

7. Are all the churches listed in your "Church Directory," which are called by the name "Churches of Christ," —are they all perfectly free from that which effects denominationalism?

8. Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott were Premillennialists. Did this make them denominationalists?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE STONE-CAMPBELL MERGER

MYERS: "Since they (Campbell's and Stone's two groups) were already saved, and according to the opponent's theory in Christ's church, why did they get together

TLC

and agree to unite in something else?" PORTER: "They had been working as independent groups but when they found that they stood for the same major principles, they decided to work together—in this way they united." MYERS: This is exactly like all other denominations unite. May I ask: If the two groups were already saved and in Christ's church, just why did they have to unite in order to work together? How could two men be saved and in the same church, preaching the same doctrines, but not yet working together?

WAS CAMPBELL IN THE BAPTIST CHURCH?

Mr. Porter says, "No!" Just why does he say Campbell was never a Baptist? He knows that Campbell never was baptized after leaving the Baptist. You see dear reader, if he should make Campbell a Baptist he could not consign all the other Baptists to hell without sending his own denominational father down there with them. Alexander Campbell was baptized by Rev. Mathias Luce, (a Baptist preacher) in Buffalo Creek, June 12, 1813, and joined the Redstone Baptist Association. He left the Redstone Association in 1824 and joined the Mahoning (O.) Baptist Association. He left the Baptist in 1830. This makes him a Baptist preacher for 17 years. He even named his church journal after the Baptist—"The Christian Baptist."

I will give the reader 8 undeniable facts proving that Campbell was one time a Baptist preacher. I challenge Mr. Porter to refute it.

1. He preached his first sermon July 15, 1810. His text: Matthew 7:24-27.

2. He left the Presbyterian church and organized his "Independent Brush Run church," May 4, 1811.

3. He was ordained to the ministry January 1, 1812.

4. He was immersed by Luce, a Baptist preacher, in Buffalo Creek, June 12, 1813, and united his Brush Run Church with the Redstone Baptist Association.

TLC

5. He delivered his sermon on the law at the Redstone Baptist Association which was meeting at Cross Creek, Va., September 1, 1816.

6. He founded his CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, a monthly religious journal.

7. He left the Redstone Association and joined the Mahoning Association, 1824.

8. He was separated from the Baptist in 1830.

Now, his INDEPENDENT BRUSH RUN CHURCH was a religious organization, a party, a sect, a denomination. It did not even carry a Bible name. Mr. Campbell was its minister. (I can name its first deacons.) He was immersed by a Baptist preacher and united his whole church with the Baptist Church. He named his church journal after the Baptist. Why? Because he was a Baptist preacher, and was working in the interest of the Baptist Church.

HIS QUESTION THAT REMAINS UNANSWERED

On page 11 he complains of a question which he says I failed to answer. But you notice he did say I tried to answer "by making a play on words." I could say the same thing about many of his answers. All of his answers are quibbling and word play. But I will answer it again. The question—"Would it be possible for men to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a denomination?" Answer: It altogether depends upon your definition of what a denomination is. They can without establishing a counterfeit and false denomination. Alexander Campbell reached (?) the body of Christ through an epochal experience of grace in his heart; but after preaching for the Baptist church for 17 years he separated himself and gathered about him a group of disciples who had imbibed his "certain interpretations of the Christian system." And this group is this day denominated "The Church of Christ."

If I should say it was possible for men to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a denomi-

TLC

nation it would still remain for him to prove his "Reformatory Movement" is NOT A DENOMINATION. His ipse dixit proves nothing.

The opponent says, "The apostles started no denomination." But Barton Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell are not the apostles. Where does the proposition say the apostles did start a denomination. Mr. Porter is trying his best to make me take issue with the apostles and the New Testament. I have more sense. He has a strange way of trying to identify his "Reformatory Movement" with the blood-bought body of Christ. Instead of trying to prove himself and his church a branch in the True Vine, they try to prove they are the vine itself.

Mr. Porter claims that he and his "religious order" does exactly what the apostles and the 3,000 converts on the day of Pentecost did. Who told him? He and his reformatory preachers do much the apostles never thought of. The principal leader in his Movement, namely Alexander Campbell, preached three years an alien sinner; or else he was saved three years before water baptism. Did the apostles do this? Campbell organized himself a church, and named it THE INDEPENDENT BRUSH RUN CONGREGATION. Did the apostles ever call their church by such names? Campbell served his church for more than a year before he was baptized. Did any of the apostles ever do this? Mr. Porter tells us that the man who baptized Campbell was a denominational preacher and a sinner. Were the 3,000 baptized by denominational preachers and sinners? And in 1849 the opponent's "Reformatory Movement" established a general organization of the churches. Did the apostles ever do this? Yes, and my opponent admits that part of the ministers in his "religious order" are premillennial and part are not. Did the 3,000 converts on Pentecost join a church that taught two different doctrines on Christ's second coming.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY

In the Cincinnati convention of 1849 the opponent's

TLC

REFORMATORY MOVEMENT which he denominates "the exclusive church of Christ," established a general organization of the churches. Mr. Kurfees in his "Need of Continued Emphasis on the Restoration of the Ancient Order" denounced this as a denominational move. Mr. Porter in a former installment laid the blame of this on the CHRISTIAN CHURCH, which he says split out of the Church of Christ some 43 years later. This means then that his sort of Church of Christ tolerated and kept in membership a denominational organization for more than forty years. Tell me—If this Missionary Society was a denominational organization did it not infect your church with denomminationalism for 43 years? Did your so-called Church or Christ claim to be free of denominationalism during these 43 years?

PORTER SAILS HIS BOAT IN TROUBLED WATERS

My opponent has defintely denounced this MISSIONARY SOCIETY as a denominational organization. I have a big question for him. Mr. Porter, Who was the first president of this missionary society? To my opponent's great consternation I will tell the religious world who was its first president. He was none other than Alexander Campbell. And how long did Campbell retain this office? Until he died, seventeen years later. (In "How the Disciples Began and Grew," page 209.)

I have a question: Mr. Porter, since you have denounced this MISSIONARY SOCIETY as a denomination, and inasmuch as Campbell was its president until the day of his death, did this not make Campbell a denominational preacher?

WHAT IS DENOMINATIONALISM?

Here is my opponent's definition: He says, "Division is the foundation of denominationalism." He adds: "There must be different doctrines proclaimed in order to establish different denominations."

Now if divisions and different doctrines effects denominationalism I will show you that the opponent's so-

TLC

called Church of Christ is chock full of denominationalism.

(a) PROFESSIONAL CLERGY AND PASTOR SYSTEM. Mr. Bennie Lee Fudge, a prominent leader in the opponent's church, writes in his THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, issue of October 7, 1949: "Today one of the greatest threats to the church is the development of a professional 'Clergy'—preachers who go where the most money is offered and then expect to direct the church when they get there." Mr. Fudge adds: "The sad part of the situation is that the churches and the Christian Colleges are helping to develop this 'Pastor' system."

May I ask a few questions? Is this "professional Clergy and Pastor system" a denominational trait? Just what percent of your preachers belong to this "Professional Clergy?" About what percent of your churches and Colleges belong to this "Pastor System?" Now tell me, Are these preachers and churches denominational? If not please explain how preachers and churches can develop a "Professional Clergy and Pastor System" and not be denominational?

(b) *DIVISIONS, STRIFE, HUMAN OPINIONS, INNOVATIONS, AND SPECULATIONS.*

My opponent gives the above named things as the cause of denominationalism. I'm going to accept his definition, and then show you that his church is chock full of it. Speaking of the "general organization of churches" established in 1849, Mr. Kurfees said—"From that day to this, one innovation after another has crept in among them, and division and strife and alienation over human opinions have marked their history." Said Brother Kurfees, "They let down the bars for other human opinions and thus lifted the floodgates for every conceivable departure from the word of God; and so, among the people of this once great and impregnable *reformatory movement,* different lines of human opinions and speculations have been projected from time to time, with the unfortunate but legitimate result of increasing divisions among them, until finally different camps are arrayed against each other, and thus the work

TLC

of divisions and strife goes on and the church of God is sadly retarded in its progress."

And to prove that Kurfees had reference to Mr. Porter's own church, he adds: "A most vivid illustration of this fact is found in the division and strife that have come in some of the churches in recent years over speculations on unfulfilled prophecies and other Biblical utterances." Mr. Kurfees had reference here to the schism that has developed over the doctrine of the Millennium. He says the general organization of churches effected in the Cincinnati Convention in 1849 started this division and speculation which has resulted in *division, strife, and speculation* over the doctrine of the Millennium. Mr. Kurfees adds: "When these speculations started in Louisville, Kentucky, a few years ago, I made an earnest and vigorous effort to impress upon their principal leader that, if the said speculations were not checked, they would be certain to lead to strife and divisions." How true this is, they have books on sale in their publishing houses against some of their own ministers and churches: and yet they claim they are free of denominational divisions. Bah!

Mr. Kurfees admits that the history of their "reformatory movement" has been marked with every conceivable departure from the word of God since the general organization of churches unto this day. Pray tell me, what more could you do in order to be a denomination?

TWO QUESTIONS THAT SENT HIM DOWN THE RIVER

On page 10 of my former letter I ask the opponent a series of questions. Two of these sent him sailing down the river, and he is headed for the rocks at race-horse speed. Let us reconsider these two questions and his answers.

1. MYERS: "If a church and its minister is spiritually dead, having heard the truth and failed to keep it—would you call that church a denomination if it has five sky-blue members in it? PORTER: "The church in Sardis was spiritually dead, but there were 'a few names even

TLC

in Sardis' that were worthy, and it was still called the church." MYERS: Mr. Porter, I didn't ask you anything about the church in Sardis, but I am glad you mentioned it, you have admitted that a spiritually dead church can have in it a few true saints. Now I am going to ask again this question, and a few others with it:

1. Tell me—Is this spiritually dead church a denomination? Say yes or no.

2. You say, "It was still called the church." I am asking—Can the body of Jesus Christ be "spiritually dead?"

3. I plead with you to explain this—"How could that church in Sardis have a spiritually dead minister and the majority of its members also spiritually dead, and yet not be a denomination?

4. Tell me—If God recognized that spiritually dead church in Sardis as "the church," as you affirm, could He not also recognize the denominations of today as "the church?"

II. MYERS: To illustrate: In Birmingham, Alabama there is a church, a local congregation, that has 100 members in its congregation that partakes of the Lord's supper every Lord's day morning. 95 of these are in apostasy, with some of them holding a very false doctrine. The minister is not ignorant of this condition; in fact he himself is spiritually dead, he has turned from the truth as he first saw it. Now the question is this—COULD THIS CHURCH HAVE FIVE TRUE CHRISTIANS IN IT?

PORTER ANSWERS: "I doubt if you could find five true Christians in it." Isn't this strange, he just said that Sardis had a spiritually dead church but "a few worthy names." Tell us Brother, why do you doubt the proposition? The church I described in Birmingham is perfectly pictured in the one at Sardis.

I'll tell you why he will not allow such a church in Birmingham, he is afraid I will ask him if it is one of their churches. And what would be the difference in his "spirit-

TLC

ually dead church" and other spiritually dead churches?

I will give you the main reason why Porter cannot answer these questions: they necessitate an intelligent distinction between the visible organization of the church and the "mystical body of Christ" composed of every saved person in all denominations. I purpose to press this point until Elder Porter says "calf-rope."

He says, If you find five true Christians there they would constitute the church. QUESTION: If these five true members constitute the church just what do the other 95 constitute? The 95 are in the organization, and they are in the majority, and like Sardis they are spiritally dead, and their minister is spiritually dead with them. Now tell me—do these 95 constitute a denomination?

The opponent's "I doubt" and "if so" is equivalent to saying, "I don't know." You see dear reader, I drawed a word picture of a religious organization that was in apostasy, spiritually dead, and tolerating false doctrines, and he admitted that such a church existed in Bible times: and yet he says God called it "the church." And it had in it a few worthy names. I ask him if this church was a denomination, and he said "the few worthy names constituted the church." But I want to know—WHAT DO THE OTHERS CONSTITUTE? His best answer is "doubts" and "ifs." He is so bamboozled and hornswoggled he don't know what to say or which way to turn.

ON MR. PORTER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE PROPOSITION NO. 2

Mr. Porter deems it unnecessary to define the various terms of this proposition. He has a sagacious reason for not defining it: his design is to use it ambiguously. The proposition is capable of being understood in two senses. The term "Church of Christ" may be applied to the spiritual body of Christ, or it may be applied to a certain group, party, sect, or denomination. If this is not true then Christ has two bodies, for in this very town we have two sects called by the same name—"Church of Christ." The term is used in the proposition to designate a certain party, Mr.

TLC

Porter's party. My opponent takes his party name and tries to identify in it the whole body of Christ. This is why he calls it "the *exclusive* church." Why does he do this? To decoy me and the reader away from the point at issue, and cause us to take up arms against the blood bought church in the Bible.

In our last affirmative we showed where Barton Stone, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell and others gathered about them certain disciples who followed them in their particular interpretations of the Christian system. The followers of these men, just like the followers of Wesley and Calvin, finally formed a party or organization. This religious organization went through many changes and was denominated by several different names and titles until finally it sectarianized a Bible name—CHURCH OF CHRIST. Now this religious order is the one referred to in the proposition. Let us not confuse the body of Christ, which comprehends all the saved of all ages, nations and denominations with the opponent's religious party which did not exist until the early part of the 19th century.

When Mr. Porter and his people are forced to distinguish between their denomination and the body of Christ in the Bible they simply call it, "THE REFORMATORY MOVEMENT." They claim this reformatory movement is the exclusive body of Christ. The word "exclusive" means to bar or shut out. These men simply try to shut out of the body of Christ every soul unless it interprets all Bible doctrine exactly like they do. This is why the opponent resented me saying the saved in every denomination is in the body of Christ. He doesn't believe that the saved in every denomination is in the body of Christ. How can a man be saved and not in the body of Christ? Alexander Campbell said, "There are Christians among the sects." (Campbell-Rice Debate, page 517.) See how Porter and Campbell butt heads. Both claims to be Church of Christ ministers, one says there are saints among the sects and the other says there are not.

TLC

IS THE REFORMATORY MOVEMENT THE EXCLUSIVE BODY OF CHRIST?

My opponent admits that his "reformatory movement" was inaugurated by men in the early part of the 19th century. I demand a clear cut answer—Did we have any sky-blue Christians in the denominations before this reformatory movement was inaugurated?

In Mr. Kurfees' "The Need of Continued Emphasis on the Restoration of the Ancient Order," he names six of the leading reformatory movements, dating from Luther's day. He then explains why these reformatory movements failed. Now notice, the last named of these movements was Mr. Kurfees' own so-called Church of Christ: and he tells what caused it to fail; namely—"THE GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES UNDER A GENERAL BOARD OF OVERSEERS AND MANAGERS." This he says happened in 1849. This was 43 years before the Christian Church or denomination came into being. Now mark this, Mr. Kurfees lines his own reformatory movement up with the other denominations, gives the reason why the others failed and also why his has failed.

Now this "Reformatory Movement" which failed God in 1849 is the very same Church of Christ denomination to which Mr. Porter belongs. And this Reformatory Movement, established in the early part of the 19th century, is the religious order referred to in the proposition.

1. The opponent says—"There is an exclusive New Testament church." I say, "yes, but it is "Christ's body" and not Mr. Porter's "Reformatory Movement." Christ's body excludes or shuts out every one that is not born of the Holy Spirit. There is not one dead branch in that True Vine. But there are dead branches in Mr. Porter's sort of church of Christ. I definitely know of one. He came to my tent meeting in Decatur, Alabama with his belly full of whiskey, and his shoes in his hip pockets, yes, and wanted to fight me because I was not preaching water baptism like Alexander Campbell's Reformatory Movement. All denominations I must confess are infected with hypocrites, but

TLC

the body of Christ is holy. "In him is no sin." Every branch in the True Vine is alive. Every stone in his temple is alive and spiritual. Not one beer-head is in that holy temple. Not one "Professional Clergyman" belongs to the family of God: but Mr. Porter's denomination and Mr. everybody's denomination has dead branches and dead-heads in its organization. When Mr. Porter tries to bundle up in his organization the whole body of Christ it is like one trying to put the Atlantic Ocean in a wash-tub. He says those who constitute the exclusive body of Christ are those who are called out of darkness (sin) into light (holiness). This is true, but can Brother Porter prove that all who constitute their "Reformatory Movement" are in the light? I have my doubts.

2. He says, "The church is the bride of Christ." Who said it was not?

3. He says, "The church was organized at Pentecost." But his "Reformatory Movement" was organized by certain men in the early part of the 19th century.

4. He gives a definition of denominationalism, says it is caused by conflicting doctrines and division. If this is true then his church is as full of denominationalism as a pup is fleas; it is chock full of bickering, division, and conflicting doctrines, as we have shown from their own literature.

5. He says, "Denominationalism repudiates the teaching of the Apostles—'That ye all *speak the same thing*, and that there be *no divisions* among you; but that ye be *perfectly joined* together in the same mind and in the *same judgment*'."

QUESTIONS: Do all of the opponent's people speak the same thing? Are they free of divisions? Are all of them perfectly joined together in the same mind? Do they all judge alike in all matters?

If our opponent cannot answer all of these questions in the affirmative then his is a denomination. We wait anxiously for his answer.

TLC

6. He says—"Denominationalism makes God contradict himself." By what means? He answers—"By preaching conflicting doctrines." Then may I ask: Do any of his ministers preach conflicting doctrines?

7. He says, "Men became members of the New Testament church by gospel obedience." No doubt they did, but this does not prove that the opponent's church is no denomination. I too became a member of the New Testament church by gospel obedience. So did Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox, John Wesley, John Bunyon, and all the other Johns who accepted the righteousness of Christ by faith.

8. He tells us that Christ had a church in Jerusalem, Samaria, Corinth and other places. Well, I don't doubt this. Who said he did not? I have no quarrel with God's churches in the Bible. Mr. Porter would love to sidetrack me away from his denomination and cause me to take issue with the Bible and God's blood-bought church. I have more sanctifigumption.

9. He said, "A falling away was foretold." Yes, and I have no doubt but that Alexander Campbell help bring it on.

10. He said, "A kingdom is reproduced by its seed." What a wonderful discovery! He must have found this in the Almanac. He tells us that if a woodpecker should drop an acorn it would produce oaks and not woodpeckers. In like manner if Campbell should drop Bible doctrine it would produce Christians and not Campbellites. But I say, if a woodpecker should drop eggs they wouldn't produce oaks; and if Campbell dropped self-made theories they wouldn't produce Christians, they would produce Campbellites, and thanks be unto God for giving us enough scholarly balance and spiritual discernment to distinguish between acorns and woodpecker eggs.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION ANSWERED

PORTER ASK: "Whose denomination is the church to which you belong?" I answer: "God's denomination," it is dedicated to His service and called by His name: and

TLC

everyone in it whose sins are covered with the blood of Jesus is a member of that grand organism—the body of Christ. And everyone in it whose sins are not covered are "tares growing among the wheat" just like those in Mr. Porter's denomination whose sins are not covered.

1. "Phebe, a servant of the church. . ." (Romans 16:1). Did Alexander Campbell say this word "servant" in the original MS was "deaconness" ? All the greatest scholars through the roll of the age define this word "servant" to mean "deaconness." Of course a deaconness would be a woman deacon. Now since denominationalism depends upon "certain doctrines" as you say, will you please give me a Scriptural refutation of all these great scholars on this word?

2. MYERS: "When the Bible says they ordained elders in every church, does that mean they were qualified to guide the local church in which they were ordained, or does it mean that they were thus qualified to hold the ministerial office elsewhere?" PORTER: "My friend seems to confuse the 'office of an elder' and the 'ministerial office.' He doesn't know the difference between an elder and a preacher." MYERS: Well, I ask you if you would show me the difference. I urged you to give me the Scripture that said there was a difference. Why didn't you give me a reference? You run all over the country bickering and biting other churches for calling their ministers "pastors." You say, pastors and elders hold the same office. We want you to send us some Bible that verifies this position? Can you? Will you?

3. You say, "The elders . . . . are also called bishops." According to this position they hold the same office; and neither one of them are ministers. This is what you say: I have a question or two: Judas was numbered with the apostles, and took part in their ministry (Acts 1:17). In Acts 1:20 his office is called the "the bishoprick." Did this not make him a bishop? And did he not fill the same office the other ministers filled? Would this not make them

TLC

bishops? Give Scripture reference with your statements please.

4. You say a pastor is not a minister. The Bible says: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." The next verse tells us what their duty was—"For the perfecting of the saints, for the *work of the ministry*, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Will you please prove from this verse that the pastor does not do the work of a minister?

5. The Bible says, "Anna, a prophetess." (Luke 2:36) It also says, ". . . four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy." (Acts 21:9) It also says, "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." (Acts 2:17) Now Mr. Porter I have a few questions:

(1) Do you have any prophetesses in your reformatory movement?

(2) Do you have any daughters that prophesy?

(3) Will you please give me one Bible reference which gives the definition of "prophesy"?

The reason we are asking these questions is that we want to know if your so-called "Reformatory Movement" measures square with the Bible.

TLC

PORTER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Myers, in his first negative, pays a high compliment to the strength of the arguments made in my first affirmative. I introduced, in logical order, seven distinct arguments in support of my proposition. A number of these comprised several arguments within one. In presenting these I used twelve full typewritten pages. The arguments were presented with clarity, and consecutively numbered, so that my opponent would have no trouble in finding them. When he replied he used one and one-half pages in his effort to set them aside. The fact that he all but ignored them emphasizes his inability to meet them. He was utterly unable to answer the arguments. They stand virtually untouched and completely unscathed. They will still be unharmed when this debate comes to a close. My opponent cannot meet them. He realized that he could not and spent nearly all his space in dealing with other matters. It is the duty of the negative to reply to the affirmative arguments. I challenge him to make a reasonable effort to answer the arguments. The reader will certainly see his dismal failure here.

The headlines of the arguments presented are as follows:

I. THERE IS AN EXCLUSIVE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

II. THE EXCLUSIVE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH ORIGINATED ON THE FIRST PENTECOST AFTER CHRIST'S DEATH.

III. DENOMINATIONALISM IS SINFUL.

IV. MEN BELONGED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH WITHOUT BELONGING TO A DENOMINATION.

V. MEN BECAME MEMBERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH BY GOSPEL OBEDIENCE.

VI. A FALLING AWAY WAS FORETOLD.

VII. A KINGDOM IS REPRODUCED BY ITS SEED.

TLC

The line of argument thus reached its climax in No. 7—A KINGDOM IS REPRODUCED BY ITS SEED. It was shown that every plant in a kingdom might be destroyed without destroying the kingdom. If the seed is not destroyed, the kingdom may be reproduced by planting the seed. And if every member of the church or kingdom of Christ were destroyed from the earth, the kingdom may be reproduced by planting the seed—the unadulterated word of God. With this thought in mind I proceed to my next affirmative argument.

VIII. THE RELIGIOUS ORDER IN THE EARTH KNOWN AS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS A REPRODUCTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

When this point is fully sustained my proposition will be amply proven. In order for the evidence to be complete and convincing I shall show a reproduction in the Church of Christ of many principles for which the New Testament church stood. The attention of the reader is now called to a number of them.

1. There is a reproduction of the apostolic recognition of what constitutes the proper rule of faith and practice.

The Church of Christ today refuses to accept any human creed in religion. In spite of all the wild assertions of my opponent that Alexander Campbell is taken for authority, the preceding statement is true. Campbell has never been recognized as authority in religion. Neither has any other uninspired man. We definitely and stubbornly refuse to take any uninspired man's statement, or system of statements, as our rule in religion. Articles of Religion, Confessions of Faith, Disciplines, Church Manuals and Creeds formulated by men are rejected. *We will not have them.* The word of God—and the word of God alone—we accept as our standard.

The refusal to accept human creeds is a reproduction of the attitude of the apostles of Christ. They refused to allow human authority to supplant divine authority. Peter

TLC

said: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4:11. To speak "as the oracles of God" is simply to speak according to the word of the Lord. Paul said: "As we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel, even so we speak." 1 Thes. 2:4. If these statements have any significance, they show that the New Testament church recognized no authority in religion but the gospel—the word of the Lord. Upon that same principle we stand today. But my opponent has completely ruled himself out of any such possibility. During his affirmatives, as you will remember, he said it is impossible for any man to take the Bible alone as his creed—that he must take his "personal interpretations" of it. So he does not stand where the New Testament church stood. This principle is not reproduced in his denomination, and it cannot be "God's denomination." His claim in this respect falls utterly for there is no reproduction of this apostolic recognition of the divine standard.

2. The New Testament method of becoming members is reproduced in the Church of Christ today.

It has already been shown that men became members of the New Testament church by obedience to simple gospel requirements. Those requirements were belief in Christ (Acts 16:31), repentance of sins (Acts 17:30), confession of faith in Christ (Acts 8:36, 37; Rom. 10:9, 10) and baptism (Acts 2:41, 47). These were conditions of salvation—even the commandment of baptism. Jesus placed salvation after both belief and baptism. Mark 16:16. Peter told men to "be baptized *for the remission of sins.*" Acts 2:38. Saul of Tarsus was commanded: "Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins.*" Acts 22:16. Paul said that men are "baptized into Christ." Gal. 3:27. And Peter declared: "Baptism doth also *now save us.*" 1 Pet. 3:21. The process by which men were saved made them members of the New Testament church. By this same process men become members of the Church of Christ today. No additional requirements are made. Consequently, there is a reproduction of this divine plan. But it is not so with my opponent. He shows the attitude of his heart toward the divine require-

TLC

ment of "baptism for the remission of sins" by calling it a "water-god" and "water salvation." If he had been present when Israel were told to look upon the brazen serpent that Moses placed on the pole, he would have called it a "brazen snake-god" and "brazen snake salvation." If he had been present when the prophet told Naaman to dip seven times in Jordan to be healed for his leprosy, he would have tried to dissuade Naaman by calling it a "water-god" and "water salvation."

3. The permanent organization of the New Testament church is reproduced in the religious order known as the Church of Christ.

In the Church of Christ today you will find two groups of officers—elders and deacons. The elders are also called bishops, overseers, pastors, and presbyters. We do not have one elder to a number of congregations but a plurality of elders to one congregation. The deacons are not overseers, but servants, and render service under the direction of the elders.

This form of organization is a reproduction of the organization had by the congregations in the New Testament. They had a plurality of elders for one congregation. Acts. 14:23; 20:17. These elders were also called bishops (Tit. 1:5-7), overseers (Acts 20:28), pastors (Eph. 4:11, 12), and the presbytery (1 Tim. 4:14). The church of the New Testament had no such thing as a Pope, a Presiding Elder, an Arch-Bishop, a Cardinal, a General Overseer or a State Overseer. These are officers found in denominations but not in the church of the New Testament. But they had deacons also. Phil. 1:1. Since there is a reproduction of the New Testament organization in the Church of Christ today, this further helps to identify the true church. If such an organization was not denominational in the days of the apostles, it is not denominational today. Other points of reproduction will be shown later, but I wish now to notice the things said in my opponent's first negative.

CONCERNING MARTIN LUTHER

Reference is made to a statement by M. C. Kurfees

TLC

concerning the faith and reverence of Martin Luther. My friend thinks that Kurfees and Porter "butt heads" about this. But Kurfees did not say that Luther "was a true gospel minister." Instead, on page 22 of his tract, he said that Luther yielded to the temptation "to recede from this noble stand by the word of God" and gave approval to the Augsburg Confession of Faith, a human creed in religion. In reply to his three questions about Luther I give the following:

1. I do not know what he means by a "denominational statement." He might explain. I have never heard of any denomination being built on the statement of Kurfees. 2. If I believed Luther is in hell, what would that have to do with the proposition. I am willing for my faith to go as far as the Bible goes. 3. All Methodists are not in hell. But what was the purpose of these questions? My friend is simply trying to blind the mind of his brethren against the truth by creating religious prejudice. It is characteristic of false teachers to resort to prejudice when they cannot meet the arguments.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING CAMPBELL

On the idea that a man must preach the truth in order to be a true gospel preacher my friends turns inquirer. So let us see about it.

1. I have never claimed that a preacher had to be infallible. Campbell was not. Neither am I. The question assumes that I claim infallibility.

2. I have already said that Campbell taught some things in Christian System that no church of Christ today accepts. Yes, we could differ and still both be in the Church of Christ. Men in the church at Rome differed (Rom. 14: 2-6) but were still members of the same church.

3. Would one of us be "guilty of denominatioanalism"? Not unless one of us built a denomination on a false doctrine.

4. A true gospel minister could make the statement in his fourth question. I have never known any gospel preacher

TLC

to "make *any one duty* the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion."

5. If any churches that are listed in our "Church Directory" (which is an individual publication) have been built as a result of pulling away from the true church and building a sect on some false doctrine, they are denominational. My friend may specify which ones have done it.

6. Nearly all denominations teach premillennialism. If a sect is built on premillennialism, it is denominational.

7. I don't know all the churches listed in the "Church Directory." It is not likely that all of them are "perfectly free" from that which might lead to denominationalism if carried to its utmost limit. The church at Corinth had something in it that could "effect denominationalism." (1 Cor. 1:12, 13). But the church was not a denomination.

8. The statement that "Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott were Premillennialists" is not true. The question is based on a false assumption.

Now, let me ask my opponent a question: *Is a man a true gospel minister if he does not preach the truth?* I challenge him to answer.

"WAS CAMPBELL IN THE BAPTIST CHURCH?"

The negative presents what he calls "eight undeniable facts" to prove "that Campbell was one time a Baptist preacher." I shall take the first four away from him, and that will leave the last four without significance.

1. "He preached his first sermon July 15, 1810." This was nearly two years before he was baptized. Was he a Baptist preacher without baptism?

2. "He organized his Brush Run Church, May 4, 1811." This was more than a year before he was baptized. Was he a Baptist preacher without baptism?

3. "He was ordained to the ministry January 1, 1812." This was several months before he was baptized. A Baptist preacher without baptism?

TLC

4. "He was immersed by Luce, a Baptist preacher, June 12, 1813." (His immersion occurred in 1812, not 1813 as twice asserted by Myers. This is another of his errors. Was it "grammatical" or "historical"?) But I have previously shown that Luce baptized him "contrary to Baptist usage" (Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 1, p. 398). Such baptism does not make one a member of a Baptist church. Mr. Myers is wrong about the whole affair. But if his claim were true, it would in no way affect this proposition. Besides, my friend says: "He was separated from the Baptists in 1830." At least, my opponent admits, if he ever was a Baptist preacher, that he ceased to be one.

THAT UNANSWERED QUESTION

My friend came back to the question about a group of men getting back to the New Testament church without establishing a denomination. And when he finished, the question was still unanswered. He said a group of men could do so "without establishing a counterfeit and false denomination." Just what does he mean by this? Let him tell us by answering the following:

1. Are not all denominations "counterfeit and false" except "God's denomination"?

2. What would a group of men have to do to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a counterfeit and false denomination?

I demand that he clear up this matter for us. I doubt that he will answer these questions, but I would like to see him make the effort.

He states that we try to prove the church is "the vine itself" instead of "a branch in the vine." He is wrong about this also. In John 15:1-6 Jesus spoke of the vine and the branches. He said: "I am the true vine." So the church is not the vine. But neither is it a branch. The idea that denominations make up the branches of the vine is not contained in this passage. To the apostles Jesus said: "*Ye* are the branches." V. 5. Each man is a branch. V. 6. So the church is neither the vine nor a branch.

TLC

Mr. Myers denies that we have done what the apostles and the 3,000 did. He reasons about it this way: Campbell preached three years as an alien sinner; he organized the Brush Run church; he served this church more than a year before he was baptized; he was baptized by a denominational preacher, and so on. He says the apostles and the 3,000 never did such things.

According to my friend, the 3,000 must have been baptized by denominational preachers, for he said in one of his affirmatives that they became members of "God's denomination" when they were baptized. However, what Campbell did *before he was baptized* has nothing to *do* with whether we have done just what the 3,000 did. By this method of reasoning I can prove that the apostle Paul failed to do what the three thousand and the other apostles did. Before Paul was baptized he "persecuted the church" (Gal. 1:13); he imprisoned disciples (Acts 26:10); he punished them in every synagogue (Acts 26:11); he voted to kill them (Acts 26:10). Did the other apostles or the 3,000 do these things?

He also asks: "Did the 3,000 converts on Pentecost join a church that taught two different doctrines on Christ's second coming?" Of course, they did not "join a church" at all, in the modern sense of that expression, but there could have been men in that church that held to different doctrines. The church at Corinth, which was the same kind of church, had some men who taught a resurrection at the coming of Christ (1 Cor. 15:22, 32) but others who said there would be no resurrection (1 Cor. 15:12). Even though there were men who taught "two different doctrines" concerning the coming of Christ, the church at Corinth was not a denomination.

"THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY"

My opponent has a number of paragraphs on this topic. I shall deal with all of them in this connection. Let us look at them.

TLC

1. *"Divisions, strife, human opinions, innovations, and speculations."*

Since these are the causes of denominations, he endeavors to prove that the Church of Christ is "chock full" of such things. He appeals to Bro. Kurfees' tract to prove the existence of such division. But the mistake Mr. Myers makes is in contending that a denomination is born the moment division enters. *This is not true.* Division, strife, human opinions, and such like *may lead to a denomination* (and there could not be one without the existence of some of these), but the *presence of division* does not necessarily mean that a denomination exists. That division, strife and human opinions must be carried to the point of building a separate organization. This mistake runs throughout his articles. He fails to distinguish between the *mere presence* of division and the *ultimate result* of division when carried to its utmost limit. When this matter is cleared up, most of his contention is completely set aside. I have never claimed that the Church of Christ is perfectly free from all of these. These same conditions existed in the church at Corinth—Paul said "there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions." 1 Cor. 3:3. Yes, that church was "chock full" of such things. Was the church at Corinth a denomination? I have asked my opponent about this a number of times, but he has been as silent as the voiceless dead. Mr. Myers, *please* answer these questions: 1. *Was the church at Corinth a human denomination, seeing it had envying, strife and division in it?* 2. *If it could have such in it without being a denomination, could it not be true with the church of Christ today?*

2. *Professional Clergy and Pastor System.*

He quotes from Bro. Bennie Lee Fudge, THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, that a great threat to the church "is the development of a professional Clergy" or "Pastor System." My friend wants to know if this is "a denominational trait." Well, it could certainly *lead* to a denomination if it were carried far enough, but the mere presence of such does not make a denomination. In one of the churches

TLC

of the New Testament a Mr. Diotrephes, who loved to have the pre-eminence, developed a "Dictator System." (3 John 9, 10). How many members were in favor of this "System"? Was this a "denominational trait"? And did it make that church a human denomination? If my friend will answer these questions, he will lose his argument on the "Clergy System".

3. *Infected with Denominationalism for more than forty years.*

As "The American Christian Missionary Society" has been denounced as a "denominational move," my opponent thinks my sort of "Church of Christ" was infected with denominationalism for 43 years. Again he shows his lack of discrimination. The "move" would have to continue until a separate religious party or sect was built before it would become denominational. Members of the church of Corinth said: "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas." 1 Cor. 1:12. Tell me, Mr. Myers: *Was this a "denominational move"? Did it make the church at Corinth a denomination?*

4. The *"Boat In Troubled Waters."*

Yes, Alexander Campbell was the first president of THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY. He was made so in his absence, and in his declining years —a position that he could not have been induced to accept during the earlier period of his life. But "did this not make Campbell a denominational preacher?" This, along with other human theories, *led* to the establishment of a denomination—the present day Christian Church. But this point was not reached till years after Campbell's death.

THAT TRIP "DOWN THE RIVER"

The negative thinks that his two questions about "spiritually dead" churches sent Porter "sailing down the river." Well, if so, it was a pleasant ride, and the ending was not disastrous. I upset his first question by giving the church at Sardis as an example. Now, he wants to know:

1. "Is this spiritually dead church a denomination?"

Answer: No.

TLC

2. "Can the body of Christ be spiritually dead?" Answer: The church at Sardis was the Lord's body at that place. It was either "spiritually dead" or its members were "physically dead," for the Lord said: "Thou art dead." Rev. 3:1. What death was it, Mr. Myers; spiritual or physical?

3. How could it be spiritually dead "and yet not be a denomination?" Answer: By the fact that they had established no other organization.

4. If God recognized the church in Sardis as the church, "could he not also recognize the denominations of today as 'the church'?" Answer: No. Present day denominations are built on human theories—this is not said of the church in Sardis.

My opponent thinks his illustration of a church in Birmingham, Alabama, "is perfectly pictured in the one at Sardis." But this is not so. In the one he mentioned, he says 95% of them were "holding a very false doctrine." This was not said of the church in Sardis. He wants to know what these 95 members constitute. Well, he said they were "in apostasy." So I would say they constitute an "apostate group." And since they were "holding a very false doctrine" they would constitute a faction in the church just as there were factions in the church at Corinth. 1 Cor. 11:18, 19. Paul said: "For there must be also factions among you, that they that are approved may be manifest among you." (Revised Version.)

HIS REPLY TO MY FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Your attention has already been called to the fact that my opponent used *all of one and one-half pages* in replying to my arguments that used *twelve full typewritten pages.* He makes some preliminary observations. He charged me with ambiguity in the use of the word church. But the charge is false. I defined it to be the "called out" (from the Greek Ekklesia) and gave examples of New Testament usage. I used it in no other sense. He seeks to make "Porter and Campbell butt heads" on the question of "Christians among the sects." But what if he succeeded? Would that

TLC

prove that the Church of Christ is a denomination? We no more accept Campbell as authority in the church than we would accept B. Sunday Myers. The Bible—not Campbell or any other uninspiried man—is our guide. But I might add this thought. Since the word "sect" means "heresy" (Acts 26:5, 14), to say "there are Christians among the sects" would be equivalent to saying that "some heretics are Christians."

He demands an answer to this question: "Did we have any sky-blue Christians in the denominations before this reformatory movement was inaugurated?" Answer: Since my opponent agrees that denominations are built on human opinions and theories, how could men build and sustain such organizations and still be "sky-blue Christians"? They could not, if I know what he means by "sky-blue."

An effort is made to prove, by the Kurfees tract, that the Reformatory Movement failed just as other reformatory movements failed before it. Certainly some of the men who were identified with it failed when they pulled away from the truth and established a human denomination. But those who remained on the original ground did not fail. But now to the arguments in particular.

1. He agrees with Argument No. 1—"THERE IS AN EXCLUSIVE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH." But he claims that in that church there are no dead branches. He states: "There is not one dead branch in that True Vine." (Here he confuses Christ and the church). He confesses that "all denominations" are "infected with hypocrites." But he says: "In him is no sin." So, according to him, *there is no sin* in the exclusive New Testament church. But this New Testament church, he says, includes all the saved. Then no saved man could get "his belly full of whiskey" or commit any other sin. Thus he denies the possibility of apostasy. Tell us, Mr. Myers: *Is it possible for a child of God to fall from grace? Can a child of God sin?* If so, then there is sin in the body of Christ—or he gets out of the body before he sins. If he gets out of the body before he sins, he is still saved. Then the body of Christ would not

TLC

include all the saved. *Please clear up this matter for us.*

In this argument I asked him three specific questions that he completely ignored. I demand a "clear cut answer." Here they are again: 1. "Was 'God's denomination' in the New Testament distinguished from all other denominations?" 2. "Was 'God's denomination' an exclusive denomination?" 3. "Was the 'body of Christ' identified in 'God's denomination'?"

He found no fault with Arguments 2 and 3. Concerning the sinfulness of denominationalism he presents four questions. If I cannot answer all of them in the affirmative, then I belong to a denomination. I shall reword them and present them to Paul about the church in Corinth. 1. Did all the members at Corinth speak the same thing? 2. Were they free of divisions? 3. Were all of them perfectly joined together in the same mind? 4. Did they all judge alike in all matters? If all these questions cannot be answered in the affirmative, then the church at Corinth was a denomination. This shows the absurdity of his argument.

He completely skipped my fourth argument: MEN BELONGED TO THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH WITHOUT BELONGING TO A DENOMINATION. He had been on both sides of this question so much that evidently he decided it to be a mark of wisdom to say no more about it. I suppose he had too much "sanctifigumption."

No fault was found with my fifth argument. He agrees there were churches in Jerusalem, Samaria, Corinth and other places. But I was not proving that such churches existed. I showed exactly what men did in becoming members of those churches. I did the same things in becoming a member of the Church of Christ. If it did not make them members of a denomination, it did not make me such. Two more questions here were completely ignored again. Here they are: 1. "*Since these simple acts of gospel obedience made men members of the New Testament church in the days of the apostles, would not the same gospel obedience make men members of the same church today?*" 2. "*Would*

TLC

it make them members of any other church?" What was wrong, Mr. Myers? Did you have too much "sanctifigumption" to make an answer to these? The reader has a right to expect you to say something about these.

He agrees that A FALLING AWAY WAS FORETOLD. This was my sixth argument. And he thinks "Alexander Campbell" helped "bring it on." No. It was being "brought on" in the days of Paul (2 Thes. 2:7). This was more than 1700 years before Campbell was born.

My seventh argument was: A KINGDOM IS REPRODUCED BY ITS SEED. He thinks I found this principle "in the almanac." This principle of reproduction was given by the God of heaven in the first chapter of Genesis. And Jesus said, concerning the kingdom, that "the seed is the word of God." Luke 8:11. If the books of Genesis and Luke constitute an almanac, that is where I found it. But I reject any such "personal interpretation" on the part of my friend. Concerning the illustration of the acorn and woodpecker my opponent thanks God that he has enough "spiritual discernment to distinguish between acorns and woodpecker eggs." The "acorn" represents the unadulterated word of God. The "woodpecker eggs" represent "self-made theories" and doctrines of men. My friend may be able to distinguish between them, but he cannot make any choice. He has said, as you will remember, that it is impossible for him to take *the word of God alone* as his creed but must take his *personal interpretations*. So it is impossible for him to choose the acorns—he must devour the woodpecker eggs. Thanks, Mr. Myers. You might try again sometime.

HIS ANSWER TO AN "IMPORTANT QUESTION"

I asked him: *"Whose denomination is the church to which you belong?"* He answers: *"God's denomination, it is dedicated to his service and called by his name: and everyone in it whose sins are covered with the blood of Jesus is a member of that grand organism—the body of Christ."*

The attention of the reader is called to another of Mr.

TLC

Myers' self-contradictions. In this statement he distinguishes between "God's denomination" and "that grand organism—the body of Christ." They are not the same, for one may be a member of one without being a member of the other. But in his fourth affirmative, when answering whether gospel obedience makes men members of a denomination, he said: "Yes, God's denomination—the body of Christ." Then he said *they were the same.* In his affirmative *they are the same,* but in his negative *they are different.* Thus he "butts heads" with himself again.

But notice this also: He says the church he is a member of is "God's denomination." He didn't say "one of God's denominations." According to him, God has only one denomination—the one *he* belongs to. All others are, therefore, "human denominations." Mr. Myers belongs to the "Church of God" denomination, with headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee, which has as its General Overseer, H. L. Chesser. There is another "Church of God" denomination, with headquarters in Cleveland, that has M. A. Tomlinson as its General Overseer. Mr. Myers, *whose denomination is this one?* Don't forget to answer. Also tell us: *How many denomniations does God have?*

CONCERNING PHEBE

Yes, the word translated "deacon" means a "servant." In the general sense all Christians are servants. But all do not fill the office of deacon. And there is nothing in Rom. 16:1 to prove that Phebe was filling an office in the church.

ELDERS AND PREACHERS

Through three paragraphs Mr. Myers tries to prove that preacher and elder are just the same—also minister and elder. The word "ministry" means "service." Any Christian is a minister in that sense. So all elders are ministers, but all ministers are not elders. Likewise all elders are teachers, but all teachers (or preachers) are not elders. Paul was a preacher (1 Tim. 2:7), but he was not an elder of a congregaiton, for he said an elder must be

TLC

"the husband of one wife." Tit. 1:6. But Paul was unmarried. 1 Cor. 7:8, 9.

PROPHETS IN THE CHURCH

Reference is made to some texts of Scripture concerning prophecy, and I am asked three questions to determine if we have any "prophetesses" in the church I represent. We are living since the "gift of prophecy" was taken away. 1 Cor. 13:8-10. So now neither men nor women can exercise this gift. And Mr. Myers has none in his denomination, regardless of his claim. In Acts 9:36-43 we read that the dead was raised in the early church. Mr. Myers, do you have any "raising of the dead" in your denomination?

"CAMPBELL-STONE MERGER"

My opponent cannot understand how the groups associated with Campbell and Stone could unite if both groups were already saved. Let me give him an illustration. W. E. Johnson, "State Overseer" of Alabama (Did you ever read of such in God's book?), reported in "The Church of God Evangel" ("Official Organ" of what Myers calls "God's denomination"), February 18, 1950, that a union occurred in Alabama. Here is his statement:

"Brother Tharp, Brother Taylor, Brother Spencer and I met with a group of ministers from an organization known as the Church of God with headquarters at Mobile. This group represented twenty-eight churches. *They voted to unite with the Church of God.*"

If Mr. Myers can understand how these two groups, both known as "the Church of God" and both "already saved" could "vote to unite," then likely he can understand how the "Campbell-Stone Merger" was accomplished. If he will tell me how he solves one of them, I'll help him solve the other.

TLC

MYERS' SECOND NEGATIVE

My opponent wants to know why I used only one and one-half pages against his twelve full pages. Because I did not need but one and one-half pages. Why waste ammunition on dead game?

My opponent has obviously elected himself as judge of this debate, incessantly asserting that I have not answered his arguments. CHALLENGE! I will meet Mr. Porter in several public debates and there read our papers. No better arguments can be produced by both writers than what is before us on paper. We have had all the time necessary to gather our material and formulate our thoughts. Let me hear if you will meet me. This will advertise our book.

I. HIS EIGHTH ARTICLE. In this article he proceeds to prove three propositions; viz., (1) THAT HIS RELIGIOUS ORDER RECOGNIZES THE PROPER RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE; (2) THAT HIS CHURCH REPRODUCES THE NEW TESTAMENT METHOD OF BECOMING MEMBERS; (3) THAT HIS CHURCH REPRODUCES THE CORRECT STANDARD OF ORGANIZATION.

He was far from proving his points; but if he could prove that they were correct standards, it would still remain for him to prove that no other Christians exists outside of his "Religious Order." The word "exclude" in his proposition means "to shut out." Mr. Porter has signed a proposition trying to prove that there are no Christians outside of those churches listed in his "CHURCH DIRECTORY." MR. PORTER, DO YOU SINCERELY BELIEVE THERE ARE NO CHRISTIANS IN WHAT YOU CALL "THE DENOMINATIONS?" DO YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE ANY CHRISTIANS IN THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION? IN THE METHODIST? You said, "All Methodists are not in hell." Do you mean by this that there are some Christians who attend the Methodist denomination?

You named four things necessary in becoming members of God's church: (1) "belief in Christ"; (2) "repent-

TLC

ance"; (3) "confession of sins"; (4) "Baptism for the remission of sins." Let me tell you, the "Jesus Only," the Mormons, and the Catholics all believe these "four things." You say, "No additional requirements are made" in becoming members of the church of Christ. Now tell us, Are the "Jesus Only," "the Mormons," "the Catholics" members of your "Reformatory Movement?"

II. QUESTION: "What do you mean by 'Reproduction of the Church'?" Do you mean that the church which Jesus built on the Rock has been produced twice?

III. QUESTION. Did Stone, Scott, and the Campbells "restore" the church, or did they "reform" it?

IV. QUESTION. Alexander Campbell taught that there were true Christians in the earth all through the Dark Ages. Mr. Porter also said the same thing—you said, "The apostasy did not result in complete destruction of the church. I do not doubt that there have been Christians in every age and century since the church was established." Now, here is the question: Since the apostasy did not completely destroy the church, why do you make the claim that your "Reformatory Movement" restored it in the early part of the 19th century?

You say, "There have been Christians in every age and century since the church was established." Is this your way of saying, "There has been a true church in the world all through the Dark Ages?" You say, "Christians in every century." Is this your way of saying, "The true church existed in the earth hundreds of years BEFORE the inauguration of 'THE REFORMATORY MOVEMENT'?" Your literature says, "Men in the early part of the 19th century restored the New Testament church." How could they restore the church if true Christians is what makes the church, seeing you admit that Christians have been in earth in every age and century?

V. CONTRADICTION. After telling us that the church "continued to exist in every century" Mr. Porter now says—"But the apostasy did come. The falling away from the principles of divine truth led ultimately to the establishment of the apostate Roman Catholic Church. . ."

TLC

Now, I do admit that an apostate Roman Church was established, but Mr. Porter has already admitted that "HUNDREDS OF CHRISTIANS WOULD NOT RENOUNCE THEIR FAITH AND ACCEPT THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPES." (First Aff. Page 10, Par. 2) In one breath Porter says, "Christians in every age and century—hundreds would not renounce their faith," but in the next breath he says, "The church was restored in the 19th century." If these hundreds of Christians (better make it millions) who lived in every century did not belong to the true Bible church, pray tell me what did they belong to? If they did belong to the true church just how can the Campbellites say, "We restored the New Testament church."

VI. HORNSWOGGLED AND HOGTIED. When I asked him if there were any Christians in the earth before this "REFORMATORY MOVEMENT," he juggled the answer and said: "How could men build and sustain organizations and still be Christians?" But he had already said in his former letter that "hundreds of Christians existed in every age and century." Pray tell me, Did these hundreds of Christians "who would not renounce their faith" build and sustain organizations? Please tell us how these "Christians" could build (?) and sustain organizations and still be Christians? My opponent not only sails down the river, he is sailing under the river.

VII. CONCERNING MARTIN LUTHER. The opponent said, "I have no right to think he was a true gospel minister." I ask him, "Do you then believe he is in hell?" He answered, "What would that have to do with the proposition?" Mr. Porter, You let me worry about that: just be honest enough to answer according to your belief. Why smatter? I also ask, "Did Kurfees make a denominational statement when he said 'Luther had profound faith in God and childlike reverence for this word'?" At this he said, "I do not know what you mean by 'denominational statement'." Ah, if he doesn't know what "denominational" means, then he might be in a denomination and not know it. My opponent was not all this ignorant, he was just play-

TLC

ing ignorant. "He that is ignorant let him be ignorant still."

VIII. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

1. I showed where Campbell taught certain doctrines "differently" from the present day Church of Christ; and ask Mr. Porter if Campbell was a true Church of Christ Minister. He answered: "If he was baptized according to the Bible, and then preached the truth therein revealed." Notice he said, "IF" he preached "the truth." But in his next letter he frankly confessed, saying, "Campbell taught some things in Christian System that no Church of Christ today accepts." Well, if Alexander Campbell could teach things differently from you, and still be saved, so can I; so can the Baptist; so can the Methodist. You tell us that Campbell was a great Minister, and your book stores and publishing houses are full of his literature, and yet you tell us that he preached things that no Church of Christ today will accept. (I can't get the percentage).

2. Myers: "Was Campbell a true Church of Christ Minister if he did not preach precisely the same things you preach?" PORTER: "I have never claimed that a preacher had to be infallible." I suppose he meant here that men might preach things that are not Scriptural and still be right in their heart toward God. WHY THEN DOES PORTER IN THE NEXT BREATH SAY HE PREACHES EVERYTHING PRECISELY LIKE THE BIBLE? Bad shape to get in!

3. Myers: "Can two men preach different doctrines and yet both be in the Church of Christ?" PORTER: "YES, we could differ and still both be in the Church of Christ." Well, well, well. If two of you have different doctrines, then surely one or the other must be preaching "false doctrine." Both of you could not be Scriptural if your doctrines differ. So here you are telling us that a man may preach a false doctrine and still be in the Church of Christ. LOGIC. If a man can preach one false doctrine and still be in the Church of Christ, he can preach a dozen and still

TLC

be in. QUESTION: Just how many doctrines may one preach differently from yours Mr. Porter, and still be in the Church of Christ? HOW MANY FALSE DOCTRINES MAY ONE PREACH AND STILL BE SAVED?

4. PREDICAMENT.

My opponent said, "Men in the church at Rome differed (Romans 14:2-6) but were still members of the same church." Well, according to this Jesus will allow different doctrines to remain in his church. Will Christ allow two sets of doctrines in His church?

5. Myers: "If you and Campbell preached certain doctrines differently does this mean that one or the other is guilty of denominationalism?" PORTER ANSWERS: "Not unless one of us built a denomination on a false doctrine." MYERS: Well, you have already said that denominations are effected by preaching false doctrine. According to my opponent's position here just as many false doctrines as he could pack into his sort of organization would not make it denominational as long as they stayed in his organization. Oh, how pitiful!

6. HARD QUESTION: Just suppose that one of your Ministers and his whole congregation should continue in the four things you said was only necessary for membership in Christ's church, but they imbibe the doctrines of Bollism, Antinominaism, Balaamism, Nicolaitanism, Nohellism, Premillennialism, and a score other isms—tell us, Would that church continue to be the church of Christ?

7. ANOTHER HARD QUESTION. You admit that false doctrines are in your "own ranks." Now tell me, Does the Scripture command you to separate them from your ranks or wait for them to leave of their own accord?

8. IS PREMILLENNIALISM A DENOMINATIONAL DOCTRINE? When I ask this question, he did some wonderful "ifing." He says, "It is if people build a sect around it." Well, if they do not build a denomination around it, is it denominational—that is, "Is it characteristic of denominationalism?" According to this sort of reasoning, as long

TLC

as false doctrines remain in his "Reformatory Movement" they do not have a denominational character. Bah!

9. WAS ALEXANDER CAMPBELL A PREMILLENNIALIST? I affirm he was. Porter says the statement is not true. Why didn't he give quotations from Campbell proving me wrong? Will my upset opponent give me the debate to read Campbell's own words stating that he believed in Premillennialism?

IX. ANSWERING THE OPPONENT'S BIG QUESTION.

PORTER: "Is a man a true gospel Minister if he does not preach the truth?" Jesus said, "I am the TRUTH." A person who does not preach Jesus (the truth) is a humbug, or some kind of bug.

X. WAS CAMPBELL IN THE BAPTIST?

The opponent says, "He was ordained to the Ministry several years before he was baptized," and he reasons: "Was he a Baptist preacher without baptism?" Let me ask —"Was he a church of Christ preacher without baptism?" Was he saved without baptism? No, he wasn't a Baptist during these years, he was "free lance," the minister of BRUSH RUN CHURCH, an independent denomination. Allow me to repeat the question—"Was he saved and in the church of Christ without baptism?" He was neither Baptist or Church of Christ during these two years, he was "free lance," i.e., guinea-pig—neither guinea nor pig. After Ministering BRUSH RUN for two years, he was immersed in Buffalo Creek, by Matthias Luce a Baptist Preacher, and brought himself and his whole BRUSH RUN CHURCH into the Redstone Baptist Association. After certain years he left the Redstone Association and joined the Mahoning (O.) Association. WILL MY OPPONENT DENY THESE HISTORICAL FACTS?

XI. WHY DID CAMPBELL SAY LUCE BAPTIZED HIM CONTRARY TO BAPTIST USAGE?

Simply because he had already preached 17 years for the Baptist, and to say his baptism by Luce was unscrip-

TLC

tural would be the same as saying, "For 17 years I have been preaching as a sinner and a lost man." This would reflect upon him as a persistent hypocrite: so to get out of it he said, "Luce did not baptize me like the Baptist baptize." Mr. Porter tries to prove his point by Campbell's own words after he had apostatized into "Legalism" and was fighting the Baptist and the fundamental doctrine of regeneration. Proving his point by Campbell's words is like one evolutionist trying to verify his position by another.

XII. TWO QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

1. PORTER: "Are all denominations 'counterfeit and false' except 'God's denomination'?" I will answer that by saying, "All are false unless they preach what it takes to get a man into God's denomination." "The new birth" is an epochal experience in the Holy Spirit, and puts a man into "God's denomination"—the body of Christ. "Visible organizations" are all counterfeit and false unless they propagate and preach "the new birth as the one sinequanon experience to the entrance of the kingdom of God."

2. PORTER: "What would a group of men have to do to get back to the New Testament church without establishing a counterfeit and false denomination?" I answer: "Get Christ in their lives and then preach him to others."

XIII. A BIG QUESTION FOR MR. PORTER.

I will now ask him a big question: "Can a man profess salvation, and start preaching in your 'Churches of Christ' without really being saved?" In other words, "Can a hypocrite unite with your congregations?" "Are these 'Professional Clergymen' that Mr. Fudge mentioned, are they in the Church of Christ?" If they are in the church which Jesus bought with his own blood they are saved, and that would make "Professional Clergymen" to have salvation. If "Professional Clergymen"—preachers for money—are saved Adolph Hitler is saved.

XIV. DIVISIONS, STRIFE, HUMAN OPINIONS, INNOVATIONS, SPECULATIONS, DIFFERENT DOCTRINES, PREMILLENNIALISM, BOLLISM, PROFES-

TLC

SIONALISM, BEER - GUZZLERS, NICOTINE BIBBERS, AND SUCH LIKE.

When I ask what characterized denominations he gave the above things as a definition; and when I showed that his "Reformatory Movement" was chock full of such stuff, he justified his churches by saying, "These things were in the churches in the Bible."

Well, well, If he can justify himself of these things by the Bible so can other denominations. Bosh. He says, "Men were guilty of these things and were yet in the churches in the Bible." Now watch him, he says, "Salvation is the only condition of membership in Christ's church." If this is the case God has some mighty dirty members in his holy body. PORTER BLASPHEMES GOD WITH HIS DAMNABLE HERESY! He joins the body of Christ to an harlot, and links Him with idolatry.

XV. A WONDERFUL JUGGLE ON BAPTISM.

He finds fault in me saying, "The 3,000 became members of 'God's denomination,' the body of Christ, by baptism." I will say it again—"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. 13:12) Mr. Porter would like for that to read: "For by a certain group of preachers are we all baptized in water to form one body." I thank my God, I have been baptized by the one Holy Spirit of God which made me a member of Christ's body.

XVI. "THE MAJORITY VOTE," "ARBITRARY RULERS AND CHURCH BOSSES" IN THE SO-CALLED CHURCH OF CHRIST.

You will find an account of this miserable wretched condition existing in the opponent's denomination on page 348 of "Gospel Proclaimer," January 1950, in an article entitled, "The Right to Legislate." In paragraph one he denounces it as worse than instrumental music. In paragraph two he admits that they preached against "the majority vote" for many years. In the last paragraph he says he could fill a whole page with names of churches "being wrecked for years by the vote." Mr. Otey has reference here to their "Professional Clergy, and Pastor Sys-

TLC

tem." Really, it is a religious war among their preachers over the biggest "money church." When these ministers cannot well carry their design over and against the ruling "Elders," the minority group, they resort to the vote of the whole church in order to out-rule the intentions of the Elders. When a preacher decides he wants a certain church, all he has to do is wheedle his way in through the few Elders that rule the church. This of course has occasioned great strife, and the "green-eyed monster that mocks the meat on which it feeds" raises up with great fury; calling its rival "Professional Clergy," and "Pastor System makers," "arbitrary rulers" and "church bosses."

BIG QUESTION: Mr. Porter affirms that his "Religious Order" is Scriptural in practice. Now tell us, Is the practice of these "Professional Clergymen, Arbitrary Rulers, and Church Bosses," Scriptural?

You tell us that your "religious order" is not denominational because it conforms to New Testament practice. Now you have thousands of ministers and members who curse, guzzle beer, pour poison nicotine into their system, and attend the modern theatres which Senator Johnson denounced as "HOLLYWOOD'S WICKED ELEMENT." Now tell us—Do these "desecraters of God's temple"—their body—practice the same life Paul and Stephen and Mary the Mother of Jesus? Tell me Gentleman Sir, Do you think Mary and Elizabeth and Anna would attend a show on Rossellini and Ingrid Bergman's affair?

XVII. WAS DIOTREPHES SAVED? Mr. Porter said he was a "Dictator," and said he was in the church. Now let us remember, Mr. Porter tells us that the only way to get into the church of Christ is by salvation. If this Dictator was in the church, according to my opponent's theory he was a saved man. Can you imagine a saved Dictator! My Lord and my God!

XIX. POOR CAMPBELL, LIVED AND DIED A PRESIDENT OF A DENOMINATION.

The Church of Christ ministry met in Cincinnati in

TLC

1849 "and established a general organization of the churches." Mr. Porter said it was organized by the "Christian Church." I reminded him that this was 43 years before the Christian Church was organized. He then squirmed, and said, "IT was not a general organization of the churches of Christ, but only a 'Society' among the churches." I ask him if this "Organized Society" was a denomination, and he frankly admitted it was. Then I ask him who was its President, and he very nearly fainted in his heart. Its President was his chief apostle and "Reformatory" father —Mr. Alexander Campbell. He now comes back and says, "They made Campbell its president in his absence." This is the same as saying they forced him to this position. Have you ever heard such juggling? How long did he serve as President? For 17 years. If they made him president in his absence, he had seventeen years to get out of it.

Another thing he said, "This was in Campbell's declining years, a position that he could not have been induced to accept during the earlier period of his life."

Can you beat that? He tells us that Campbell's age was the blame. This is like saying, "Campbell could not resist sin in his old age as well as he did in his youth." My Lord and my God! What is Mr. Porter's sort of church of Christ coming to? He says we should grow in grace, and here he informs us that Campbell was so weak in grace in his old age that he could not help but fill a sinful office for 17 years. Seventeen years is a mighty long time. Campbell was quite different from Paul, who said "while his outward man was perishing his inward man was being renewed day by day." While Paul's body grew weaker, his spirit grew stronger. Campbell's grace waned with his body.

When I ask, "Did this make Campbell a denominational preacher," he said, "It led to the establishment of a denomination." Question: Can man be guilty of what leads to the establishment of a denomination and still be saved? If Campbell did what led to a denomination, then he was guilty of denominationalism. "Denominationalism" is that which leads to, or creates denominations, sects, parties.

TLC

Hence, I have proved that my opponent's own Star Preacher was denominational in his ministerial character. Alas!

XX. A QUIBBLE THAT WOULD BE AMUSING WERE IT NOT SO AMAZING.

When I proved that "the body of Christ," the exclusive church, had no hypocrites in it at all (I proved this by saying "in His holy body there is not one beer-guzzler"), my disturbed opponent reasons like this: "If there is no sin in the body of Christ then no saved man could fill his belly with whiskey." Ah Sir, you explain how Christians can fill their belly with whiskey? You are the one that says, "Christians fall from grace when they get drunk." Do they fall out of the church when they get drunk? If it takes salvation to put a man into your church, then it takes salvation to keep him in your organization: and can you prove that every man is out of your Churches of Christ that has backslid? I have my doubts. You admit that you still have in your church some "Dictators," "arbitrary rulers," "church bosses," "professional Clergymen," and "Bollites." When these heretics apostatized Sir they fell out of the "body of Christ;" but they are still in your sort of "Reformatory Movement:" therefore your organization is one thing and the body of Christ is quite another.

XXI. MR. PORTER SAYS THE CHURCH AT CORINTH WAS A DENOMINATION.

On page 10 of his second affirmative, Brother Porter ask four questions concerning the church at Corinth: and then he says, "If these questions cannot be answered in the affirmative, then the church at Corinth was a denomination." Very well, Sir, I must surrender the point here and say I cannot answer them in the affirmative. So you have definitely proven that the church at Corinth was a denomination. Now let me ask you, "Was it the church of Christ?" Maybe it was the Church of God.

XXII. HIS TWO QUESTIONS ANSWERED (From page 11).

1. "Since these simple acts of gospel obedience made

TLC

men members of the New Testament church in the days of the apostles, would not the same make them members of the same church today?" I answer, "Yes."

2. "Would it make them members of any other church?" I answer, No, this is why Luther, Wesley, Calvin, Knox, and millions of other great saints, were in Christ's church hundreds of years before Stone and the Campbells instituted their "REFORMATORY MOVEMENT."

XXIII. "HOW MANY DENOMINATIONS DOES GOD HAVE?" He reminds me that question because he found two denominations by the same name—"Church of God." Well, we have two denominations in this town bearing the same name—"Church of Christ." How many denominations does Christ have? After all, it is Porter's denomination under fire, not mine.

XXIV. ELDERS AND MINISTERS — BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

In the opponent's last negative he said, "Myers doesn't know the difference in an elder and a minister." Really, he doesn't know; and when I pressed the point, he said, "All elders are ministers." After this I ask him if Judas was a bishop, and were the other apostles bishops? Perhaps he overlooked this question—purposely. Please answer it.

XXV. CAMPBELL-STONE MERGER.

I ask him, "Why did Campbell and Stone's two groups have to unite into something else since they were already saved and in the same church?" Mr. Porter quibbles as usual, and finds two groups in Mobile, both called by the name "Church of God," who got together and voted to unite. Then he says, "If Myers can explain how these two groups, both known as the Church of God and both saved, could vote to unite, then I'll help him solve the 'Campbell-Stone Merger'." O. K. Brother Porter, I will be glad to explain it—THESE TWO GROUPS WERE UNITED INTO ONE DENOMINATION. DOES THIS SOLVE THE CAMPBELL-STONE MERGER? And so we clearly see who dropped samboo in the well.

TLC

XXVI. DOES THE SO-CALLED CHURCH OF CHRIST FOLLOW THE NEW TESTAMENT ON WATER BAPTISM? My opponent has had lots to say on "water baptism" and its design in this debate. I haven't said much against it: but since "water baptism" is about all he has I will satisfy his theological ambition by seeing how much he does know about it. I am asking him a series of questions. He can answer everyone of them in less than one page. After we get his answers we will see how they fit the Bible pattern.

1. WHEN DID CHRISTIAN BAPTISM BEGIN?

2. WHO WERE THE FIRST JEWS TO RECEIVE CHRISTIAN BAPTISM?

3. WHEN WERE THE APOSTLES BAPTIZED WITH CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, BEFORE THE SPIRIT DESCENDED ON PENTECOST OR AFTER THE SPIRIT DESCENDED? (Please give scripture)

4. WHEN DID THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST BEGIN?

5. WHEN WERE THE SINS OF OLD TESTAMENT SAINTS TAKEN AWAY?

6. WERE THE 3,000 ON PENTECOST BAPTIZED IN WATER BEFORE OR AFTER THE APOSTLES WERE BAPTIZED?

7. WHO WERE THE FIRST GENTILES TO RECEIVE CHRISTIAN BAPTISM? (Please give reference)

TLC

PORTER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

The identity of congregations, among people known as the Church of Christ, with congregations of the first century has been shown by means of their features or characteristics. In the churches of Christ today there is a reproduction of the features that characterized the churches of the New Testament record. On this point I showed in my preceding affirmative *a reproduction of the apostolic recognition of the proper rule of faith and practice, of the New Testament method of becoming members, and of the New Testament form of organization.* From this point I proceed with my affirmation.

4. *The New Testament form of worship is reproduced in churches of Christ today.*

Besides engaging in prayer and the teaching of the apostles, the early church continued steadfastly "in the breaking of bread." Acts 2:42. This they did on the first day of the week. Acts 20:7. Since the first day of the week came once each week, this was a weekly service. It was not a physical meal that brought them together, but the "breaking of bread" in memory of the sufferings and death of the Lord—the Lord's supper. We today have this same item of weekly worship in our services. On this point we are identical with New Testament congregations.

Likewise, the congregations in the days of the apostles made their contributions, as the Lord had prospered them, on the first day of every week. 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. Churches of Christ today adhere to this divine plan. We do not resort to pie suppers, ice cream socials, raffling contests and other such methods of raising money for the church. Such was not done by churches under the direction of inspired men of the first century, and those who do such things today are not identical with congregations of the first century.

Under the direction of the apostles the churches of the New Testament offered their praise to God in the singing of songs. Paul said: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making

TLC

melody in your heart to the Lord." Eph. 5:19. Their making of music was limited to vocal music—to singing. They never used fiddles, horns, banjos, organs, pianos, or other mechanical instruments in their praise to God. They sang —*they did not play.* Any church today that employs such mechanical instruments in its worship is not identical with the New Testament church. But the church of Christ now limits its music to vocal music just as the church of the first century. Hence, there is a reproduction of this item of worship that characterized the church of the first century.

When any religious group adheres strictly to the divine rule of faith and practice—the word of God—and refuses to accept any man as authority; when its members have become such by meeting the same requirements that made men members of the church in the New Testament; when they hold faithfully to the organization that featured the New Testament church; when they worship according to the simple form of worship revealed in the New Testament church: then that group of people must constitute the church that Jesus authorized. It is the church of the New Testament—*the exclusive New Testament church.* The people with which I stand identified reproduce all these principles and have a Scriptural right to claim to be the church of the Lord. We accept no standard of authority but the word of God; we have subscribed to no rules of membership but those laid down in the New Testament; we hold to no organization except that made known by inspired men; and we engage in no form of worship but that made known by divine revelation. Therefore, I insist, we constitute the church of Christ today. These arguments are unanswerable. My opponent has not tried, and likely will not try, to answer them. They sustain my proposition in such a way that my opponent cannot overthrow it. If he thinks he can, I challenge him to make the effort. So far he has not done so, but has all but ignored the arguments presented.

I shall now pay attention to the second negative of my opponent. He says: "My opponent wants to know why I

TLC

used only one and one-half pages against his twelve full pages." It would be interesting to see my opponent try to find the statement I made in which I "wanted to know" that. The reader can see for himself that *I expressed no such desire.* I did not ask *why,* but I stated why. And it was not because the arguments constituted "dead game." I will admit that it would have been a "waste of ammunition" on the part of my opponent, for when any man fires denominational ammunition at bulwarks of truth he is wasting his ammunition. The fact that he went through his second negative without attempting a reply to the arguments further emphasizes his inability to meet them.

But when I state that Mr. Myers has not met my arguments he thinks I have "obviously elected" myself "as judge of this debate." But, of course, when he says that Porter "juggled the answer" and is "hornswoggled and hogtied" he has not elected himself as judge. Isn't that a strange form of consistency? If it works in one case, why not in the other?

HIS CHALLENGE. He challenges me to meet him "in several *public debates* and *there read our papers.*" That would be some public debate, would it not? He wants us to go around over the country and read our written debate to public audiences. I consider that a reflection on the intelligence of the reader. Does he think the reader cannot intelligently read our published debate and that he must supply his "personal interpretations" to make it understandable? This debate, as far as I am concerned, is being written for the reader, and I am perfectly willing for the man who buys the book to read it for himself. I think he will have the ability to do it. He will not need either of us to read it for him. But if Myers wants a public debate—or several of them—he can get all he asks for. And just here I remind him of the fact that the Church of Christ of Cleveland, Tennessee, challenged him to meet me in "public debate" in Cleveland. This is the city where his denominational headquarters is located. But Mr. Myers was not interested in meeting me there. So I now accept his challenge for a "public debate"—several of them—and we will

TLC

start in Cleveland. We will have propositions covering the teaching of both groups. And during the oral debates we can sell the people our written debate. Thus they will have the advantage of two debates. When this article reaches you, Mr. Myers, it will have some propositions, already signed, attached to it. Just sign them and return one copy to me. Then I'll contact my brethren at Cleveland and tell them we are ready. What do you say? I am of the opinion that your eagerness for "several public debates" will begin to wane.

CONCERNING MARTIN LUTHER AND CHRISTIANS IN DENOMINATIONS

My opponent asked if I believe Martin Luther is in hell. When I asked what that would have to do with the proposition, he says for me to let him worry about that. So we will let him worry a little. In his second negative, under TWO QUESTIONS ANSWERED, he said: "The new birth is an epochal experience in the Holy Spirit, and puts a man into 'God's denomination'—the body of Christ." Very well, then, since the new birth puts a man into God's denomination, *every man* is in *that denomination* who has been *born again.* This means that *every saved person is in God's denomination.* This is what my opponent has often said. Let him stand by it. Mr. Myers is a member of the Pentecostal "Church of God" denomination, with headquarters at Cleveland, Tennessee, which has H. L. Chesser as its General Overseer. I asked Mr. Myers the question: "Whose denomination is the church to which you belong?" In his first negative, under AN IMPORTANT QUESTION ANSWERED, Mr. Myers answers: "God's denomination." I want the reader to get this: The "Church of God" denomination with H. L. Chesser as General Overseer is "God's denomination." Well, what of it? Mr. Myers says that every saved person—every one who has experienced the "new birth"—is in "God's denomination." *Therefore, every saved person is under the oversight of H. L. Chesser and is a member of the Pentecostal "Church of God" of Cleveland, Tennessee!* Yes, Mr. Myers, it is time for you to start worrying. Martin Luther was not a member of that denom-

TLC

ination nor under the oversight of Chesser. In that case, according to my opponent, Martin Luther had not been born again and has gone to hell! Then he asks: "Are all Methodists in hell?" They are, or at least they will be, according to my friend, for they are not members of that Pentecostal denomination to which Myers belongs. So they are not members of God's denomination and have not been born again! The same is true with the Baptists and with all other denominations, even the Pentecostal denominations who claim the baptism with the Holy Spirit. After my opponent has fought so hard against "religious intolerance" he has now consigned all others to hell who are not members of his denomination. So all his play for religious prejudice against me on these grounds has backfired. And all that he may yet say about it will rebound to his own consternation.

For his benefit I may say that the "Jesus Only" Group, the "Mormons" and the "Catholics" have not met the four simple requirements which I introduced and which were incorrectly stated by my opponent. The "Jesus Only" Group "prays through" to salvation; the Mormons require faith in Smith and the Book of Mormon; and the Catholics substitute sprinkling for baptism. So his effort concerning these has failed him.

REPRODUCTION AND RESTORATION

Mr. Myers feigns ignorance, and asks for information, about what I meant by "reproduction of the church." I fully explained when I introduced the idea. I showed that men might destroy all wheat plants in the world but they would not have destroyed the wheat kingdom if they did not destroy the seed. The seed could be planted and it would "reproduce" itself—produce the same thing it did originally. Webster defines "reproduction" to be "the process by which animals and plants bring forth their kind." That is what I meant by it. So I said all members of the church, or kingdom, might be destroyed, but the kingdom is not destroyed if the seed remains. Plant that seed—the word of God—and it will reproduce itself. It will produce the

TLC

very thing it produced originally. There is no congregation on earth today which has had a continued existence since the first century. Congregations, produced by the unadulterated word of God, are reproductions of congregations that existed in the days of the apostles. That is what I mean by "reproducing the church." Do you understand that, Mr. Myers?

He wants to know if Campbell and Stone reformed or restored. In the sense given in the preceding paragraph, it was a work of restoration. If Scriptural congregations existed, their whereabouts were not known. At least none existed on the American continent. So they set about to call men back to the original foundation—to *restore them to the divine standard.* In this sense it was a restoration.

But my friend thinks he has caught me in a contradiction. Since "misery loves company," it would be great consolation to him if he should do so. But not so fast. Maybe the contradiction is not so great after all. He gives the article, page and paragraph in which he claims that I said that "HUNDREDS OF CHRISTIANS WOULD NOT RENOUNCE THEIR FAITH AND ACCEPT THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPES." Let the reader look to that page and paragraph and see if I said that. *I said no such thing.* Myers added to what I said. The words, "of Christians," which he put on the inside of quotation marks are not my words at all. They are Myers' addition to my statement. If he did not know he was misrepresenting me, then his ignorance must be nearly infinite. Men who were sincere would die for their faith, even though it was not according to the New Testament, before they would subscribe to the authority of popes. Furthermore, I did not say, "There have been Christians in every age and century since the church was established." He broke off a part of my statement and changed the meaning of it. I stated that some passages "seemed to indicate continued existence" and "I do not doubt that there have been Christians in every age." But I did not definitely say, "There have been." I was simply showing there might have been or there might not have been. It would make no material difference *as*

TLC

long as the seed was not destroyed. The seed could be planted and the same kind of congregations would be produced that existed in the first century. This takes care of his "restoration scare."

"HORNSWOGGLED AND HOGTIED"

This is the position my friend says he put me into. If I am "hogtied," he "hogtied" me; if I am "hornswoggled," he "hornswoggled" me. But to "hornswoggle," according to Webster, means to "bamboozle or humbug." To "bamboozle" means to "deceive by trickery." To "humbug" means to "cheat." So Myers says he has "cheated" me and "deceived" me "by trickery." My! My! I hardly expected him to confess to such tactics. But I have not been "deceived" by his "trickery." Mr. Myers, who hornswoggled whom? Do you want to correct this "grammatical error"? I have told you before that you would do better to stay with simple words that you understand.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING CAMPBELL

He returns to his questions concerning Campbell and wants to know, since Campbell taught some things that we do not accept, why cannot he and the Baptists and Methodists do the same thing and still be saved. Perhaps you can if it is something upon a correct knowledge of which God has not made our salvation to depend. For example, one of Myers' brethren, C. G. Paschal, had an article in "The Church of God Evangel," Feb. 25, 1950, on Paul's "Thorn In The Flesh." He gave three prominent positions held by Bible students. Then he gave his position which was different from all the rest. I suppose these positions might be held by four men, without condemning their souls, if they caused no division by an agitation of the same. But when men deliberately set aside a plain teaching, or commandment, upon which God has offered remission of sins, it is a different matter entirely. That is what Myers and others have done. So this takes care of his "juggling quibble" about false doctrine.

He did not deny that members of the same church at Rome held different positions about a matter, but he said

TLC

this would make Jesus "allow different doctrines in his church." Well, was it so or not, Mr. Myers? I gave the passage. Why did you not show it was not so? The Lord for awhile tolerated "the doctrine of Balaam" and "the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes" in the church at Pergamos. Rev. 2:14, 15. But such did not exist with the sanction of God. Just so some today might introduce Bollism, Balaamism, Nicolaitanism and such like. If it could be done, without God's sanction, in the church at Pergamos, why not in some congregation now?

ANOTHER HARD QUESTION. He thought the preceding was a hard question. So he tried another. He wants to know if false teachers should be separated from our ranks or wait for them to leave of their own accord. Paul said to "mark and avoid" teachers who "cause division" contrary to the doctrine of Christ. Rom. 16:17. Try to find a harder question, Mr. Myers. This one was incorrectly named.

WAS ALEXANDER CAMPBELL A PREMILLENNIALIST? This question is bothering my opponent. I denied it. He asks why I did not give the proof. Well, he is the man *who affirmed it.* He should have given the proof. I can offer much proof that he was not, but Myers is affirming.

In this connection I shall also say again that "Premillennialism" is characteristic of many denominations. But a man might believe the theory without joining a denomination or establishing one. But that would not make the doctrine true.

HIS ANSWER TO MY "BIG QUESTION"

I asked if a man is a true gospel preacher if he does not preach the truth. Mr. Myers says: "A person who does not preach Jesus (the truth) is a humbug." Yes, but what does it mean to preach "Jesus"? It means more that just saying the name. Must a man preach the things Jesus and the apostles taught to be a true gospel preacher? Try again Mr. Myers—yours was a "juggling" act. *I challenge you to answer.*

TLC

WAS CAMPBELL IN THE BAPTIST CHURCH?

My opponent says Campbell was not a Baptist "during these years" before he was baptized but was a "free-lance" preacher. Then he has admitted that his "eight undeniable facts" that he gave in his first negative to prove Campbell was in the Baptist Church are not "undeniable." Three of those "facts," as previously shown, concerned Campbell *before he was baptized.* So my friend has "denied" three of his "eight undeniable facts." This demolishes his whole argument.

And when Campbell was baptized it was "contrary to Baptist usage." My opponent says that Campbell did not say this till 17 years after it occurred. In this way Campbell would shield himself from the charge of hypocrisy. But I have previously shown, from Memoirs of Campbell, Vol. 1, page 398, that Campbell, *before he was baptized,* "stipulated with Elder Luce that the ceremony should be performed precisely according to the pattern given in the New Testament" and that Luce, *before he baptized him,* "objected to these changes, as being contrary to Baptist usage." But Mr. Myers says this was not thought of till seventeen years later.

MY OPPONENT'S BIG QUESTION

Mr. Myers asks: "Can a hypocrite unite with your congregations?" He might go through a form and cause men to recognize him. But if he was insincere, God never added him to the church in the first place. But don't forget that a man might be sincere in his obedience to the gospel but later become a "hypocrite," a "professional clergyman" or anything else that is wrong. This would not prove that he was wrong all the time.

SCRIPTURAL IN PRACTICE

Inasmuch as we claim the church to be Scriptural in practice my friend thinks that we indorse Professionalism, Beer-guzzlers, Pastor-system-makers, Arbitrary rulers, Church bosses, and every form of wickedness that may be engaged in by some of the members. No, I do not believe that "Mary, Elisabeth and Anna would attend a show on

TLC

Rossellini and Ingrid Bergman's affair." Neither do I defend such "practice" as Scriptural. The church at Corinth had a lot of ungodliness in it. They were carnal, having envying, strife and division among them. 1 Cor. 3:3. There was fornication among them. 1 Cor. 5:1. They were going to law with one another. 1 Cor. 6:6. They were guilty of defrauding their brethren. 1 Cor. 6:8. But this wickedness in the church did not make of it a denomination; nor would a man be forced to defend such wickedness if he claimed the Corinthian church to be the church of the Lord. Since my opponent says that his denomination is "God's denomination" I take it that he believes it to be Scriptural in practice. But he admits there are beer-guzzlers and hypocrites in his denomination. Does he defend their practice?

WAS THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH A DENOMINATION?

Since my friend could not answer the four questions concerning Corinth in the affirmative, he says I claim the church was a denomination. Again I feel sure that he knew he was misrepresenting. He had asked me the four questions concerning the Church of Christ, and he said if they could not be answered in the affirmative, it proves we compose a denomination. I simply applied the same questions to Corinth and declared if they could not be answered in the affirmative, it would prove the same about Corinth —*according to Myers' argument.* I was showing the absurdity of *his argument.* If a failure to answer them in the affirmative proves we are a denomination, a similar failure with respect to Corinth would prove the same thing. If not, why not? But I don't believe either. But, according to Myers' argument, the church at Corinth would be a denomination.

Just here I am reminded that I have asked my opponent two questions about Corinth a number of times. I have challenged and begged him to answer. But not a word has he said. Here they are again: 1. *Was the church at Corinth a human denomination, seeing it had envying, strife and division in it?* 2. *If it could have such in it without being*

TLC

a denomination, could it not be true with the Church of Christ today? What is the matter, Mr. Myers, that I can't get you even to notice these? Do you still have too much "sanctifigumption" to answer? Tell us something about it. Are you afraid of them? There is something wrong—you are as silent as the tomb about them. It is time to start saying something about them. Have you seen the "handwriting on the wall"?

A "JUGGLE ON BAPTISM"

Mr. Myers thinks I "juggle" when I claim the 3,000 were baptized in water in Acts 2. He gives 1 Cor. 12:13 to try to prove it was Holy Spirit baptism. And he says: "I thank my God, I have been baptized by the one Holy Spirit of God which made me a member of Christ's body." *According to this, no man is saved till he has the baptism of the Holy Spirit.* All people who are saved, my friend admits, are in the body of Christ. But Holy Spirit baptism put Myers into it. So it puts every other one into it likewise. Consequently, no man is saved, in the body of Christ, till baptized with the Holy Spirit. This makes baptism with the Holy Spirit, salvation and church membership to occur at the same time. But I give herewith a report of a revival that appeared in "The Church of God Evangel," March 25, 1950. (This is typical of all their reports): *"There were 136 saved, 75 sanctified, 51 baptized with the Holy Ghost, 97 baptized in water, and 36 added to the church."* Notice in this that 136 were saved but only 51 were baptized with the Holy Ghost. If it took the baptism of the Holy Spirit to put Myers into the body of Christ—to save him—then how did these others make it without it? Only 51 out of 136 were baptized with the Holy Ghost. So 85 of them *were saved without it.* And only 36 were added to the church. That leaves 100 who were saved without being added to the church. It looks as if some one else is doing some "juggling."

CAMPBELL AND THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY

My friend thinks it strange that Campbell, in his declining years, might be led to be a president of a Mission-

TLC

ary Society when he would not have done so in his younger years. He tries to contrast him with Paul whose inner man was renewed while the outward man was perishing. Does he mean by this that the older a man becomes the stronger grows his mental power? If not, there is no point in his contrast. But if that is what he means, then it is contrary to all known facts of the case. Anyone who knows anything about it knows that one's mental strength declines with old age just the same as physical strength.

But suppose Campbell strayed, with the full strength of his mental power, from the truth of God, and that he will be lost in hell eternally. Would that prove that the Church of Christ is a denomination? Not at all. We are not following Campbell; he is not our authority in religion; and regardless of what he did, we can still stand on the infallible rule of God's word and be just what men were in the days of the apostles.

THE AMAZING QUIBBLE THAT WAS NEARLY AMUSING

Mr. Myers says: "When I proved that 'the body of Christ,' the exclusive church, had no hypocrites in it at all"—He further states: "I proved this by saying 'in his holy body there is not one beer-guzzler'." How did he *prove it?* By introducing Scripture? No. He "proved" it by his assertion—*by saying* something. Well, that sort of proof would be amazing were it not so amusing. If his assertion is to be taken as evidence, he could prove anything. But he will have to give something better. He intimates that a saved person cannot fill his belly with whiskey, and he says: "You are the one that says, 'Christians fall from grace when they get drunk'." Thus my friend intimates that he believes it is impossible for a saved person to fall. In this he disagrees with his "inspired" brethren. L. C. Heaston, one of his Holy-Ghost-baptized brethren, had a long article in "The Church of God Evangel," Nov. 19, 1949, on the subject: "CAN A PERSON ONCE SAVED EVER BE LOST?" He gave many Scriptures to prove the possibility of it. And he said: "As sure as you backslide you are headed for hell. Some said that God would not be

TLC

just to send a backslider to hell, but he deserves it. I think God ought to make a backslider's hell a little hotter." But Mr. Myers denies it. The editor of the same magazine, Feb. 11, 1950, says that persons who say "that once saved a person is forever saved" are "PENKNIFERS OF THE BIBLE." But that is what my opponent is saying. It would be a good idea for them to get some of the wrinkles in their inspiration ironed out, for it is leading them different directions.

But in the same paragraph Mr. Myers says regarding heretics: "When these heretics apostatized they fell out of the body of Christ." Since you have *proved* by your assertion, Mr. Myers, that there is no sin in the body of Christ, let me ask you this: Did these men sin before they fell out of the body of Christ? Or did they fall out before they sinned? If they sinned before they fell out, then there was sin committed in the body. If they fell out before they sinned, then what constituted their fall? In this case they would have to get out in order to sin, and you have saved people out of the body.

SURRENDERS THE QUESTION

In answering two questions for me my opponent gives up his whole contention. I asked: *"Since these simple acts of gospel obedience made men members of the New Testament church in the days of the apostles, would not the same make men members of the same church today?"* He answers: *"Yes."* Also I asked: *"Would it make them members of any other church?"* He answers: *"No."* The "simple acts of gospel obedience" to which I referred are faith in Christ, repentance of sins, confession of Christ and baptism for the remission of sins. Obedience to these, my friend says, "made men members of the New Testament church" then and does the same today. Furthermore, he says it will not make men members of any other church. These are the simple acts that I performed—I did nothing else. They made me a member of the New Testament church. They did not make me a member of anything else. So agrees my opponent. So, *according to his own admission, I am not a*

TLC

member of any denomination. I belong to nothing but the New Testament church. My position is sustained. Thanks, Mr. Myers, for your surrender.

BISHOPS AND PREACHERS

Judas was a "bishop" in the sense that he had a "bishopric," which simply referred to his apostolic office. The apostles were overseers in the sense of directing revelation to the churches. But they have no successors—not even among my friend's brethren.

QUESTIONS ON BAPTISM

I am asked a number of things about "Christian baptism." The answers will depend on what he means by the term. After all, the term does not occur in the Bible. I suppose he means baptism for the Christian age.

"1. When did Christian baptism begin?" Answer: The baptism for this age, according to the commission of Mat. 28:19, was first administered in Acts 2.

"2. Who were the first Jews to receive Christian baptism?" The first to receive the baptism of Mat. 28:19 were the Jews at Pentecost. Acts 2:41.

"3. When were the apostles baptized with Christian baptism, before the Spirit descended on Pentecost or after the Spirit descended?" Answer: Some of them had "John's baptism" (Acts 1:21, 22) before Pentecost. Paul was baptized after Pentecost. Acts 9:18.

"4. When did the gospel of Christ begin?" Answer: It was preached in promise to Abraham (Gal. 3:8), in preparation by John the Baptist (Mark 1:1, 2), and began in fact on Pentecost (Acts 2:14-40).

"5. When were the sins of Old Testament saints taken away?" Answer: Complete redemption was reached in the death of Christ. Heb. 9:15.

"6. Were the 3,000 on Pentecost baptized in water before or after the apostles were baptized?" Answer: After a part of them; before a part of them.

TLC

"7. Who were the first Gentiles to receive Christian baptism?" Answer: The first Gentiles as such—uncircumcised Gentiles—to be baptized with water were Cornelius and his household. Acts 10.

TLC

MYERS' THIRD NEGATIVE

1. LORD'S SUPPER.

On page 1, the opponent affirms they observe the Lord's supper according to New Testament standard. They could do this and still be a denomination.

2. FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE CHURCH.

In paragraph 3 of the same page he insists that they make their contributions to the church like the early apostles. I cannot say that they do exactly; but if they should that would not keep them from being a denomination. My opponent takes 1 Cor. 16:1, 2 for a base for establishing a general rule for raising money to build churches and for the support of the ministry. But it is shown at Romans 15:26 that this particular collection was taken—"For the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." Nothing said about a collection to build churches or support the preacher. It is shown at 2 Cor. 9:1 to 5 that Paul sent Titus beforehand to get this collection for the saints. This was a collection, not tithes and offerings. How do you know Sir but that Titus collected clothing, food, and money during the week and had each one who contributed bring their respective materials to church with them the next Lord's day? This would be a collection. See here, this self-styled Church of Christ take certain references which has to do with raising a collection of materials for charitable purposes and applies it to raising money to build and support churches. It proves how little they know of God's Holy Word.

3. PIES AND ICE CREAM.

The opponent chides other churches for selling pies and ice cream to get money for the chucrh. What is the difference in selling ice cream and selling potatoes and cotton? Acts 2:45 tells us that they "sold their possessions." Yes, and brought the money into the treasury of the church. Say Brother, Do any of your people sell materials to raise church money? Better watch your answer, I might have lots of information close by.

TLC

4. MUSIC.

My opponent has never found where the early saints used instruments of music in church. The verse is found, Sir, adjoining that verse which tells you to use the "pitch pipe." "Now let's not be unreasonable," they answer, "the pipe is only to assist in getting the pitch of the song." "Certainly so, and our piano is to assist in holding the pitch after we get it."

5. HEART FAILURE.

When the opponent read my challenge to meet and read our debate before large crowds his heart must have fluttered dangerously. He says, "That would be some public debate, wouldn't it." I answer, "It really would, it would be so differently from the ordinary way of presenting truth people would pour out to hear it." Will Mr. Porter allow one of his brethren in Huntsville, Alabama to meet me and read his part of the debate?

6. PUBLIC DEBATE IN CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE.

When the so-called Church of Christ run their little challenge in the Cleveland paper, my father, W. L. Myers represented our position, and published his article, "DID MIRACLES CEASE WITH THE COMPLETION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT?" In a footnote he challenged any minister in the whole Church of Christ denomination to answer that article theologically. They read the article, and the challenge, and run like scared cats. The article is still unanswered. Mr. Porter, your poor helpless brethren in Cleveland are suffering great reproach. Can you help them? It surely must be painful to belong to the "diehards."

7. CHRISTIANS IN THE DENOMINATIONS.

When I ask if he believed there are any saved people in the denominations, as he calls them, he did not have enough resolute endurance and religious impregnability to answer yes or no; and as usual he begins to squirm like an eel and twist like a screw-ball. But the amusing part is he turns and represents me as teaching that every Chris-

TLC

tion on earth is under the oversight of Reverend H. L. Chesser. This unholy allegation needs no refutation; every honest reader will know that this is a deliberate falsehood. MR. PORTER AND HIS MAN-MADE CHURCH SYSTEM ARE THE ONES TRYING TO PROVE THAT ALL CHRISTIANS UPON EARTH BELONG TO THEIR "REFORMATORY MOVEMENT." This is what the term "exclusive" in the proposition means. He tries to exclude from the body of Christ all saints except those who follow Alexander Campbell's "materialistic infidelity." You see dear reader, his Popish dogmata relative to water baptism shuts out of the kingdom of God all such great men of God as Luther, Calvin, Finney, Wesley, Spurgeon, Moody, and when he is backed into a corner with the candid question—Were these great men saved or lost in hell, he has not enough courage to stick to his bush.

Come on Porter, don't smatter, be a good honest boy and loyal to your people, tell us—Are there any saved people in the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians?

8. POINT BLANK CONTRADICTION.

Porter now denies saying that saved people existed all through the dark ages. No wonder he is trying to back out of this; according to his theory truly saved people is what makes up the church, and to admit that truly saved people were in the earth in every age would annihilate his dogma that Campbell restored it in the 19th century. Campbell couldn't restore what already existed in fact. So my opponent now thinks the best way out of this mess is to deny saying that true saints existed BEFORE Campbell's "Reformatory Movement." The following is a quotation from the pen of Alexander Campbell:

> "I observe, that if there be no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us 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 of the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against the church: THIS CANNOT BE: AND THEREFORE THERE ARE CHRIS-

TLC

TIANS AMONG THE SECTS." (Campbell-Rice Debate, page 517)

Now watch Porter twist: he says, "When a person becomes a true Christian that move puts him into the Church of Christ." Now let me ask you Mr. Porter, "When Campbell said, 'There are Christians among the sects,' did he mean that God's true church existed among the various denominations?" Tell me—Do these Christians among the sects join your "Reformatory Movement" in that operation that made them Christians? Well, the opponent might repudiate Campbell at this point, so I will show you that he himself taught the very same thing in his Second Affirmative. He said:

> "This apostasy, (Catholicism) however, did not necessarily result in complete destruction of the church. In view of a number of statements in the Bible I do not doubt that there have been Christians in every age and century since the church was established. . . .all these statements seem to indicate continued existence."

In my next installment I proved by his own theory that Campbell could not restore the church if these "Christians in very age and century" is what constituted the church. This so completely annihiliated his dogma he is now trying to deny saying Christians existed in every age and century, but I have the above words right here before me.

Now, notice how he prevaricates in his next letter. He said:

> "I did not say there have been Christians in every age and century since the Church was established."

Now, compare this with his words above: "I do not doubt that there have been Christians in every age; BUT I DID NOT DEFINITELY SAY 'THERE HAVE BEEN'." Well dear Brother, If you have no doubt that Christians have existed in every age, then you do believe that they have existed. But the way you get by is by saying, "I did not definitely say, 'there have been'." No, Mr. Porter, you

TLC

have not definitely said anything; every word that runs out of your mouth is indefinite, abstract, if so, it might be, it could be, it ought to be, it probably is, I'm not certain, but if—. It is evident Sir, that somebody is bamboozled and hornswoggled.

Mr. Porter not only denies God's word, and my word, he even denies his own word. A man that will deny his own word certainly cannot be trusted with God's word.

9. REPRODUCTION AND RESTORATION. When ask if Campbell reformed the church or restored it, he bungled the answer so badly the reader will not know what he tried to say. He ran back to his "wheat seed illustration," and said "If all wheat plants were destroyed, the seed could reproduce another crop." I suppose he means by this that all Christians were destroyed from the earth during the apostasy (1,500 years), and when the Campbells arose the Bible produced more Christians—"another crop of wheat." Mr. Porter, Do you honestly believe that no Christians existed on the earth for fifteen hundred years until the Campbells arose? Do you intelligently and honestly believe that Martin Luther's ministry produced no Christians? Do you candidly believe that Wesley's ministry produced not one Christian? Do you honestly from the bottom of your heart, believe that Jesus Christ had no living, actual, tangible, visible, kingdom of God upon the earth for 1,500 years? Absurd and unreasonable! The Old Covenant was never without a remnant "that would not bow their knees to Baal." But the great religion of Jesus Christ, and the gracious economy, was without a true remnant for 1,500 years. All who believes this stand on your head.

QUESTIONS THAT MORTIFY HIS THEORY WORLD WITHOUT END

The opponent and his Brotherhood takes great pleasure in denouncing others for having "conflicting doctrines." They say, "This is denominationalism." It was my responsibility to prove that their own organization is full of conflicting doctrines. Then I reasoned, "If men in your organization can preach different doctrines and retain

TLC

membership in God's church so can the Baptists, Methodists, and others. He comes back and says, "They can if it is something upon a correct knowledge of which God has not made our salvation to depend." He means by this that Baptists, Methodists, and others are in Christ's church if they have not violated a doctrine essential to salvation. Very well, but dear reader, these saved Baptists, Methodists, and others ARE NOT IN MR. PORTER'S ORGANIZATION, THEY ARE NOT IN THEIR "REFORMATORY MOVEMENT." It follows then that Mr. Porter's organization is not the "EXCLUSIVE" body of Christ.

SIXTY-FOUR DOLLAR QUESTION. The CHRISTIAN CHURCH, the progressive wing of Mr. Porter's "Reformatory Movement," teaches the four things which my opponent says are essential to membership in the church of Christ. They teach "belief in Christ," "repentance," "confession of sins," "baptism in water for the remission of sins," precisely like the opponent's church teaches, not one iota of difference. They hold to Alexander Campbell on these four things as perfectly as does Mr. Porter. Now tell us Brother Porter: DO THESE FOUR THINGS MAKE THE MILLION MEMBERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH MEMBERS OF YOUR CHURCH OF CHRIST? Now come clean, tell us—IS THIS CHRISTIAN CHURCH A DENOMINATION? Yes, you denounce it with severity, and brand it a denomination. Then you turn around and tell us that these four things which the Christian Church holds are the only requirements in becoming members of the church of Christ. DOES THIS MEAN THAT YOU HAVE ONE MILLION DENOMINATIONAL MEMBERS IN YOUR SORT OF CHURCH OF CHRIST? Porter, I know this is an awful operation upon your spirit, but remember you brought it on yourself when you imbibed Campbell's metaphysical dogmata.

Your Brother I. A. Douthitt, in the "Round Table Discussion" in Birmingham, Alabama during your debate with Tingley, ask a question—"What does this Myers of the so-called church of God know about the New Testament

TLC

church?" When he reads this debate his question will be fully answered.

10. QUESTION UNANSWERED. On page 4 of my former letter I ask this question: "Just suppose that one of your ministers and his whole congregation should continue in the four things you say is only necessary for membership in Christ's church, but they imbibe the doctrines of Bollism, Balaamism, Nicolaitanism, no-hellism, Premillennialism, and a score of other isms—tell us, Would that church continue to be the church of Christ?" He has not answered this question. He will not answer this question. Why? Because it wonderfully distinguishes between his denomination which has in it such things, and Christ's body, "the true vine," which has no dead branches in it.

When I brought this point against his denomination he ran to the Bible, and tried to prove that God's church in the Bible had false doctrines and hypocrites in it. You see dear reader, this false school hammers on other churches, calling them denominations because they have in them false doctrines and hypocrites; and when I prove irrefutably that his church was guilty of the same, he tries to prove that these false doctrines and isms do not make his organization a denomination because God's church in the Bible had the same. Well, if these false doctrines and hypocrites did not make God's church in the Bible a denomination, and if they do not make yours a denomination just why would they make others a denomination? A strange logic indeed!

11. WHERE DOES MR. PORTER MAKE HIS CAPITAL MISTAKE? By a failure to Scripturally distinguish between the body of Christ, a spiritual organism, and the visible church, a literal organization. The body of Christ is composed of every soul that ever has or ever will be born of the Spirit of God. *"THIS IS THE EXCLUSIVE CHURCH."* "EXCLUSIVE"—"To shut out," (Webster). WHAT DOES THE BODY OF CHRIST SHUT OUT? It shuts out all the devil's goats; not one unregenerated member in it; not one hypocrite. It shuts out all the "Profes-

TLC

sional Clergymen," "arbitrary church bosses," "beer guzzlers," "Balaamites," and "Nicolaitanites." There is a church in the Bible that is "sanctified with the washing of water by the word"; it is "without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing." (Ephesians 5:24-27) This body of Christ is perfectly free of idolaters, whoremongers, and adulterers. Mr. Porter tells us in his former letter that the church is the bride of Christ. And may I add: "There is no spot in her." (Cant. 4:7) My friend said, "The Lord for awhile tolerated the doctrine of Balaam and the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes in the church at Pergamos." Now your doctrine tells us that if you are in the church you are saved. Then do you mean by the above statement that God allowed these awful heretics to remain on in salvation for awhile? The above statement shows that Mr. Porter has not enough scholarly balance to rightfully distinguish between the "visible organization" of the church and the "spiritual organism." Now the reason is obvious, it would annihilate his Popish and Papistical tenets world without end. It would prove that his church is no more the "exclusive body of Christ" than the other wing, the Christian Church, because they hold to every essential doctrine that Mr. Porter's denomination holds. Yes, somebody is definitely bamboozled and hornswoggled.

12. DIED HARD. "Can a hypocrite unite with your sort of church of Christ?" My opponent answered: "He might go through a form and cause men to recognize him. But if he was insincere, God never added him to the church in the first place." No, but Mr. Porter added him to his church.

See dear reader, this definitely proves who killed cock robin. He had to admit that a hypocrite was not in the body of Christ, but could be in his sort of church. This shows that Porter's denomination is one thing and Christ's church is quite another. If Mr. Porter's church was the exclusive body of Christ it would exclude all those "Professional Clergymen," "arbitrary church bosses," "beer-guzzlers," and "cussers." Instead of them trying to identify

TLC

all saved people with Christ's exclusive body, they try to bundle the whole body of Christ up in their little denomination. This is ambuscaded hypocrisy; not a scintilla of truth about it. It would be easier for Porter to put the Atlantic ocean in a wash-tub than to put all the body of Christ into his little organization.

13. ANSWERING HIS QUESTION WITH A BIT OF "SANTIFIGUMPTION." He ask: "Was the church at Corinth a human denomination, seeing it had envying, strife, and division in it?" Answer: It was according to your theory, for you have already said that human opinions, division, and strife is the cause of denominationalism. Sir, you are the one who gave these things as evidence of denominationalism, so you have answered your own question—whether you know it or not. "If it could have such in it without being a denomination, could it not be true of the church of Christ today?" I will answer his question with another question, as Christ did on one occasion: If it could have such things in it without being a denomination could it not be true of other churches today, which you denounce as denominations? He thinks if these things did not make Corinth a denomination neither would they make his church today a denomination. And if they do not make your sort of church a denomination just why would it make other churches? The same thing that makes geese in Asia make geese in Africa.

14. IPSE DIXIT. That means, "he said so." When I agreed that the simple acts of gospel obedience made men members of the New Testament church and the same acts would make them members of the same church today, the opponent says—"These are the simple acts that I performed—I did nothing else." He did nothing else? "Ipse Dixit," he did do something else, he imbibed Alexander Campbell's personal interpretations of the Christian system; and this made him a member in Campbell's "reformatory movement"—a denomination just as much or more than any other. Say Mr. Porter, What about those "Professional Clergyman," they are members of your party, ministers of your churches, do they perform anything else

TLC

besides "gospel acts of obedience?" Did you not say "hypocrites God would not add to his church?" But you frankly confess that some are added to your sort of church. Alas!

15. HIS GNOSTIC ALLEGATION—A MODERN JUHUDI ACT. He represents me as saying, "A Christian cannot get drunk." I taught this and nothing more, that a Christian could not get drunk without becoming a drunkard. Can a truthful man tell a lie? No, only liars tell lies. A truthful man can however, forfeit his truthful character and then tell a lie. Mr. Porter tells us that salvation puts men into his sort of church. Then he turns and says, "Men can get drunk, apostatize out of the church and be lost." BUT GET THIS, THEY STILL HAVE APOSTATES IN THEIR SORT OF CHURCH. Surely if salvation should put a man into Porter's church apostasy would knock him out—but does it? No man wears a heavier yoke than the man who belongs to a false cult. Gospel buck-shot hit him from a thousand positions.

16. BISHOPS AND PREACHERS. The opponent said, "Judas was a bishop." To this I gladly concede. But mark this, Judas was a bishop before the day of Pentecost. Now the bishopric is an office in the New Testament church. Did Judas fill this office before the church started? I think not, but Mr. Porter thinks the church did not start until Pentecost. The idea that the church started at Pentecost is perfectly human.

17. WAS CAMPBELL IN THE BAPTIST CHURCH? When I gave proof from literature written by men in his own "reformatory movement," he did not try to refute the facts, but merely said, "Campbell stated that he was not baptized according to Baptist usage." Do you mean to tell me Porter that a man would honestly disagree with the Baptist's interpretation on Baptism, yet join them and preach for them 17 years? JUST WHY WOULD A MAN THAT SAYS WATER BAPTISM IS ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION GO INTO A CHURCH THAT TAUGHT JUST THE OPPOSITE? Would that not make him hypocritical? No, Campbell apostatized on baptism after he had

TLC

been preaching in the Baptist church for years. No use trying to squirm out, you know it is so.

18. MENTAL DEFICIENCY. I proved that Campbell was the president of a denomination, The Christian Missionary Society. The opponent answers: "They made him president in his absence while ill." I then proved that he had 17 years to get out of this office but did not. The opponent comes back and says, "It was in Campbell's declining years." He laid it on his physical infirmities. Then I proved that Campbell was rather strong during these 17 years. And now he comes back in his last letter and tells us it was "mental weakness." He says, "Anyone who knows anything about it knows that one's mental strength declines with old age." He adds: "But suppose Campbell strayed with the full strength of his mental power from the truth of God, and that he will be lost in hell eternally . . . we are not following Campbell; he is not our authority in religion."—Yes you are following him; if not, why have you been trying desperately to defend Campbell throughout this debate? Why didn't you cast Campbell aside to begin with? Sir, your "reformatory movement" claims its origin in the works and doctrines of Campbell. Hear a quotation from "HOW THE DISCIPLES BEGAN AND GREW," page 122, I quote: "And so the Stone movement, though several years older in *its organic form* than that of the Campbells, is generally regarded as a tributary and not the main stream."

It can be seen from this that they regard Campbell's movement as the real movement. Yet you have now repudiated your own denominational father!! You should be ashamed to treat him in such an abusive way!! Your book shelves, and even your own library, is chock full of his literature which holds Campbell up as the greatest preacher since Paul's day. But now you are letting him down hard. First you say he was the greatest preacher this side of the apostle, next you say he joined a denominational society, and was president of it for 17 years; then you say this was due to physical weaknesses of old age; after this you turn and say maybe it was mental deficiencies; and finally

TLC

you say, "We are not following Campbell." Strange!! If Alexander Campbell had not enough intelligence to know he was president of a denomination, then Porter could be in a denomination and not know it. Proof: Campbell wrote his "CHRISTIAN BAPTISM," 1853, several years after he was made president of this denominational society. If Campbell was mentally unbalanced when he joined the "denominational society," then he was also unbalanced when he wote his theory on baptism. Mr. Porter denounces the society, but holds to his baptism theory. You had better check on his "baptism book," it might be as denominational as his "Missionary Society."

19. The opponent represents me as saying I was saved when baptized with the Holy Spirit. I said no such thing. I taught this and nothing besides, that I was baptized into the body of Christ by the agency of the Holy Spirit and not through the agency of some man. The trouble with the opponent is, he doesn't know the difference in regeneration —that inward spiritual baptism that puts us into the body of Christ—and the Gift of the Spirit, that baptism of power —power to witness for Christ. (Acts 1:8) The apostles were saved *BEFORE* they were baptized with the Holy Spirit. Proof, John 17:12, "None of them is lost but the son of perdition." Their sins were forgiven while Christ was upon earth. "Their names were written in heaven." (Luke 10:20) (Written in heaven at least three years before Porter said baptism started.) They were "branches in the True Vine;" i.e., they were already in Christ (Jno. 15:5), three years before water baptism started (?) at Pentecost. "Christ had cleansed them from sin." (Jno. 15:3) "They were not of the world, even as Christ was not of the world." (John 17:16) Notwithstanding, they had not yet received the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Jno. 15:26). And if Brother Porter is right, they were not baptized in water.

LITTLE QUESTION FOR BROTHER PORTER: "When were the apostles baptized into one body, when they were baptized with the Holy Spirit on Pentecost or when they were baptized in water? or was it when they

TLC

received the baptism of repentance?

ANOTHER LITTLE QUESTION: Do you believe that men were already saved (John 17:12), cleansed from sin (John 15:3), their names written in heaven (Luke 10:20) before they were made members of God's church on Pentecost? Well, I am really enjoying this discussion.

Have you not noticed Mr. opponent, the same verse that tells us we are baptized into Christ's body also says, "AND we were all made to drink into one Spirit,"—i.e., it simply means that the same Holy Spirit that put us into the body of Christ also empowered us in Pentecost. Our brother Porter should learn the difference in the baptism of repentance and the baptism of the Holy Spirit: and he should take a lesson from 1 Corinthians 12 teaching us that all of the operations of God in the soul of man are effected through the agency of the Holy Spirit. He is the executive agent of the Holy Trinity—if you didn't know it.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON BAPTISM

1. "When did New Testament baptism begin?" He answers: "Acts 2."

2. "When were the sins of Old Testament saints taken away?" His answer: "In the death of Christ."

3. "Who were the first Jews to receive New Testament Baptism?" His answer: "The Jews at Pentecost."

Somebody is badly bamboozled. Mr. Porter tells us that the apostles and the thousands of Jews saved during the personal minstry of Christ had their redemption completed in the death of Christ. But the same Mr. Porter also said that these did not receive New Testament baptism until Pentecost. THIS MAKES THESE APOSTLES AND OTHER JEWS TO BE COMPLETELY REDEEMED 50 DAYS BEFORE THEY RECEIVED WATER BAPTISM.

EXPLANATION OF THE TESTATOR VERSE

2. "When were the sins of the Old Testament saints taken away?" They say, "In Christ's death." This is perfectly right; but it does not mean that people before Christ did not have their sins forgiven and cleansed out of their soul. Their sins were forgiven, their souls were cleansed

TLC

and purified. How may we explain it? Like this—Their sins were taken out of their heart and placed upon Christ who was to die for them at Calvary. Mr. Porter's church explains it like this—"The sins of Old Testament saints were taken out of their life and rolled forward and placed on the cross, and when Christ died he took them away forever." They say, "It is finished," means "sin is finished," i.e., completely destroyed from the mind of God. This is a great explanation, I agree with you perfectly. But wait, you tell us that these thousands of Jews saved under Christ's personal ministry, and their sins completely taken away in Christ's death, did not receive water baptism until Pentecost. This simply means that 50 days, nearly two months, intervened between "complete redemption" and "water baptism." Yes'er, somebody is definitely hornswoggled.

These questions were proposed in the Huntsville Debate (Burton-Myers), and Mr. Burton run through them like a wild-boar through a briar patch. He did it deliberately so none could understand what was said, not even his opponent. But the "wild-boar system" just don't work in this written debate.

FIRST GENTILES RECEIVED WATER BAPTISM EIGHT YEARS AFTER CHRIST DIED

My opponent says, "The first Gentiles as such—uncircumcised—to be baptized with water were Cornelius and his household, Acts 10."

"Christ preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world." (1 Tim. 3:16) This verse tells me that the Gentiles believed on Christ when they heard him preach. The Syrophoenician woman of Mark 7:26 was a Gentile. The Holy Spirit recorded her humility and faith for our example. Mr. Porter nor Mr. Myers has more faith and humility than this Gentile woman had. She was not the only Gentile woman that believed on Christ during his personal ministry. There was also the Gentile centurion (Matt. 8:5) whose faith excelled all the Jews. He was a devout worshipper of

TLC

Christ, and exercised great faith. Christ distinguished him from the Jews, the circumcision.

Now my opponent tells us that these great Gentile believers were not baptized in water until eight years after Christ died. The contradiction is prima facie.

The position of my opponent forces him to say, "God did not save any uncircumcised Gentiles for eight years after Christ died to save all men." All who believes this stand on your head!

EXCEEDINGLY BIG QUESTION: IF WATER BAPTISM WAS NECESSARY FOR SALVATION, DID GOD NOT GIVE THE GENTILES A CHANCE OF SALVATION UNTIL EIGHT YEARS AFTER CHRIST DIED? DID GOD REFUSE TO SAVE THE UNCIRCUMCISED GENTILES JUST BECAUSE THE JEWS REFUSED THEM WATER BAPTISM? WAS CIRCUMCISION ABOLISHED IN CHRIST'S DEATH? WAS IT ABOLISHED FOR JEW AND GENTILE? IF IT WAS ABOLISHED FOR GENTILES IN CHRIST'S DEATH, JUST WHY WOULD GOD REQUIRE GENTILES TO BE CIRCUMCISED DURING THESE EIGHT YEARS, OR ELSE THEY COULD NOT RECEIVE SALVATION IN WATER BAPTISM?

When this self-styled Church of Christ tries to prove that God refused to save any uncircumcised Gentiles for eight years after His Son died they either make circumcision essential to their salvation or they tie their salvation to the hands of some preacher who could save their soul in baptism or refuse to save them. ALL WHO BELIEVES THIS STAND ON YOUR HEAD!

Let us suppose a case. Suppose the Syrophoenician woman, great in her faith for Christ, lived seven years after Pentecost and then died? She was not of the circumcision, but she was very humble, meek, and full of faith in Christ. She died one year before water baptism was allowed upon the Gentiles, and seven years after Christ's death. Where did this woman go, to heaven or hell? Now don't juggle the answer Sir, be honest, the supposition is

TLC

perfectly logical and the illustration germane. If one Gentile woman could believe in Christ like this woman did, a thousand could. And you say Christ completed their salvation in his death, but you will not allow them to get New Testament baptism until eight years later. You inevitably put eight years between their salvation and their water baptism.

Why did the Holy Ghost wait eight years to call Peter down to baptize these Gentiles? Because God knew that the heresy of "baptismal regeneration" would play havoc upon millions in the years to come, therefore God put plenty of time between the salvation of the Gentiles and their baptism in water. Hence, such men as my opponent is without excuse.

MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION UNANSWERED

"Did the twelve apostles receive New Testament baptize (water baptism) *BEFORE* or *AFTER* the Spirit descended upon them? He answered, "Some of them had John's baptism." Did they? Was John's baptism New Testament baptism? If not, why mention it? Porter, the best policy for you is to repent, come clean with God, quit this "superficial society," and get this old time Holy Ghost religion. Then you could shout and shine for God and be a blessing to this world.

The point is this: Did New Testament baptism start after or before the Spirit came upon the apostles? If you don't know, just say, "I don't know," and then we will know that you do not know so much as you once thought you did know—about baptism!

INFALLIBLE FACTS ABOUT CORNELIUS AND HIS HOUSE

1. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." (John 10:16) They were sheep, not goats.

2. When thou are converted (when your mind is saved from the remains of Judaism—fulfilled when Peter saw the sheet full of beasts and fowls representing the Gentiles) strengthen they brethren;" i.e., go preach to your Gentile

TLC

Brethren, Cornelius and his family. They were brethren, not "Mr." and "my friend."

3. The beasts and fowls in the sheet-vision (Acts 10) represented the Gentiles. God said, "What I have cleansed call thou not common." Note, "have cleansed," already.

4. Cornelius was already acquainted with the gospel of peace before Peter preached in his house—"The word preaching peace by Jesus Christ, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism John preached." (Acts 10:37)

5. Peter said, "In every nation (uncircumcised Gentiles) he that feareth God and works righteousness *is accepted.*" Cornelius and his house was of another nation, they were uncircumcised, BUT THEY HAD LONG BEFORE WORKED RIGHTEOUSNESS AND FEARED GOD. Cornelius did this long before Peter preached in his house. (Acts 10:2)

6. When Peter said, "In every nation," he meant all of the uncircumcised Gentiles who lived on the other side of the earth, were accepted of God if they feared him and worked righteousness. THIS DEFINITELY PUTS SALVATION BEFORE WATER BAPTISM.

7. The purification of their hearts was irrefragably evidenced by their reception of the Holy Ghost (Acts 15:8-9)

GOSPEL OF CHRIST BEFORE PENTECOST NOT A FACT!

"When did the gospel of Christ begin?" My opponent says, "In promise to Abraham, in preparation by John the Baptist, but not in fact until Pentecost."

THIS IS THE END! Never heard the beat in my life. Jesus preached the gospel to the poor. Was it a fact or not? Jesus also preached his sermon on the Mount, the greatest gospel sermon that ever will be preached upon earth. Was that sermon a fact? My opponent seems to think the Sermon

TLC

on the Mount was not a gospel sermon. I suggest we write on the door of his church, "Ichabod"—the glory has departed.

TLC

PORTER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Inasmuch as my opponent refuses to pay but little attention to my affirmative arguments and spends his time dealing with other matters, I shall not let him get by even with that, but I shall blast him out of his position on such things. But first I shall notice what little he did say concerning my arguments.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

He says we could be Scriptural on this and still be a denomination. Yes, if that were the only thing on which we adhere to the Scriptures, but when we follow the divine standard on the Lord's supper, as well as the other things taught in the word of the Lord, then we do not compose a denomination.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE CHURCH

And the same is true regarding church finances. Since 1 Cor. 16:1, 2 has to do with the poor saints at Jerusalem, Mr. Myers thinks that "Titus collected clothing, food and money during the week and had each one who contributed bring their respective materials to church with them the next Lord's day." Well, suppose they did. That would still be a Lord's day contribution—the plan we follow in the church of the Lord today. But I doubt if a few men could carry a *liberal contribution* of *food and clothing* from the churches of Macedonia and Achaia all the way to Jerusalem. See Rom. 15:26; 1 Cor. 16:3, 4; 2 Cor. 8:19.

PIES AND ICE CREAM

I suppose there would be no difference between selling ice cream and potatoes and cotton. As individuals we can certainly sell such things, but *the church* has no authority to operate a commercial establishment to raise money for the Lord. The "possessions" sold in Acts 2:45 were "individual possessions"—not "church property." We still occupy Scriptural ground when we "lay by in store on the first day of the week." 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. The New Testament church, as an institution, never staged pie suppers nor ice cream socials to raise money for the Lord.

TLC

MUSIC

My friend thinks "instruments of music" are parallel with "pitch pipes." He says we "get the pitch" with one, and he "holds the pitch" with the other. But since "music" is "a succession or combination of pleasing tones," when he "maintains the pitch" with the instrument he produces a co-ordinate element and another type of music which the New Testament does not authorize. Such is not true with the pitch pipe—no other element of music is made. So his parallels are not parallel, and we still occupy the New Testament ground upon which my opponent does not stand.

HEART FAILURE

Mr. Myers thinks I had heart failure when he challenged me for several debates. But I sent him propositions already signed for such debates, with the proposal that we start in Cleveland, Tennessee, where he had already been challenged to meet me but refused. The propositions did not come back with his signature. He didn't "have the heart" to sign them. So whose heart failed? He says "the so-called Church of Christ" in Cleveland "ran like scared cats" when they read the challenge made by my opponent's father in an article in a Cleveland paper. Well, they hurried with a challenge for my friend to meet me in public debate there, if that is what he calls "running like scared cats." I never knew "scared cats" would run at you—I thought they would run from you. There must be a different type of cats in my opponent's community. Yes, if my "poor helpless brethren in Cleveland are suffering great reproach," I can help them, Mr. Myers, if you will just sign those propositions I mailed you. I will admit that my brethren there are "helpless" when it comes to inducing my opponent to meet me in oral debate in Cleveland. And they will likely remain "helpless" for a long time to come. What do you say, Mr. Myers? Are you ready for "several public debates"? If so, sign up.

CHRISTIANS IN THE DENOMINATIONS

In my preceding essay I showed, according to my opponent's arguments, that every saved person must be a

TLC

member of his denomination at Cleveland and under the oversight of H. L. Chesser. He replies by charging me with a "deliberate falsehood." But I am not the least disturbed by any such tactics. Enemies of the truth threw worse charges into my Lord's face. So why should I be upset by the same tactics today? But let us look at his arguments again and see if I *deliberately lied* about it.

In his second negative, under point No. XIII, TWO QUESTIONS ANSWERED, he said: "The new birth puts a man into God's denomination." If this is true, every "born again" person is in "God's denomination." But Mr. Myers is a member of the Pentecostal "Church of God" denomination, with headquarters at Cleveland, Tennessee, having H. L. Chesser as General Overseer. So I asked him the question: "Whose denomination is the church to which you belong?" He answered in his first negative, under the topic, AN IMPORTANT QUESTION ANSWERED: "God's denomination." Have I lied when I say that Mr. Myers said that the Pentecostal "Church of God" denomination, with H. L. Chesser as General Overseer, is "God's denomination"? I have not. This is exactly what he said. Did I lie when I stated that he said all "born again" people, or saved people, are in God's denomination? I did not, for he declared that "the new birth puts a man into God's denomination." Then look at them in the form of a syllogism:

1. All "born again" (or saved) people are in "God's denomination."

2. But the Pentecostal "Church of God," with H. L. Chesser as General Overseer, is "God's denomination."

3. Therefore, all "born again" people are in the Pentecostal "Church of God" and under the oversight of H. L. Chesser.

This is the consequence of his doctrine, whether he is willing to accept it or not, and there is no need for him to try to raise a smoke screen by shouting "deliberate falsehood." The reader can see for himself that I have not lied

TLC

about it. So, according to the arguments of my friend, the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and members of other denominations, including Martin Luther, John Wesley, and others, are not saved for they were not members of that Pentecostal denomination which my friend says is "God's." Take your medicine, Mr. Myers. I know it is a bitter dose, but you measured it for yourself, and you will have to swallow it. And we might add a little more to it. In his fourth affirmative, under the heading of ANSWERING HIS QUESTIONS, he looked at this question: "If people now should do just what the gospel requires—no more and no less—would that make them members of a denomination?" He answered: "Yes, God's denomination—'the body of Christ'—but not a human denomination." So Mr. Myers says "God's denomination" is "not a human denomination." Or is this a "deliberate falsehood"? Since he says that "God's denomination" is "not a human denomination," but the Pentecostal church with H. L. Chesser as Overseer is "God's denomination," then it follows that this particular Pentecostal church is not a human denomination. *All others are!* So his cry of "religious intolerance" rebounds upon his own lips. I am certainly "sticking to my bush," for if I believed that Baptistism, Methodism and Presbyterianism would save people, I would be preaching such doctrines. No, I do not believe that Christians are found in the denominations, for denominationalism is contrary to Christianity. And, according to your arguments, you do not believe any are saved outside of your denomination, which you say is "God's." You can't get out of it, Mr. Myers. You would as well not try. Remember you said: "A man who will deny his own word cannot be trusted with the word of God." Thou art the man.

POINT BLANK CONTRADICTION

My friend thinks I contradict myself when I say there *may have been* Christians in all ages and yet Campbell and his co-adjutors engaged in a work of restoration. But he has failed to show any contradiction. The work of "restoration" was getting men back to the Bible alone. If such lived at the time mentioned, we have no record of them. But

TLC

even if they did, there was none in America. So it was still a work of "reproduction." I have shown that the perpetuity is in the seed, *and even if all Christians were destroyed from the earth, the seed can be planted and it will reproduce what it produced in the first century—Christians*; not Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians or Pentecostals. Such are not mentioned in the divine record. Thus I have shown that it makes no difference whether there were Christians in all ages or not. The seed, the word of God, remains, and it will produce congregations just as it did originally. In this sense it is a "reproduction" or "restoration." Before this fact my friend is utterly helpless. But he says I have not "definitely said anything." This will be amusing to the reader. I have been so definite in the affirmative arguments I have presented that my opponent has "definitely" let most of them alone..

Why should I be concerned about what Campbell meant when he said: "There are Christians among the sects?" Campbell has never been my authority in religion, and I am under no obligation to defend anything he ever said. When I used the wheat seed illustration I did not mean "that all Christians were destroyed from the earth." But *I did mean* that *in case they were*, the kingdom still existed, for *the seed had not been destroyed*. Plant that and Christians—members of the New Testament church—will be the result.

DENOMINATIONALISTS IN THE CHURCH

My opponent states that he contended if we could preach conflicting doctrines and "retain membership in God's church," the Baptists and Methodists can do the same thing, and that I admitted that such is true. But they could not "retain membership" unless they were members. Hence, he says I admit they are members of "God's church." But since they are not members of the church to which I belong, then the church to which I belong is not God's church. But it so happens that *he said nothing* about "retaining membership" in that church. And *I made no admission* about their "retaining membership." My friend has changed his statement entirely and misrepresented

TLC

what I said. The reader may turn to his topic, QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, in his second negative and see just what he said. He has revised the whole thing and applied my answer to his revision. Such becomes a base misrepresentation.

HIS SIXTY-FOUR DOLLAR QUESTION

In mentioning the four conditions, as taught in the New Testament and as maintained by us, that men must meet to be saved or become members of the church my friend *has never stated them correctly*. He has mentioned them a number of times and has stated them *incorrectly every time*. But since members of the Christian Church do the same things, he wants to know if they are members of the Church of Christ. When men do the things necessary to be saved, God adds them to the church (Acts 2:41, 47). But if they go beyond and join a human denomination, they are no longer in divine favor. They are in the same condition as others who turn to other things after being saved. I am under no more obligation to accept their denominationalism than I would be the drunkenness of some saved person who turned to liquor. Both are condemned.

If Bro. I. A. Douthitt learns in this debate "what this Myers of the so-called Church of God knows about the New Testament church," his stock of information will not be materially increased.

HIS UNANSWERED QUESTION

This question was definitely answered in my introduction of the church in Pergamos. His claim that it has not been answered is without foundation. Before he was through he admitted that I gave a Bible example in answer to it. But he wants to know: "If these false doctrines and hypocrites did not make God's church in the Bible a denomination, and if they do not make yours a denomination, just why would they make others a denomination?" Answer: Simply because "others" have followed false doctrines to their *ultimate conclusion* and have set up human organizations that the Bible nowhere sanctions. Without this there would not be "others" for you to ask about. Since Balaam-

TLC

ites and Nicolaitanes were in the church at Pergamos, my friend wants to know if "God allowed these awful heretics to remain on in salvation for awhile?" Certainly not. Men can remain in the church and yet be lost. If not, how will the angels *gather them out* of the kingdom (or church) in the day of judgment, according to Mat. 13: 41, 42?

If my CAPITAL MISTAKE is that I do not have the "scholarly balance" to distinguish between the "visible organization" of the church and the "spiritual organism," as my opponent says, perhaps, since he has such a superlative degree of "scholarly balance," he will produce the passage of Scripture that makes any such distinction. I have called for this before, but he has been as shy of it as a mule is of a hole in a bridge. Maybe he can't get his "scholarly balance" and "sanctifigumption" to work at the same time.

HYPOCRITES IN THE CHURCH

I never did say "that a hypocrite was not in the body of Christ" but could be in my "sort of church." This is Myers' "personal interpretation"—it is *not what I said at all.* I said that God does not *add hypocrites* to his church. If men are not sincere, they certainly cannot be saved. But men may turn hypocrites *after they have been added.* In such case there would be hypocrites in the church. If my friend is not able to see the difference between being hypocrites *when* they are added and becoming hypocrites *after* they are added, he should never talk about anyone's lack of "scholarly balance." Ephesians 5:24-27 does not say the church is "without spot or wrinkle," but that he "*might* present" to himself a church like that and "that it *should be* holy and without blemish." If "the body of Christ is perfectly free of idolators, whoremongers and adulterers," as Myers says, then how did the church at Corinth have in it "such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles"? 1 Cor. 5:1. This church was the "body of Christ" at Corinth. 1 Cor. 12:27. I do not expect him to answer this question. His position will not allow him to answer. But here was a fornicator in "the body of Christ." If all "Professional Clergymen," "arbitrary church bosses,"

TLC

"beer-guzzlers," "cussers," and "hypocrites" fall out of the body of Christ, as my opponent has claimed, I am still wanting to know *when they fall out.* I have asked him before, but he is as silent as the voiceless dead. Do they sin before they fall out, Mr. Myers? If so, you have sin in the body of Christ, and your position is surrendered. Or do they fall out before they sin? If they do, you have men *falling* who have not sinned. Furthermore, you have people on the outside of the church who are still saved, unless people can be lost in a sinless condition. Now, come on, Mr. Myers, and answer these questions. You completely ignored them before. Try it now, as I shall have no chance to notice your answer. You will be much safer that way. So do your best.

THE CORINTHIAN PROBLEM SOLVED?

I have repeatedly asked him two questions about the church at Corinth. 1. "Was the church at Corinth a human denomination, seeing it had envying, strife and division in it?" 2. "If it could have such in it without being a denomination, could it not be true of the church of Christ today?" He had ignored these so long that I had begun to think he would never try. But in his preceding negative he actually threatened to answer, and I thought he might do so. But it was a false alarm. Concerning the first he said: "It was according to your theory." No, No. You are wrong. I have said that a denomination is not formed by the mere presence of such things, but when these things lead to the formation of a separate party or organization. You are the man who has tried to prove that we constitute a denomination just because you found some division and strife. So come on and answer the question. *Was the Corinthian church a human denomination, according to you, Mr. Myers?* Concerning the second question he answers by asking: "If they do not make your sort of church a denomination, just why would it make other churches?" And he adds: "The same thing that makes geese in Asia makes geese in Africa." When you have "other churches," Mr. Myers, you must have some human denominations, for the Lord built but one. But men have followed false teaching and division

TLC

to its ultimate conclusion and formed other organizations. That was not true with Corinth, though it could have been done. It is just like his goose illustration. Goose eggs make geese in both Asia and Africa. But in both countries the eggs have to be hatched before they make geese. The mere presence of goose eggs is not sufficient. Likewise, the mere presence of false teaching does not make a denomination. The "egg" of false teaching, envying and strife, must be "hatched" before we have denominations. The "egg" hatches when men, by false teaching, form human churches, which the Lord never authorized. Thank you, Mr. Myers, for your effort in "gooseology." You might try with better results sometime.

GETTING DRUNK MAKES DRUNKARDS

I showed, according to my friend, that *a Christian cannot get drunk,* for he said there is no sin in the body of Christ. Yet he says all Christians are in the body of Christ. So if a Christian can get drunk, there will be drunkenness in Christ's body. But drunkenness is sin; and Myers says no sin can enter the body of Christ; therefore, it is impossible for a Christian to get drunk. But friend Myers tells us now that he did not mean that. He meant only "that a Christian could not get drunk without becoming a drunkard." Is not that an enlightening piece of information? I wonder who thought he could. As he becomes a drunkard when he gets drunk, then there would be drunkards in the body of Christ. If not, then you will have to say *he cannot get drunk.* Take your choice.

CAMPBELL AND THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY

I have never said that Campbell was president of a denomination, through physical weakness, mental deficiency or from any other cause. This is more of Myers' misrepresentation. I never even said the American Missionary Society was a denomination. All of this tirade of my friend is but his "personal interpretations." Of course, he can't help it; he can't even take the word of God for what it says. So I should not expect him to do any better with my word. His claim that I *finally* say that "we are not following Campbell" will be amusing to the reader. Throughout this

TLC

debate I have contended that we have never taken Campbell, nor any other uninspired man, as authority in religion. Then for you to say I have "finally" rejected him is the height of absurdity. But why have I defended him? I have *never defended him as an authority in religion.* I have *merely* defended him *against my opponent's misrepresentations.* He knows this as well as anyone else. But he can make no progress unless he misrepresents. So that is the course he follows. If all that he has said about Campbell in this connection were true, it still would not prove that we form a denomination today, for we stand upon the Bible as our only rule of faith and practice. To follow the Bible alone will not make a denomination. The positions which Campbell held concerning baptism were held long before he published his book on "Christian Baptism." You cannot attribute those positions to his old age. Everybody knows better—except Mr. Myers.

HOW MYERS WAS SAVED

I am sorry I misunderstood my friend regarding his being saved by Holy Spirit baptism. I thought that was what he meant, but he tells us he did not. He says he was baptized into Christ "by the agency of the Holy Spirit and not through the agency of some man." So he was not saved by Holy Spirit baptism nor by water baptism. What baptism was it? He tells us it was "the baptism of repentance." My! My! What next will the gentlemen say? Did you not know, Mr. Myers, that the "baptism of repentance" was administered by man? So if you were not baptized by the agency of man, you didn't get the "baptism of repentance." Paul said in Acts 19:4: "John verily *baptized with the baptism of repentance.*" So if that is what you were saved by, it came *through the agency of man,* Mr. Myers. Does this represent your knowledge of the Bible teaching on baptism? But Jesus said: "John truly *baptized with water.*" Acts 1:5. Put the two together. Paul said that "John baptized with the baptism of repentance." But Jesus said that "John baptized with water." So the "baptism of repentance" and "water baptism" were the same thing. If you were saved by the baptism of repentance, you were saved by

TLC

water baptism, and thus you surrender your whole contention on being saved before water baptism. Thank you, Mr. Myers. It is amazing how false teachers cross themselves. This ruins his "little question" about whether the apostles were saved when they were baptized with water or with the baptism of repentance. They were the same thing. He introduces Luke 10:20; John 17:12; John 15:3, 5; John 17:16 to prove they were in divine favor before they received Holy Spirit baptism, as though any one had ever questioned that fact. But, he says, according to Porter, they were not yet baptized with water. *Porter never said a thing like that in his life.* Let the reader turn to my preceding affirmative and he will see that I said otherwise. Why cannot Mr. Myers get something straight now and then? Why engage in such base misrepresentation? It is a weak cause that requires any such course. Howbeit, the statement of Luke 10:20 does not even refer to the apostles but to the seventy. It makes no material difference in this discussion, but it does show another blunder of a so-called inspired man. Although claiming to speak as the Spirit gives him utterance, he cannot even get his Scriptures straight.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON BAPTISM

When he comes to a consideration of these he revises his questions and then tries to fit my answers to his new questions. Let the reader turn to his former negative and compare his questions which I answered with his statement of his questions this time. The reader will see that they are not the same at all. Only a man in utter desperation would do a thing like that. I have never said that the apostles had their sins taken away at the death of Christ fifty days before they were baptized in water. I know that Myers knows that I said they had been baptized with John's baptism, which was water baptism, before Jesus ever died. Then why will a man state something that he absolutely knows is not true? Those "thousands of Jews" who rejected John's baptism "rejected the counsel of God." (Luke 7:30). Do you tell me they obtained redemption at the death of Christ? And thus they were redeemed without water baptism? If so, then rejecters of God's counsel can be saved.

TLC

But if you refer to the others, they "justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John." Luke 7:29. So they had water baptism *before Jesus died.* If you want to "hornswoggle" somebody, you will have to try some other trickery. This failed to work this time. He says Winston Burton in their debate at Huntsville, Alabama, ran through these questions "like a wild-boar through a briar patch." When a wild boar runs through a briar patch, you can usually tell he has been through it by looking at the patch. He usually knocks out a strip as he goes through. The same thing happened to his questions when Brother Burton ran through them. This is quite an admission of defeat.

BAPTISM AND THE GENTILES

Since the first Gentiles as such to be baptized with water were the members of the household of Cornelius, my opponent thinks he can *suppose* a case that will prove salvation without baptism for the Gentiles. He refers to the faith of the Syrophenician woman whose daughter was healed. He supposes that she lived seven years after Pentecost and died a year before water baptism was administered to the Gentiles. But this supposition cannot be proven if his life depended on it. I'll answer his "supposition argument" by supposing she died one day before Jesus died. And my supposition is just as good as his. If not, let him prove it. If my "supposition" is true, I *suppose* she went to heaven; if his "supposition" is true, I *suppose* she went to hell. But what does either supposition prove? Absolutely nothing. When did I say that "Christ completed *their* salvation in his death"? Christ made provision for their salvation in his death, but that did not save them when he died. If so, then all men were saved when Jesus died for he provided salvation for all.

Just here he asks what he calls "EXCEEDINGLY BIG QUESTIONS." Let me trim them down a little. 1. *"If water baptism was necessary for salvation, did God not give the Gentiles a chance of salvation until eight years after Christ died?"* Try this on my opponent's position concerning the necessity of faith: *If faith in Christ, produced by the preaching of Peter to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7), was*

TLC

necessary to salvation, did God not give the Gentiles a chance of salvation until eight years after Christ died? This would be a good place for my opponent to *stand on his head.* He could do that with more ease than he can answer this question. Another BIG QUESTION was: *"Did God refuse to save the uncircumcised Gentiles just because the Jews refused them water baptism?"* Then try this one for my opponent's position: *Did God refuse to save the uncircumcised Gentiles just because the Jews refused to preach to them?* These counter questions, with respect to his position, put my opponent to *spinning on his head.* Furthermore he wants to know: *"If circumcision was abolished in Christ's death, why would God require the Gentiles to be circumcised during these eight years, or else they could not receive salvation in water baptism?"* Here is his parallel: *If circumcision was abolished in Christ death, why would God require Gentiles to be circumcised during these eight years, or else they could not have the gospel preached to them that they might believe and be saved?* If he thinks the cases are not parallel, then let him show where the gospel was ever preaced to uncircumcised Gentiles during these eight years. I shall parallel his next statement by paraphasing like this: "When this self-styled Church of God tries to prove that God refused to save any uncircumcised Gentiles for eight years after his Son died, they either make circumcision essential to their salvation or they tie their salvation to the hands of some preacher who could save their soul by preaching to them or refuse to save them." Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

INFALLIBLE FACTS ABOUT CORNELIUS

His "infallible facts" is one of the greatest demonstrations of the fallibility of a fallible man that I have ever seen in print. Let us look at them:

1. He uses John 10:16 to prove they were sheep before Peter went to them.

2. He claims that the "brethren" whom Peter was to strengthen were "Gentile brethren, Cornelius and his family." Luke 22:32.

TLC

3. The sheet vision proves they were already "cleansed" from sin before Peter was sent for. Acts 10:11-15.

4. They had worked righteousness and were accepted of God "long before Peter preached in his house." Acts 10:2, 34, 35.

5. He thinks that Acts 10:37 proves that Cornelius was already sufficiently acquainted with the gospel to be a saved believer before Peter preached to him.

It is too bad to spoil such a pretty little theory, but I can't resist the temptation. The whole thing adds up to this: Cornelius was saved before baptism because he was saved before Peter ever had any contact with him. If so, it leaves things complicated. Note the following:

1. *If Cornelius was already a believer and saved, God did not know it.* A "good while" before, he chose Peter as the one by whose mouth the Gentiles "should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." Acts 15:7.

2. *If Cornelius was already saved, the angel did not know it.* The angel told Cornelius that Peter "shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house *shall be saved.*" Acts 11:14.

3. *If Cornelius was already saved, he did not know it.* He followed the instruction of the angel to send for Peter (Acts 10:7, 8) and gathered in his relatives and friends to "hear all things" that God commanded them. Acts 10:33.

4. *If Cornelius was already saved, his servants did not know it.* They told Peter that Cornelius had "been *warned* from God" to send for him. Acts 10:22.

5. *If Cornelius was already saved, Peter did not know it.* He spoke the *words by which* Cornelius and his house were to be saved. Acts 11:14.

6. *And if Cornelius was already saved, the other apostles at Jerusalem did not know it.* When Peter rehearsed to them his preaching at the house of Cornelius, they said: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted

TLC

repentance unto life." Acts 11:18. They had no knowledge of this before.

Thus we see that neither God, the angel, Cornelius, his servants, Peter nor the rest of the apostles knew that Cornelius was already saved, but B. Sunday Myers knows that he was. It is too bad that he was not present when the angel appeared to Cornelius so he could set the whole thing straight. But I have an idea that the angel was right and that Myers is wrong.

THE GOSPEL IN FACT

The "gospel in fact" is the gospel consisting of its facts, including the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. 1 Cor. 15:1-4. These were not facts till Jesus died, was buried and arose the third day. Hence, the *gospel in fact* could not be preached until after the resurrection of Jesus. My opponent doesn't know the difference between this and *the fact that a sermon was preached.* What has happened to his "scholarly balance"? It was a fact that a promise was made to Abraham (Gal. 3:8), but the gospel preached to him was the *gospel in promise—not the gospel in fact.*

A BRIEF SUMMARY

In sustaining the proposition that the Church of Christ is the exclusive New Testament church, founded on the first Pentecost after Christ's death, I have presented the following arguments.

1. *There is an exclusive New Testament church.* Scriptures were given to prove this. No attempt was ever made to set it aside except to assert that it was a "spiritual organism" instead of a "visible organization." The only proof ever offered was his assertion.

2. *The exclusive New Testament church originated on the first Pentecost after Christ's death.* No reply was ever made to the Scriptures introduced to prove it.

3. *Denominationalism is sinful.* This was proven from various angles by a number of New Testament passages. While my opponent indorses denominationalism, he never

TLC

made any attempt to show the arguments to be wrong.

4. *Men belonged to the New Testament church without belonging to a denomination.* My friend agreed that this was true, but later argued it was "God's denomination."

5. *Men became members of the New Testament church by gospel obedience.* My opponent finally agreed that this was so. Furthermore, he admitted that such gospel obedience—the commandments having been enumerated—would not make them members of any other church. He also admitted that such obedience now would make men members of the New Testament church and would not make them members of any other. Here he surrendered the whole thing, for it was those same gospel commandments that I obeyed. Hence, I am not a member of a human denomination.

6. *A falling away was foretold.* Mr. Myers took no issue with this point.

7. *A kingdom is reproduced by its seed.* I showed that every stalk of wheat in the world might be destroyed but the wheat kingdom would not be destroyed if the seed is left. Plant the seed and it will reproduce itself. The same was shown concerning the oak tree. And the word of God is the seed of the kingdom. Luke 8:11. Destroy all members on earth and you will not destroy the kingdom or church. Plant the seed and it will reproduce itself. By that process congregations of the Church of Christ exist today. They do not compose a denomination but are reproductions of the congregations of the first century. My opponent has never been able to find a place to take hold of this argument. He has been as helpless before it as a barometer before an approaching storm.

8. *The religious order in the earth known as the Church of Christ is a reproduction of the New Testament church.* Application of this was made to the rule of faith and practice, the method of becoming members, the organization of the church and the form of worship. Not one of these points did my opponent set aside. He virtually agreed

TLC

to many of them but said they did not prove the church to be undenominational.

Besides all of these, which fully sustained my proposition, I took time to chase him in all of his denominational meanderings and to show the fallacy of his contentions.

My work in this discussion is completed. I come to its close with full satisfaction about the work accomplished. And this closing advice I give to each reader: Reject all human denominations and human creeds and take the Bible alone as your rule of faith and practice. Mr. Myers says it cannot be done, but I know that it can. And when you follow divine requirements laid down in the New Testament, you will become a member of the Lord's church and will not need to join any human denomination. Following the Bible, and the Bible alone, you will have full assurance of reaching the home of the redeemed after your journey here has been completed. No other course is safe. Denominationalism and human creeds exist without divine sanction. You cannot afford to detour from the divine path for any human course. Stay with the Bible. My opponent admonishes me to "get this old time Holy Ghost religion" so I can "shout and shine" for God. But for such admonition he has not even a hint in the Bible. The Bible nowhere says anything about "getting Holy Ghost religion," or "getting religion" of any kind. Such is the language of denominationalism—it belongs to the theories of men. Let him produce the text of Scripture that intimates such a thing. Until he presents the Scripture for such admonition, I shall pursue my present course and take the Bible as my only rule of faith and practice. The reader should do the same thing.

TLC

MYERS' FOURTH NEGATIVE

Among the multitudinous lassos tossed by the adroit hand of Satan to boomerang poor lost souls and drag them into perdition, the "Campbell System" stands close to the top. It is an awful greased plank over which millions will skid into hell, head down, heels up, world without end. It is Satan's counterfeit church which claims to be the exclusive body of Christ. It denies every fundamental and sine-quanon experience in the grace of God, and thus helps to fulfill the apostolic prediction that in the latter day there should be a falling away from the truth. Alexander Campbell a Baptist preacher drifted far away from Bible orthodoxy and founded this most dangerous heresy that now curses this country, as it is so seductive and popular and at the same time utterly destitute of salvation, having denied the supernatural birth, without which the devil gets everybody. This great multitude of religious professors, snared in the Nicodemus hobble, which thinks that the new birth is some temporality having to do with your material body, whereas Christ explains it to be a transaction purely between your human spirit and the Holy Spirit —"That which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" i.e., it is your soul or spirit that is reborn in regeneration. Campbellism declares this to be a birth of your body in water, hence this awful error has run them so deep into materialistic infidelity until baptism has been paganized and demonized. Adam's physical mind and body did not utterly fall in Eden as in that case he would have instantly turned idiot and fell dead in his tracks. It was his spirit that lost from it all the life of God, thus leaving it a spiritual corpse. Now it is this part that is resurrected from death in regeneration. But the devil's a wise old man and knows that upon this residuum of body and mind which survived the fall he can build gigantic systems of intellectual and materialistic religions and use them as a substitute for Holy Ghost religion. Hence the popular churches are filled up with poor dead dummies a withering burlesque on Jesus Christ who came all the way from heaven to this lower earth, bled and died to raise all the dead to life. My opponent has obviously

TLC

been caught in this awful trap, witness his testimony: "The Bible nowhere says anything about getting Holy Ghost religion." Here you are, a point blank denial of the apostolic injunction—"Be filled with the Spirit." (Ephesians 5:18)

I. NO AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENTS.

Have you noticed, my opponent signed a contract to affirm that his "restoration movement" was the EXCLUSIVE BODY OF CHRIST. The word EXCLUSIVE in the proposition obligates him to prove that no Christians exist outside of his "restoration movement." The word EXCLUSIVE means to bar or shut out. This is exactly what he tries to do from his pulpit, he tries to shut out of the kingdom of God everyone except those who follow Alexander Campbell's "Christian System." But have you noticed, in this polemic he tried to prove that God's church in the New Testament was the exclusive church, but he frankly did not try to prove that his "restoration movement" was that exclusive body. He cannot prove it, that is why he did not try.

II. FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

The opponent seemed quite disturbed when I proved that he was using a special collection designed to "help the poor saints at Jerusalem" as a basis for financial support of the ministry. Does he follow the Bible on the "financial system?" Positively not! They do not follow the tithe system as did the early Christians. They do not give tithes in distinction from offerings. Hebrews 7:8 tells us that Christ received tithes after his resurrection, which places tithing under Grace. Read it: "And here men that die (Law priests) receive tithes; (i.e., they receive tithes until their death) but there he (Christ) receiveth them of whom it is witnessed that he liveth," i.e. resurrected. This verse plainly tells us that the priests under the Law received tithes no longer than their death, but Christ was receiving them after his death which was an evidence that his priesthood did not stop with his death. Paul uses the tithe system to prove that the priesthood of Christ was to continue after

TLC

his resurrection. "Christ's priesthood is after the order of Melchisedec" Hebrews 7:11. Melchisedec received tithes; so does Christ, but not from this self styled Church of Christ because they refuse to give Him tithes. "Will a man rob God?"

III. ARE ALL BAPTISTS IN HELL?

On page 4, the opponent consigns all Baptists to hell, he says: "I do not believe that Christians are found in the denominations." What an awful heresy! And definitely a boomerang that knocks the opponent's position beyond the north pole. If all Baptists are lost this puts Alexander Campbell in hell, because I have shown beyond a shadow of a doubt that Campbell was immersed by Luce a Baptist preacher, preached for the Baptist 17 years, left them and was never baptized afterward. My opponent's denomination is an apostatized off-shoot of the Baptist church.

IV. AMAZING JUGGLE.

The opponent holds that the church was restored in the early part of the 19th century. This means that the church went out of existence for about 1500 years. I ask what move makes one a member of the true church. His answer was, "salvation." After this I ask if there were any true Christians during the centuries before Campbell's day. He answered, "I do not doubt that there have been Christians in every age and century." Then I came back and ask if these true saints who lived long before Campbell's "Restoration Movement" were in the true church. He saw that he was in mud over his head, and came running back denying that he said true Christians lived in every century and age. He said, "I did not definitely say there have been Christians in every age and century." After this I pressed the point a little more and he heaved up this statement: "There may have been." But more amusing than ever, in his final word he says, "If there were Christians in every age and century they were not in America." Ha, Ha, horse laugh.

V. DID THE TRUE BODY OF CHRIST APOS-

TLC

TATIZE WHEN A GROUP WENT INTO ROMAN CATHOLICISM?

The "Campbell System" holds that the Roman Catholic Church was the whole body of Christ in apostasy. This is man-made theology, and as full of punk as an egg is meat. The Roman Church is a group of members apostatized out of the body of Christ. The HOLY BODY OF CHRIST itself never has and never will apostatize. A member of that body can relapse into sin and be broken off of the body, but the body is unbreakable. Branches in the True Vine may become unfruitful and taken away from the Vine, but the Vine itself is indestructible: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." My opponent's superficial theory holds that both the Vine and the branches were dissolved during the Dark Ages. Let all who believes this stand on your head!!

VI. DEFINITELY BAMBOOZLED.

I ask for his definition of what characterizes denominationalism. He gave the answer, and I took his own definition and proved infallibly that his "reformatory movement" is chock full of the same. Now he comes back and explains why these things do not make his movement denominational, he says they have not been carried to their ultimate conclusion. Ultimate conclusion?? Ultimate conclusion?? Just what point marks the ultimate conclusion? I suppose when they leave Porter's "isms" that is the ultimate conclusion. Just how may we know when these things have been carried to their ultimate conclusion in other religious bodies? When the thing is boiled down we find that all others are in denominations—if they do not follow Mr. Porter's personal interpretations. Punk!

VII. IS THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH A DENOMINATION?

This Christian Church is the other wing of the Campbell Society. This church follows the four things which my opponent says is essential to salvation precisely like he does. Now I ask: "When these people follow the four things necessary to salvation does that move put them into the

TLC

true church of Christ?" He straddled on this question worse than a duck wading the dew. In fact he refused to come plain out and answer the question, he just said, "When men do the things necessary to salvation God adds them to his church." Now, he infers here that when those of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH follow the four things necessary to salvation that move does put them into God's church. But dear reader, these million members of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH are not in his "movement," they compose a party all of their own. Now have we fully discovered who killed cock robin. My opponent cannot deny that the Christian Church follow the four things necessary to salvation. He cannot say that these four things do not put them into salvation. And if his theory is correct their salvation puts them into the true church of Christ. But he turns around and says that this body is a denomination. This makes him to say that a denomination is a member of Christ's holy body. My opponent is in mud up to his neck.

VIII. HYPOCRITES IN THE BODY OF CHRIST.

Brother Porter says, "God does not add hypocrites to his church." To this I gladly agree, but dear reader, a hypocrite can definitely be added to Porter's "reformatory movement." Who says no? It is certainly possible for a hypocrite to be baptized in water, pretend to be saved, and join up with Mr. Porter's organization, yes, and even start preaching for them. It follows then upon a logical sequence that the body of Christ is one thing and Campbell's "restoration movement" is quite another.

IX. FILLER QUESTION.

The opponent wants to know when Professional Clergymen, arbitrary church bosses, beer-guzzlers, and cussers fall out of the body of Christ. I have answered it once, I will answer it again: they fall out when they decide in their heart to practice such damnable things. They fall out of the body of Christ just like Mr. Porter says they fall out of the Grace of Christ. He holds that a man may sin out of the Grace of God and at the same time retain his position in the holy body of Christ. I can't get the percentage, can you?

TLC

X. CAMPBELL AND THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The opponent asserts, "I have never said that Campbell was president of a denomination." He adds, "I never even said the American Missionary Society was a denomination." Now don't that beat "bob-tail." Their literature is chock full of statements denouncing as denominational this CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY, which is just another name of THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. In October 1849 one hundred and fifty six delegates from all parts of the Movement met in Cincinnati, Ohio, and "established a general organization of the churches under a general board of overseers and managers." This general organization was denominated THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY. The Society was a composition of the Christian churches, which at that time was denominated THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST. Alexander Campbell was elected President of this "general organization" and remained its president until the day of his death. Now Mr. Porter's movement incessantly denounce this "Society" as denominational. Hence, according to their own position Alexander Campbell lived and died at the head of a denomination. Alas!

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION THE BIGGEST CURSE

XI. BIGGEST CONTRADICTION EVER.

On the conversion, baptism, and church membership of the apostles and other disciples converted during the personal ministry of Christ I ask a few questions. These questions mortified his "baptismal remission theory" world without end. His party holds that New Testament baptism did not start until Pentecost. They also hold that conversion places all believers into the church. My opponent has not denied these facts. Now turn to pages 10-11 of his last letter and you find him telling us that the apostles were saved from their sins with the baptism of John. This was three years or more before the apostles were made members of the church at Pentecost—if the church started at Pentecost. His theory inevitably puts three years between

TLC

the salvation of the apostles and their addition to the church.

He also holds that the apostles never did receive New Testament baptism, all they had, he asserts, was John's baptism, and he tells us that John's baptism was not New Testament baptism. Dear reader, you can see the awful predicament he is in, he gets the apostles saved from sin without Christian baptism. He also gets them saved three years or more before they were made members of the church at Pentecost.

XII. SCREW-BALL THEORY.

"For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." (1 Corinthians 12:13) My opponent's church says this is water baptism. They say this baptism puts all believers into the church. They tell us that this baptism did not start until Pentecost. Now it is positively stated that this baptism put all the Jews into the body of Christ. This of course included the twelve apostles and the thousands of Jews converted under the ministry of John and Jesus. But wait, the opponent tells us that the twelve apostles were converted under the baptism of John, and he holds that they were not baptized in water after the day of Pentecost. According to this the apostles were never in the body of Christ inasmuch as they never did receive the baptism mentioned in 1 Cor. 12:13. If 1 Cor. 12:13 is water baptism when did it put the twelve apostles into the body of Christ?

Thousands of Jews were saved from their sins during the personal ministry of John and Christ. Of Nathaniel Jesus said, "In him is no guile." Of the apostles Jesus said, "None of them is lost but the son of perdition." (John 17:12) And again of them he said, "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." (John 15:3) Note: "Now are ye clean," not "will be clean at Pentecost." Now these thousands of Jews had their hearts purified from sins long before Pentecost. And since my opponent says Christian baptism and the church did not

TLC

start until Pentecost this puts about three years between their salvation and their baptism. It also puts their salvation before their addition to the church. If this doesn't mortify their "baptism remission theory" there is not a cow in Texas.

XIII. THE GENTILES AND WATER BAPTISM.

I ask when was water baptism first administered to the Gentiles. He tells us it was eight years after Pentecost when Peter preached in the House of Cornelius. Now, the Syrophenecian woman was possessed with faith such as could not be found among the Jews. This means then that she was possessed with this great faith eight long years before she received water baptism. If she died seven years after Pentecost (which is very possible) then she never did have water baptism, John's or any other. If my opponent is not careful he will have this and other great Gentile saints walking the streets of the New Eden without any baptism at all.

XIV. COULD THE GENTILES EXERCISE FAITH IN CHRIST BEFORE PETER PREACHED TO THEM?

On page 12 the opponent holds that they could not. Let's see, the Centurion of Matt. 8:8 had faith in Christ that excelled that of the Jews. Also the Syrophenecian woman. Paul tells us that Christ "preached to the Gentiles, and was believed on in the world." (1 Tim. 3:16) You see, I ask the question: "If water baptism was necessary to salvation, did God not give the Gentiles a chance of salvation until eight years after Pentecost?" He could not answer the question plainly and Scripturally, so he jumped the fence with a counter question; he says, "If faith in Christ produced by the preaching of Peter to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7), was necessary to salvation, did God not give the Gentiles a chance of salvation until eight years after Christ died?" He tells us here in so many words that "saving faith" was not permitted to the Gentiles until eight years after Christ died. Please get this: If Acts 15:7 says anything about faith that saved the Gentiles from sin at the time Peter preached to them I will give him this debate. The text does say that the Gentiles believed Peter's preaching.

TLC

When I preach to a congregation of already saved people they too hear the word of God and believe. This is just another example of how the modern Church of Christ denomination adds to God's word. John 2:11 says, "His disciples believed on him." These disciples were already saved, just like Cornelius when he heard the word of God and believed. To say that salvation by faith, water baptism, or any other way, was not allowed upon the Gentiles until eight years after Christ died is total infidelity. It is my good pleasure to counteract this most awful heresy and infidelity. It is Mr. Porter's theology that says the Gentiles could not exercise saving faith in Christ before Peter preached to Cornelius. God has never said this, nor have I said it.

He has another counter question, to wit: "Did God refuse to save the uncircumcised Gentiles just because the Jews refused to preach to them?" I answer, "Certainly not: when have I ever said such a thing?" Where does the Bible say such a thing? It can't be found in the New Testament. The only place you can find such a distempered theory is in the journals of Alexander Campbell and his disciples. The New Testament teaches just the opposite, it tells us in Acts 10:36-37 that the Gentiles already knew the word of God which "preached peace by Jesus Christ." This Mr. Porter represents us as teaching that God refused to save the Gentiles until Peter preached to them. I will give the opponent this debate to quote a statement of mine saying that God refused to save the Gentiles until Peter preached to them. This is his doctrine, and it can't be found in Holy Writ.

XV. DID THE GENTILES HAVE THE GOSPEL BEFORE PETER PREACHED TO THEM?

My opponent says, "Let him show where the gospel was ever preached to uncircumcised Gentiles during these eight years?" It is my good pleasure to show you just this. Cornelius was an uncircumcised Gentile. When Peter preached he addressed him thus: "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ:

TLC

(he is Lord of all:) that word, I say, *YE KNOW*, which was published throughout all Judea. . ." Here it is expressly stated that Cornelius already knew the "gospel of peace" before Peter preached to him. Now I want you to observe the statement "he is Lord of all." That expression was made of Christ only after his resurrection from the dead. Christ introduced the great commission thus, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." This means that "he was Lord of all." Now the gospel which Peter said Cornelius knew was the word that preached Christ Lord of all. This definitely proves that the resurrected Christ had been preached in the hearing of Cornelius.

My opponent seems to think that all the Gentiles were barred out of public service and not permitted to hear the sermons as preached by the hundreds of Christian preachers. It is true that the Jewish preachers refused to attend the assemblies of the Gentiles, but even under the Law Gentiles could attend the Jewish assemblies. They were not permitted in the sanctuary, but they were permitted in the court, the first department of worship. These were denominated "proselytes of the gate." Cornelius was one. He had a "good report among all the nation of the Jews" (Acts 10:22). The best scholars believe him to be the same centurion that exercised such great faith, whose servant was healed (Lk. 7:1-7), who built for the Jews a synagogue (Lk. 7:5). Compare what is said of Cornelius, Acts 10:2, and the centurion of Luke 7:1-7. Acts 1:2 says, "He gave much alms to the people." Luke 7:5 says, "He built for the Jews a synagogue." Acts 10:22 says, "He was of a good report among all the nation of the Jews." In Luke 7:3-4 it is said that the elders of the Jews besought Christ to heal his servant. The elders of the Jews said of this centurion that he was worthy of the favor because he loved the nation of the Jews and had built for them a synagogue. From these comparisons it is easy to conclude that Cornelius was the same centurion as described in Luke 7th chapter.

If anyone should want to know why Mr. Porter has such a strange idea about the Gentiles worshipping Christ it is because of his crooked doctrine on water baptism. It

TLC

forces him to say that no Gentiles worshipped Christ and was saved until eight years after Christ died. My Lord and My God! "And there were certain Greeks among them, that came up to worship at the feast . . . saying, 'We would see Jesus'." (Jno. 12:20) The Gentiles have been privileged to accept God in faith since the day of Adam. Was there ever a time when salvation was barred from the Gentiles? Never! What kind of God would that be? Rahab was a Gentile. She married a full blood Jew, and had such great faith in God she found a place in the royal lineage of the Messiah. (Matt. 1:5) Ruth was a Moabitess, a Gentile girl. She married a full blood Jew, and was enumerated among the Messianic line. (Matt. 1:5) Yes-er, somebody is wrong about the Bible.

On page 13 of my opponent's letter he holds that the Gentiles had not a chance of repentance until Peter preached in the house of Cornelius. Let's see, the whole city of Nineveh repented before God in sack-cloth and ashes, and they found favor and mercy of God. These were Gentiles, and they repented 900 years before Peter preached in the house of Cornelius. Yes-er, somebody is wrong about the Bible.

Under this same caption my opponent says, "If Cornelius was already saved, the other apostles at Jerusalem did not know it." This is right, but because some other man did not know it did not make their salvation of none effect. There are millions of true Christian people in the world who are not following Alexander Campbell's interpretations, these are saved and Mr. Porter don't know it.

When Cornelius was baptized with the Holy Ghost these other apostles at Jerusalem discovered that these Gentiles had found life through repentance. The text gives no hint as to when these Gentiles repented, it could have been forty years before this. It merely states that the Holy Spirit upon them proved to certain Jews that God had granted them "repentance unto life." If you will notice the text does not say, "God will, in the future, grant them life." It says, "God has (already) granted them repentance unto

TLC

life." This could have took place years before this.

XVI. OBVIOUS CONTRADICTION.

In my former letter I introduced several references to prove that the apostles and many other Jews were truly saved from their sins before their baptism with the Spirit on Pentecost. I did this because the modern Church of Christ holds that Christian baptism did not start until Pentecost. This proves that a multitude of Jews were already saved before receiving water baptism. Then he comes back and holds that those converted before Pentecost did not receive Christian baptism, that they had only John's baptism. Then I come back with 1 Cor. 12:13 and definitely proved that all Jews and Gentiles did receive Christian baptism. But what I want you to carefully notice just here is this, on page 10 he agrees that these Jews were in God's favor before they received Holy Ghost baptism. He says that no one has ever questioned that fact. Here he admits that the Jews on Pentecost were saved from their sins before they received the gift of the Spirit. Now I want you to hear what Peter said about the experience of the Gentiles, he said, "God put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:9) If God put no difference between Jew and Gentile, then the Gentiles received the Holy Spirit before they received water baptism (Acts. 10:47, 48)

A person has to be a wilful, deliberate, Scripture twister to teach that the Gentiles of Acts 10 were baptized with the Holy Ghost before they were saved from their sins. Acts 15:9 states the condition necessary to the reception of the Spirit; viz., a pure heart. God told Peter He had cleansed them. (Acts 10:15) He had to tell Peter this three times. I just wonder how many times God will have to tell Mr. Porter.

XVII. REBUTTAL.

My opponent presents six points trying to prove that Cornelius was not saved before Peter went down to preach. I will consider them in order. I have already covered Number 1, and Number 6, so I will now consider the others.

TLC

The first has to do with him hearing the gospel. I have definitely shown that Cornelius "knew the word" before Peter preached. (Acts 10:36, 37)

2. He says, "If Cornelius was already saved, the angel did not know it. The angel told Cornelius that Peter 'shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all they house *shall* be saved'." I say, "Yes, and this salvation also included Peter." Read it for yourself, "We believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ *we shall be saved, even as they.*" (Acts 15:10) Yes, Peter preached words that would save the Gentiles. When a gospel preacher today stands before a group of Christians he tells them words whereby they shall be saved. Man shall live by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God. Acts 15:10 refers to the same salvation as mentioned in chapter 10. Peter is rehearsing the matter before the council; and since it also included the salvation of the apostles we are forced to say it means "final salvation." "He that continues unto the end the same shall be saved." "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." (Romans 13:11) The Bible in many places speaks of the future salvation of Christians, and the reference my opponent uses is one.

3. "If Cornelius was already saved, he did not know it. He followed the instruction of the angel to send for Peter (Acts 10:7-8) and gathered in his relatives and friends to 'hear all things' that God commanded them. Acts 10:33."

Here my opponent falls off his bed. Cornelius did hear from Peter what God commanded of him. When Christians today hear the gospel they hear what God commands of them. But don't forget the Bible has more commands than "water baptism."

4. "If Cornelius was already saved, his servants did not know it. They told Peter that Cornelius had been warned from God to send for him." (Acts 10:22) What a wonderful point to prove that he was not yet saved! But I say his servants must have known that he was saved, they said, "Cornelius, a just man." (Acts 10:22) He was a just, or justified man.

TLC

5. "If Cornelius was already saved, Peter did not know it. He spoke the words by which Cornelius and all of his house were to be saved." (Acts 11:14) This is a repetition of point number 2. The same reference. It has been proven that this was final salvation. As has been stated the apostles were also included in this salvation.

6. "If Cornelius was already saved, the other apostles at Jerusalem did not know it." But I say, the reason why they did not know it was because their mind was still tainted with Judaism which said, "You must be circumcised in order to be saved." This is why Peter and the other Jews were sent down there; they were to witness their reception of the Holy Spirit, a thing which proved infallibly that their heart had been already purified by faith. Yes, the apostles found out that God had (in time past) granted to these Gentiles repentance unto life. It's a pity my opponent couldn't be as honest as the apostles and admit that these Gentiles had reecived repentance unto life BEFORE water baptism. If a false doctrine on water baptism proves that a man is in a denomination then you can plainly see that my opponent is in one big as hog-back mountain.

A BRIEF SUMMARY

In sustaining the proposition that the so-called CHURCH OF CHRIST is a denomination, a human organization founded in the early part of the 19th century, I have presented the following facts. That my opponent made no attempt to refute these facts is quite noteworthy, and all the more verifies my position.

1. Barton W. Stone organized his INDEPENDENT SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY in the year of 1803. This SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY consisted of six ministers to begin with; namely—Barton Stone, Richard McNemar, John Thompson, John Dunlavy, Robert Marshall, and David Purviance. (For proof of this read, "RESTORATION HANDBOOK," series 1, page 23)

2. On August 17, 1809 Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell's father, organized THE CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON. Says C. L. Loos, "This act and

TLC

this date may be regarded as the actual beginning of our reformation in an organized form. A committee of twenty-one was appointed to recommend the best means of promoting the purposes of the organization." ("How the Disciples Began and Grew," page 48)

3. On October 4, 1810, Thomas Campbell, on behalf of the CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, applied for membership in the PITTSBURG SYNOD, and was rejected because of certain doctrines which conflicted with the Presbyterian's views.

4. On May 4th, 1811 the members of the CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION met and changed the name of the organization to THE INDEPENDENT BRUSH RUN CHURCH.

5. On January 1, 1812 Alexander Campbell was ordained and chosen Minister of this BRUSH RUN CHURCH.

6. After Alexander Campbell had served as Minister of BRUSH RUN for two years he imbibed the theory of baptism by immersion; and on June 12, 1812 Campbell was immersed in Buffalo Creek (Penn.) by Matthias Luce a Baptist preacher.

7. After this the Baptist church invited Campbell and his Brush Run Congregation to unite with their denomination. "This matter was brought before the Brush Run Church in the autumn of 1813, and it was decided to accept the invitation from their Baptist brethren." (In "How the Disciples Began and Grew," page 86) The association they joined was called REDSTONE.

8. After preaching for the REDSTONE for about three years Campbell began to drift into legalism. As a result of this his doctrines caused great confusion and conflict among the brethren.

9. In process of time the Redstone Baptist began to censure Campbell so hotly he decided to leave the REDSTONE ASSOCIATION and join the MAHONING (O.) BAPTIST ASSOCIATION. This took place in 1823. (For

TLC

proof of this read page 93 in "HOW THE DISCIPLES BEGAN AND GREW.")

10. Joining the Mahoning Association did not help matters one whit, Campbell's legalism incurred even more friction among the Mahoning brethren. And by the year of 1830 Campbell and most all of his followers were expelled from the Baptist's communion.

11. When Campbell was separated from the Baptist he brought out with him a goodly number of disciples, and having no organized church as yet he and his followers decided to join up with Barton Stone's INDEPENDENT SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY. This merger took place in the year of 1831.

12. When this merger took place they changed the name of the denomination from SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY to DISCIPLES OF CHRIST. And note: Alexander Campbell immediately became preeminent leader of the organization.

13. In October 1849 one hundred and fifty-six delegates from all parts of the Movement met in Cincinnati, Ohio, and "ESTABLISHED A GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES UNDER A GENERAL BOARD OF OVERSEERS AND MANAGERS." (Kurfees) This "general organization" was denominated

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN
MISSIONARY SOCIETY

14. Alexander Campbell was elected President of this "general organization," and remained its President until the day of his death—17 years.

15. About 1906 this "general organization" split into two groups over the use of mechanical instruments of music in the public worship.

16. The splinter group was denominated THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, the other changed its name to THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

TLC

17. The party which calls themselves THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, of which my opponent is a member, now denounces this "general organization" as sectarian and denominational. Of course this makes them to say in effect that Alexander Campbell, their star preacher, was the President of a denomination for 17 years—in fact until the day of his death.

18. Both of these groups hold that they are the EXCLUSIVE BODY OF CHRIST. Both teach the plan of salvation precisely alike. The "four things" which they say places all believers into the true church, are taught precisely alike in both groups. AND SINCE THESE FOUR THINGS DO NOT PLACE THEM INTO ONE BODY WE ARE FORCED TO CONCLUDE THAT NEITHER OF THEM IS THE EXCLUSIVE BODY OF CHRIST, BUT JUST PLAIN HUMAN DENOMINATIONS. And so Jack's house comes tumbling down.

—THE END—

TLC

PORTER'S BOOK CLUB

This book is published by PORTER'S BOOK SHOP as the first book to appear in PORTER'S BOOK CLUB. Books in the Club will be books of which W. Curtis Porter is the author, or co-author, as in the case of debates.

In the list of books published there will be a number of debates with various denominational preachers. A number of these are already on record and others will be recorded. There will also be a book of Sermon Outlines, a volume of Radio Sermons, a book of writings that have appeared in our religious papers over a number of years, a volume entitled Quibbles That Backfired, which will contain interesting highlights of matter presented in debates over many years. And somewhere along the way there will be a volume of poetry, containing poems of various natures, many of which will be suitable for use in church bulletins.

All books published through PORTER'S BOOK CLUB will be books that have never been printed. So there will be no duplication of any book you now have in your library.

Now that we are under way, it is planned to publish as many as four books per year if possible for the next few years.

Book Club members agree to take as many as four books per year and will receive their books at twenty percent discount from the regular retail price. If you are not a member of the Club but wish to become one, then just drop a card stating your desire, and your name will be enrolled for the books. And, while this book is already in print, you may have it as your first book at the Club Member's price, if you will send your membership now. You are required to pay nothing till you receive the books.

Write to

PORTER'S BOOK SHOP
P. O. Box 195
Monette, Arkansas

TLC