

"Quibbles That Backfired" is a series of three sermons delivered by the late Curtis Porter at the Florida College lectures. It was the purpose of the author to prepare these "Quibbles" for publication, And the preparation was well under way when death took him, We have attempted to give the reader these sermons, rich in content, just as they came from the lips of the speaker

Few, if any,, uninspired men have had a better in sight into the teachings of the Book of God's than W. Curtis Porter. In every sense of the word He was a Christian He had an almost unbelievable ability to analyze an argument, and if it was fallacious, to recognize the fallacy and expose it in terms easily understood. These sermons will not only prove to be very profitable, but also exceeding interesting

THE PUBLISHER

"QUIBBLES THAT BACKFIRED" (1)

Brother Cope, brethren and friends. It is with deep gratitude in my heart that I appear before you at this time to engage in my part of this program that has been assigned to me. I appreciate the many fine things said by brother Cope regarding my work; the recommendations given, and matters of that kind. But I am just afraid that I may not be able to live up to your expectations. But I am glad to be here. As brother Cope told you, we had some car trouble on the way. Not long after we left home, a traffic jam developed in the circulation system in my car. And the car kept getting rather hot about it. We made various efforts to eliminate the situation, but, it kept hanging on, and I kept easing on, thinking that I could get here without having to take time out to have it fixed. But yesterday afternoon it finally developed that I would not be able to do that. So I had to stop and have the radiator taken out and bored - rotten out - rather, and have the thing fixed so that we could come on. So we got just about eighteen miles out here and at 2:30 this morning went to bed, got up and I am here. I am glad to be here.

Concerning the Book Club, I may just mention this briefly. I began the publication of a book, or the books that I had in mind, sometime in the past; intending to publish some of the debates that I had which are now on record, and some others that would doubtless be recorded, along with a number of other books that I might write or had written. One book was published - the Porter-Myers Debate. A number of you have received copies of that book already because a number of you are on the club list. That is the only book so far that has been published. A number of things have hindered further publications. In the first place I ran into a great deal of trouble with the binding of that first book. Though it was bound by one of the largest binderies in the South, and they have a great reputation for good work. In fact they bound the Bogard debate for me and it has been excellent in every way. But somehow they received some bad paste and the cloth would not stay fastened to the board. All the books were sent back once to be rebound, any many of them were sent back the second time. Some of them are yet to be sent back, because of the faulty material that went into the paste. Along with that I have not been able to get to the matter as I wanted to. Steps are under way to discontinue my book shop, other than the publication of the books. In that case, I hope to get some others out. And that will include

as brother Cope mentioned awhile ago, a book entitled, "QUIBBLES THAT BACKFIRED. " That is to be the title of the speeches that I shall make during this program.

These "quibbles that backfired" will concern interesting highlights that have occurred in the discussions I have had over many years. Arguments that men have made by way of illustrations or scriptural references in efforts to sustain their position regarding the subject involved. Some of these backfired in that the termination of it showed the utter absurdity of the thing that had been suggested. Others backfired because they reverted upon the man who made them and put him in the very same predicament in which he intended to put the other fellow. And this will be a rehearsal of some of those things, Of course it will necessitate that I identify them; that I call their names. The way has been well prepared by the preceding speakers for me to go into this. I will have no hesitation therefore whatsoever following the two speeches already delivered by brother Dowdy and brother Keller, of the calling of names and identifying of the men concerned on the issues discussed in these debates over the years.

My first debate was held in 1916, when I was 19 years old. It was with a Baptist preacher, who has become widely known throughout the country. One of the greatest debaters of his people. He is a member of the Baptist church, the Missionary Baptist church. When I call his name, many of you have known him and heard him through the years, and certainly many of you have known of him. D. N. Jackson. He is the first man I ever debated. I debated him seven times during my career as a debater. And in my first debate with him in 1916, near Monette, Arkansas where I now live, we were discussing the subject of Baptism. The statement made by the Lord in the conversation with Nicodemus in John the third chapter, has oftentimes given Baptist preachers a great deal of trouble, because the Lord referred to being born of water and of the spirit. He declared, among other things, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. This was used to show the necessity of baptism. That the only thing connected with the kingdom of God that is made up of water is what we call baptism. And that the Lord was simply declaring therefore that men must be baptized. They must be born of the water and of the Spirit. In referring to that argument, Mr. Jackson said, there are only three things born of water. This quibble has been made by others through the years, and perhaps you have heard it. There are only three things born of water: a frog, a mosquito and a Campbellite. I said in response, "Mr. Jackson, it

happens to be that I know that the very act which makes one a Baptist is immersion in water. That is the final thing that puts a man into a Baptist church. The Baptists therefore are born of water. You say there are only three things born of water: a frog, a mosquito and a Campbellite. I know you are not a Campbellite. I want to know which are you? A frog, or a mosquito?"

In another debate which I held in 1934, about twelve miles from where I now live, in a congregation known as the Mangrum congregation. The congregation where I grew up as a boy, where I made my confession that Jesus was the Christ, where I was baptized and where I preached my first sermon. But incidentally where I couldn't preach today. I met elder F. S. Gipson, another Baptist preacher, on the general church question. We were discussing Galatians, chapter three, verse twenty seven. Paul said, "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." This, too, has given Baptist preachers a great deal of trouble, because the Apostle Paul shows that men get into Christ by being baptized into Him. And unless men can be saved outside of Christ, they cannot be saved without baptism. During the course of the investigation leading up to this I had asked Mr. Gipson a number of questions regarding the inner man or the outer man. I do not know of any issue that will give as much trouble to Baptist preachers as the inner man and the outer man. I asked him which man he baptized; the inner man or the outer man. He said he baptized the outer man. I wanted to know which man became the child of God; the inner man or the outer man. He said it was the inner man. You know the theory is that when the inner man becomes a child of God he cannot sin any more. And all the sins committed after his conversion are committed by the flesh of the outer man. Therefore he cannot be lost. So when we came to the discussion of Galatians 3:27, being baptized into Christ and putting on Christ, he said, "now you have the thing all wrong." He said, "men put on Christ in Baptism, but remember, that the baby is first born before you put the clothes on him. And so therefore we must first be babes in Christ, we must first be children before we can have ourselves clothed with Christ. We put the clothes on in baptism. We are born babes in Christ first." I said, "Mr. Gipson, you are putting the clothes on the wrong baby. You said you baptized the outer man. You say the baby that is born is the inner man. You are putting the clothes on the wrong baby. You must put the clothes on the inner man and not the outer man, according to your position.

In 1936, in Weatherford, Texas, I met Mr. H.A. Thompson

in debate. Also a member of the Baptist church. Discussing the same subject of water baptism. In the course of our discussion, he introduced Colossians 2:6. In which the apostle Paul said, "As ye therefore have received Christ Jesus our Lord, walk ye in him." Mr. Thompson said, "If ye receive him in the water, walk in him in the water. " Well, that was another quibble of course, that backfired, because I turned the thing around, and said, "Mr. Thompson, according to your application of that, if you receive him at the mourners bench, walk in him at the mourner's bench. If you receive him in the corn field, walk in him in the corn field. If you receive him behind the tree somewhere, walk in him behind the tree." And so another quibble backfired.

In 1935, and I was reminded of this again when Brother Dowdy spoke, regarding the things it takes to make the different denominationalists, the different disciplines and creeds that men have. But on this occasion, I met Mr. W. E. Sherrill. Widely known as "Zeke" Sherrill. One of the outstanding Baptist debaters in the State of Arkansas. This debate was held at Broseley, Missouri, in 1935. At the very beginning of that debate Mr. Sherrill began to refer constantly to this New Testament as "this good ole Baptist discipline." And over and over again he would talk about this "good ole baptist creed I have, I will turn over here to this good ole Baptist Discipline and see what this good ole Baptist preacher said." I said, "Mr. Sherrill, you are wrong about that. Surely the New Testament is not a Baptist discipline. You could hardly think of a Baptist discipline that would not say one thing about a Baptist church. Now if this is a Baptist discipline, there ought to be something in it somewhere about a Baptist church. But it so happens there is not a word said in this book that you refer to as a Baptist discipline about a Baptist church. Now, if you want a Baptist discipline, I have one here in my handbag, I will let you see it. But the one you are referring to is not one. " Well, Mr. Sherrill came back in his next speech and said, "You fellows are always talking about not having a discipline, nor having a creed, but you do have one. If you want to see the Campbellite discipline, I will show it to you. I have got it with me. " In my next speech I demanded to see it. "Mr. Sherrill, I want to see that Campbellite discipline you referred to. " I thought I knew what he had in mind, and what I expected him to introduce. When I called for it, he did not introduce it. He began to ignore it, and I began to suspect that he didn't have with him what he thought he had. And so I began to press him to show me something about that discipline he was talking about. And in every speech in the course of

the debate as we went along, I kept reminding him that he had not shown me that Campbellite discipline. And we had longer debates back in those days than we do now. Now we have about four sessions, and that is about as much as we can ever get. Back in those days, we had oftentimes many sessions. And oftentimes we had two sessions a day, instead of one every night. Mr. Sherrill and I were signed for an eight session debate. To have two sessions each day, and two hours each session. But the thing got started, and in order to allow the people the greater advantage of it, we had three sessions a day. 10 to 12, 1 to 3 and 7 to 9 each night. In every session of that debate I pressed him to show me that Campbellite discipline. When we came down to the intermission just before the last session of the debate, one brother came to me and said, "Brother Porter, he is going to produce that discipline this afternoon. I heard him talking about it during the lunch hour. He has gone across the country here for it." I said, "Fine. " Well, in my first speech that afternoon, I called attention to it again, and he did not produce it. He made his final speech and still it was not given. I had the last speech in that debate. It is an unusual experience, but sometimes I do have. I had the last speech in that debate, and in my last speech I reminded the audience and Mr. Sherrill that he had never produced the discipline. I had been calling for it during all the debate and it had not been produced. He said, "Here it is, I forgot." He reached down into his handbag and pulled out a book and handed it over to me. I looked at it, opened it, and it was a book of sermons by some man that I had never heard of. I said, "The very idea, a book of sermons, by a man that I don't even know, never heard of." Baptist preachers were sitting on the seats around the stand, and I walked around and let every one of them look at it. Then I turned to Mr. Sherrill, and I said, "Mr. Sherrill, I thought you said you were giving a Campbellite discipline. This says a book of SERMONS!" "Well, I thought I had it here in my suit case, but I don't. You can send over here to a certain company and get it. " I said, "This is not it?" (long pause) "This is not it? Why you told the audience a while ago this is it!" Although he is noted for his lying, that one became very embarrassing to him.

Let us hurry on. Nothing was said about when I was to quit.

I met Mr. Ben M. Bogard in debate in Hubbard, Oklahoma in 1940, and you know who Mr. Bogard was. During the course of our debate he made this quibble regarding baptism. In comparing it with Jesus Christ, the Son of God, he said, "Christ was the son of God before his burial. The Lord was not buried

to make him a son of God, he was already a son of God before he was buried. Therefore we are sons of God before we are buried in baptism." I responded, "Yes, Mr. Bogard, Christ was the Son of God before he was buried. But he was also the Son of God before he was crucified. Were you?"

Back to Mr. F. S. Gipson, whom I met in 1934, in our discussion on the establishment of the kingdom, or the church. He contended that the kingdom, or church, was established during the personal ministry of Christ on earth. And of course I contended that it was established on the first Pentecost after Christ arose. That it came with power, according to Mark 9:1. And in Luke 19 the Lord gave a parable in which he sent a nobleman into a far country to receive a kingdom and to return. I showed this nobleman went into a far country. He left one place and went into another place which is a far country. And then returned. To receive for himself a kingdom and to return. I said, "Please tell us, what was the far country to which the nobleman went, who represented Jesus Christ." I contended that he went to heaven, and did not receive the kingdom until he went to heaven, and he is coming back again. He got the kingdom after he went away, and he got it before he is coming back. They are wrong in saying he established it before he left, and others are wrong in saying it will be established when he returns. The Lord said it was between the two. What was the far country? Mr. Gipson said the far country was the earth. When the Lord left heaven and came to the earth, he came to the far country, got his kingdom and went back to heaven. I said, "Now the record says that when he left the place to go to the far country, that he left citizens behind him. And those citizens hated him. People in heaven he left behind, hated him after he left. When he received his kingdom and went back to heaven, the Lord said, 'bring hither my enemies, and slay them before me.' The Lord had enemies in heaven, and had them put to death when he got back from the earth, because the earth was the far country to which he went."

Mr. E. Z. Newsome in a debate in Bernie, Missouri, in 1935, discussing the matter of falling from grace, said that if the devil can get one child of God, he can get them all. If he does not get them all, it is his fault. And if any man is ever saved, then he is saved by the grace of the devil. The devil could have gotten him, but he did not, and just because the devil did not want him, he let him go on to heaven, and therefore the man could praise the devil throughout eternity because the devil could have gotten him, but did not. I turned the thing

around, handed him the other end of it. I said, "Upon the basis of that, if the Lord can get one of the devil's children, he can get them all. Certainly the Lord is stronger than the devil. On that basis, if God can get one, he can get them all, and if he does not get them, it is because of the meanness of God. And if any man goes to hell, he goes there because God was too mean to save him. And he can therefore curse God throughout eternity because God could have had him, but would not."

In 1951, over near Monette, Arkansas, I met John L. Causey in debate. When discussing the scripturalness of the church, he said, "Now the Baptist church is mentioned in the next verse after you read about the Church of Christ." I had been placing on the blackboard, Baptist church and Baptist churches; and church of Christ and churches of Christ, insisting that he give us some scriptural reference with respect to a Baptist church. He said the Baptist church can be read in the next verse after you read of the church of Christ. I said, "Well, fine. In Romans 16:16 Paul said, 'The churches of Christ salute you.' Mr. Causey said the next verse talks about the Baptist church. The next verse says, 'mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned and AVOID them.' " Sometimes they will come back and say, "Well, but that says CHURCHES of Christ, it does not say CHURCH of Christ. I want the singular number." Well, alright we will get the church at Ephesus, "feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." And the next verse says, "After my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock."

Mr. Sherrill, in Broseley, Missouri, upon the subject of apostasy, said that God's children cannot go to hell because in Revelation 1:18 we are told that Jesus has the keys of hell and of death. Therefore the Lord has taken the keys away from the devil and the devil has no way of opening hell and let them in. I said, "I wonder how he will get his own in? The Lord has hell locked up and has the keys and the devil cannot open it. How is he going to get his own children in? If he happens some way to get the doors open so that children of the devil can get in, maybe some of the others can too."

G. E. Cobb, another Baptist preacher, I met in Wooster, Arkansas, 1948, discussing the building of the church, or the time of the church's establishment, started out on his affirmation on Isaiah 28:16, in which the Lord said, "I will lay in Zion

for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation. " He went then to Mark the first chapter, verses 14 through 18, where the Lord at the sea of Galilee called Peter, Andrew, James and John to become his followers, and said there is where the Lord's church began, there is where it was set up." I said, "Mr. Cobb, upon the basis of your argument you have the foundation laid in Zion, and the church built in Galilee. The church was not even built where the foundation was laid. The foundation laid in one place, and the church built in another. He came back to try to fix that thing up and he said, "the word Zion does not mean Jerusalem there. The word Zion means the church," trying to get out of the idea that one was in Jerusalem and the other in Galilee, to try to get them together. So he said the word Zion does not refer to Jerusalem there, it refers to the church. Alright, God said, through Isaiah, "I will lay the foundation in the CHURCH." And so the church was not built on the foundation, the foundation was laid in the CHURCH.

Hoyt Chastain, the frankest Baptist preacher I ever met. I will have more about that later on, not in this speech, perhaps, but later on. Entirely too frank for his own good, as you will discover later on. But Mr. Chastain, regarding Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," said, "Porter does not believe that. The Lord said that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Porter says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall very likely be DAMNED." And Porter says he will be saved, if he holds out." Well, I said according to Mr. Chastain, he does not believe the rest of it. In the rest of it Jesus said, "he that believeth not shall be damned," but Mr. Chastain would say that he that believeth not shall very likely be saved, and he will be damned only if he holds out in his unbelief.

I met Mr. A. G. Canada, of the Pentecostal church of a certain brand, out in Oakland, California, in 1951. We were discussing the existence of miraculous works which he and his brethren claim to be able to perform. I took with me to the stand one night a bottle of carbolic acid. When we came to discuss Mark 16:17 and 18, that "they shall lay their hands on the sick and they shall recover, if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them," and so on. I set that bottle of carbolic acid on the stand and I said, "Now Mr. Canada, when you come to this stand, here is a bottle of carbolic acid. The passage you are relying upon says if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. I leave this bottle of carbolic acid setting here. I

am not going to tell you to drink it. I am going to warn you against it. If you do it will kill you. But if you want to prove to this audience that you have the power that you claim to have, the opportunity to prove it to this audience is **KNOCKING AT YOUR DOOR**. Well, when he returned for his speech he said, "Mr. Porter wants me to drink a bottle of carbolic acid, but I am not going to do it. But I did drink some acid one time, and it did not hurt me. But I did not know it was poison. There were five of us to drink out of a drink that had poison in it. And the chemical analysis showed that it had enough poison in it to kill twenty-five men. And of those five men only two of them suffered any ill effects." I said, "Now I do not know how much of it Mr. Canada and the other four men drank. He said there was enough there to kill twenty-five men. I do not know if they drank all of it or not. He did not say. If they did, I do not know how they got the chemical analysis. But let that be as it may, enough poison there to kill twenty-five men, but only two of them suffered any ill effect. Now I want to know did those two men have the baptism of the Holy Spirit? If they did have, like the other three you said that had, then it should not have hurt them, for the Lord said, 'it shall not hurt them.' And if they did not have, those two men should have died!"

Mr. A. J. Kirkland, in a debate that I had with him in Somerset, Kentucky, in 1952, regarding our becoming God's children, said there are two family relationships. First, he says there is the relationship by birth. It is a relationship spiritually, and concerns the inner man. The second is an adoption, which is a relationship legally, and concerns the body. He was trying to get away from the idea that the body remains a child of the devil, and goes on serving the devil until the resurrection, that they have been contending for so many years. He was trying to fix that up and get out of a predicament that he felt would be presented there. So he said that a man is a child of God from two points of view. The inner man is born by birth spiritually, the body is the child of God by adoption, legally. I said, "Well then, the body is a child of God legally, the inner man is a child of God legally, the inner man is a child of God illegally. If they are not both children of God legally, then one of them is illegal. I want to know what an illegal child of God is called. In Hebrews the statement made by the Apostle Paul regarding the matter of being chastened, declared that God chastens every one he receives and those whom he loves. And if we be without chastisement ye be bastards, and not sons. And that's the man that does not sin, the inner man, a child of God illegally. You see he is without any chastening whatsoever, and he is a bastard and

not a son, and that is the reason, I suppose, that he was not a child of God legally.

L.R. Riley, another Baptist preacher, whom I met in Mayfield, Kentucky in 1952, discussing with me the matter of present salvation and future salvation, he said that is all now. There is no such thing as future salvation. He offered me a hundred dollars for a passage that mentions two kinds of life or two kinds of salvation; one present and another future. I called attention to Rom. 6:3 & 4, where the man baptized is raised to walk a new life, there is a spiritual life in which he walks. Rom. 6:23, Paul speaks of having your fruit unto holiness and in the end everlasting life. There is one now and there is one at the end. In I Tim. 4:8, Paul said, "Having promise of the life that now is, the spiritual life, and that which is to come, the eternal life." And in I Pet 3:21, Peter said, "Baptism doth also now save us." That is now, that is present. Rom. 13:11, Paul said, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed." That is future. I walked over to him and said, "Drop that hundred dollars in my pocket, will you please?" Let me have it. Well, he didn't.

When I met Hoyt Chastain in McDougal, Arkansas, in 1948 -I met him number of times - he came up with I Cor. 1:17, that the Lord sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel. Baptism, he said, is not essential, because Paul was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel. I replied, "Upon the basis of your argument, then Paul was simply saying that the Lord sent me not to make Baptists, but to preach the gospel, because you make Baptists by baptizing them. He came back and said, "Well, I will agree with that." He is a man that, along with other men, try to create prejudice against those that hold to the truth, arousing emotionalism in the hearts of those who may not be members of the church, Baptists, Methodists, and various others who might be present. But he said, "I'll take that, The Lord didn't send Paul to make Baptists, the Lord didn't send me to make Baptists. The Lord sent me to preach the gospel, but when the love of God is preached abroad in a man's heart, he will want to be a Baptist." I said, "Indeed?" Are there any Methodists in the audience tonight? Do you want to be a Baptist? If you don't, Chastain says you don't have the love of God in your heart. That stopped the prejudice.

With Vernon Barr, in Center, Texas, in 1950, I made the illustration we often make on Mark 16:16, and paralleled it with a statement like this: "If the president of Ford Motor Company

should broadcast a statement that he that believeth in us and is baptized will get a new Ford. I said, If that were broadcast tonight, before daylight there would be the biggest baptizing in this country you ever heard of. There wouldn't be any quibbling about that. He that believeth and is baptized shall get a new Ford. Why you couldn't keep the preachers out of the creek. They would be on their way to get a new Ford. Mr. Barr said, "No, I wouldn't, I would get mine by faith before Porter would have time to get to the creek. I'd have my Ford and I'd be gone." I said, "No, Mr. Barr, you didn't get a Ford, the only thing on earth you got was a Dodge. "

This quibble was made one time, and I didn't have time to go through all my notes, and I have forgotten who made the quibble. But it concerned the baptism of John. I made the argument that John baptized for the remission of sins according to Mark 1:4. This man said, "No, that isn't true, John never baptized anybody for the remission of sins. That the record doesn't say that he did. It says John baptized in the wilderness and PREACHED the baptism for remission of sins. It doesn't say John baptized anybody for the remission of sins. " I said, "Well, I have always had an idea that John practiced what he preached. And if he preached baptism for the remission of sins, I have an idea that is the kind he practiced." "Oh", he said, "but you misunderstand. John baptized men in water; water is the element of John's baptism--the baptism which is for the remission of sins is not water baptism, it is the baptism of repentance. The element is not water; the element is repentance. The Lord does that when he submerges you into repentance. That is the baptism which is for the remission of sins, but John baptized with water. That was not for the remission of sins, and John never baptized anybody with the baptism of repentance." I said, "Well, wise men differ. I turn to Acts 19, and I find that Paul came to Ephesus and found certain disciples there, and he said, 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?' And they said, 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' 'Then in what were ye baptized?' They said, 'Unto John's baptism.' And Paul said, 'John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance.'" My opponent said, "John never baptized anybody that way, the Lord did it." You can take your choice as to which is right; my opponent or the book of God.

I must hurry - if I can. Just a few more, if I can indulge your patience just a little more.

Marvin Hicks, a man identified with the United Pentecostal people, who hold to the idea that there is only one person in the

Godhead, and that is Jesus Christ. I met him in 1957 in Lufkin, Texas. He affirmed that there is one person in the Godhead, and that is Jesus Christ. He defined the word person to mean a human body. Since there is only one human body connected with deity, then there is just one person in the Godhead. I said, "Mr. Hicks, on the basis of that, Christ was a person only 33 years. You say he was a person only because he had a human body, for the human body is the person. And upon the basis of that, you should not be affirming tonight that there is one person in the Godhead. You should be affirming that there is no person in the Godhead. Unless Jesus took his human body to heaven with him." And I pressed him to tell me whether or not he did. In John 6:62, the Lord said, "What enables you to see the son of man ascend up to where he was before?" Was the human body in heaven before he came? Did the human body go back to heaven? Heb. 5:7; Paul spoke of his prayers in the days of his flesh. Did he take the human flesh back to heaven with him? If not, he is not a person now, and there is no person in the Godhead! And you ought to change your affirmation.

L.R. Riley in Gleason, Tennessee met him first there in 1951 upon the basis of falling from grace or apostasy. He made the argument based upon 2 Pet. 1:4, that we become partakers of the divine nature, as the Apostle Peter expressed the matter. That the child of God partakes of the divine nature at conversion, but the divine nature of God is eternal. And since God is everlasting, and if we partake of the divine nature when we are born of God, then we never can be lost. We have eternal life; God has eternal life. I said, "Mr. Riley, I learn from the book of God that the divine nature is deity. Deity is God's nature. Do you mean to tell me that when you became a child of God that you became a possessor of deity?" He said that the child of God is deity. I said, "Indeed? Deity is God. If you want to know who your God is, here is one of them. He says he is a little God. He became a God when he was converted, because he became deity! You can worship him, because the Lord said, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God! and Him only shalt thou serve.' "

On the subject of the establishment of the church, Isa. 2:2-3 said should be established in the top of the mountains the last days, I have not time to give all the statement as you are acquainted with it. Mr. Ralph Statten, of the Free-Will Baptist church in Newport, Arkansas, in 1950, insisted that I tell him the subject of that sentence. The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountain. I said that the subject of that sentence is the word mountain. He came back and

said, "That's fine; it didn't say the Lord's house shall be established in the last days; it said the MOUNTAIN of the Lord's house. Not the Lord's house, but the MOUNTAIN of the Lord's house shall be established in the last days. I pressed him to tell me what was meant by the mountain of the Lord's house. What does the term mountain mean; what does it symbolize? He says it meant GOVERNMENT. Fine. The Lord's house was established before that, but it didn't have any government. The government was not established until the last days. You have the Lord's house, and nothing to govern the Lord's house.

W. E. Sherrill, whom I met in Broseley, Missouri, in 1935 on Acts 2:38, connected verse 41, declared that they that gladly received the word were baptized. They received the word before they were baptized, and he said the term word in that passage comes from the Greek word Logos, which always means Christ. I came back and I said, "Mr. Sherrill, you mean to tell me that the Greek word Logos always means Christ?" He said, "Yes." I know that sometimes it does, but does it always mean Christ? He said, "Yes, Logos means the spoken word, but logos means Christ. I said, "Mr. Sherrill, didn't you know that that is the same word, just a different case? That the word logos corresponds to our nominative case and in English? And that Logos is the accusative case corresponding with the English objective? And it is just the one word in the different cases? Didn't you know that?" He said, "No, I didn't know that." But he already said "I studied Greek four years in college and know what I am talking about!" I said, "You mean you studied Greek four years and you didn't know that?" He said, "I didn't say four years, I said three years." I said, "You couldn't study Greek thirty lessons without learning that. But since you say that is so, then I am here to tell you that the word logos is not in your passage. The word you say always means Christ isn't there, it's the word Logos which you say NEVER means Christ!" And he came back and said, "It is there; it is verse 40 with many other words, there is your Logos. It is Logos in verse 40 that they gladly received the word." I said, "No, it isn't. In verse 40, it is Logos; it's the dative case. And in verse 41, it is in the accusative case, and the word Logos is not in either of them." He came back and says it is. I would hold the book down and make him look at it and tell him it is not there. He would come back in his next speech and say it is there. I said it isn't; he says it is. So I thought the thing had reached to where it had to be brought to a climax somehow, and I stuck my neck out. During our intermission, I went to the blackboard and I wrote on the blackboard the

words, Logon, Logos, and Logois in the English letters and also in the Greek letters. And I came back in my next speech, and said, "This matter has resolved into a matter of 'tis or it 'taint! You don't know who is telling the truth about it. But I am determined for you to find out. I have written upon the blackboard the three words in both English and the Greek letters. The people in this audience may have never seen a Greek letter before, but you can come up here, and take this book and we can show you the verse, and you can point out on the board the one that is in that verse; if you never saw a Greek letter before. And I propose that we do it. That we select three men to come up and determine which of these is in verse 40. And I think Mr. Sherrill's moderator is a pretty fair-minded man, and I am going to choose him as the first man to do it. And I am going to let him select the other men, and he can select BAPTISTS if he wants to, and let those three men come up and check on the board which of these is in verse 40 and let the audience know. How about it?" He said, "I won't do it!"

A. N. Dugger, of the 7th day church of God, who hold to the Sabbath position, I met in 1919. That was back in the days of short debates. We had eleven nights and two days. In that debate, we were discussing the first day of the week. John 20, - where the Lord, met with his disciples on a first day and after eight days again. I insisted that after eight days was the next first day. He said, "Porter needs to be brushed up on his mathematics. " And Mr. Dugger was contending that Christ was crucified on Wednesday, and arose on Saturday. And he said, "I'll just brush him up on his mathematics. They met on Sunday, and Sunday is one day (incidentally, we had a rule that we had to answer all questions from our seat. I tried to get out of it; I tried not to have to sign the rule; but in order to meet him I had to; and at the time, I was just 21 years old, but I met him under that rule) Monday, two days; Tuesday, three days; Wednesday, four days; Thursday, five days; Friday, six days; Saturday, seven days; Monday eight days, after eight days, would be on Tuesday of next week. " I said, "Mr. Dugger, I am going to grant you Wednesday Crucifixion. I am going to take your system of mathematics and make you admit that Jesus arose on Sunday. " I turned to Mark - the statement that the Lord said that he would be crucified, and after three days would rise again. I said, "He was crucified Wednesday according to you. Is that right?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Wednesday, one day; Thursday, two days; Saturday, three days; after three days would be Sunday. " He said, "Yes."

Two or three other points and I close. Mr. D. N. Jackson has a quibble he often times comes up with and he usually saves it until his last speech. He is going to have the last speech too. In fact, I met him seven times, and I have had the last speech in only one debate that ever had with him. But his speech runs like this. If you become a child of God when you were baptized, then water is your mother. If you were baptized in the White River, you have a white mammy. If you are baptized in the Red River, you have a red mammy. If you are baptized in the black river, you have a black mammy. I said, "Mr. Jackson (I had to bring it up one time to get a chance to reply to it before he got to it, because I knew he would do it in his last speech, so I had to do it in order to ever have any chance to reply to it; he always saves it to his last. So I mentioned that Mr. Jackson has been doing that), has given us I Cor. 4:15 where Paul said, 'In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel.' And the preacher begets the person who is a child of God in the sense that as he is the preacher, he becomes the father in the gospel, and upon basis of the argument made along that line, then I want to know what color your daddy is. If the gospel is preached to you by a white man, you have a white daddy; if a red man, a red daddy; if a black man, a black daddy. It works in one case as well as in the other."

When I met Mr. Bogard in Culbert, Oklahoma, discussing Rom 16:16, I had written on the blackboard, as I mentioned a while ago, "churches of Christ and church of Christ" and Baptist church and Baptist churches" and put Rom. 16:16 along with churches of Christ, and insisted that the plural comprehended the singular, of course they had been coming, you know saying, it doesn't say singular, it is not church of Christ, but CHURCHES OF CHRIST. You must have the singular. I proposed that if he found either singular or plural for Baptist church, I would take both of them. If he would find Baptist churches in the Bible, I would have sense enough to know that one of them would be a Baptist church. Or that if he found Baptist church, a number of them would be Baptist churches. If he would find either of them, I would TAKE THEM BOTH. He tried to identify it by its description. He said it has certain characteristics. You don't identify a thing by its name, by its characteristics. When I was pressing him on it, he spoke from his seat. Bogard didn't often do that. Usually had to be hurting when he did. But he spoke from his seat, and said, "Mr. Porter, I guess if I got up there and drew a picture of a cat on the board, you wouldn't know it was a cat unless I wrote under it and said, 'this is a cat!' " I said, "Mr. Bogard, if a picture of the cat you drew on the board

didn't look any more like a cat than the Baptist church looks like the New Testament church, that is what you would have to do." Even Mr. Bogard appreciated that because he got quite a laugh out of it.

One more, then I shall close this part of my work. This concerns the same debate with Mr. Bogard at Hobart, Oklahoma in 1940. Discussing the matter of wearing the Groom's name, we insisted that the church being the bride of Christ should wear the name of the groom. He said, "Porter, you are all wrong about that. You fellows are always talking about the church wearing the name of the Groom. The bride wearing the name of the husband. You don't have any Bible for it at all its pure human tradition. Human philosophy. Porter, I give you five hundred dollars to read anywhere in the Bible where any wife ever wore the name of her husband." He walked back and forth on the stage and grew more confident, and raised his offer to a thousand dollars. Said, "I'll give you a thousand dollars, if you will read anywhere in God's book that a wife ever wore the name of her HUSBAND." I said in reply, "Mr. Bogard, will you please write out that check for a thousand dollars, and get one of your brethren to hold it for me. I am fixing to collect." I stepped over to the blackboard, and I rehearsed briefly the story of creation - how God created man and woman. God created man and created for him an help meet by taking a rib from his side and making woman. The record says that Adam called her name Eve because she was the mother of all living. It doesn't say God called her that. Adam called her name EVE. And then in Genesis 5, and verse 2, the record said that God created male and female, male and female created he them, and called their name Adam. In the very first pair that God placed on earth, He gave the name of the husband to the wife. God called their name Adam. I said, "Let me have your check - a thousand dollars." He came back in his next speech and said, "Now that doesn't prove anything." He said the word Adam just meant man, that is all in the world it meant. I said, "I don't care what it means, I know that names meant something. Jacob meant something, Isaiah meant something, Abraham meant something. Certainly names had significance. I don't care what the word Adam means. The fact remains that God said it was THEIR name. It was their name." He didn't pay me, but he will-in eternity. I thank you very kindly.

"QUIBBLES THAT BACKFIRED" (2)

My subject "Quibbles that Backfired", deals with interesting highlights of discussions that I have had over many years. They pertain to arguments, illustrations, or matters presented by my opponents on various discussions, that in some way returned upon the men that made them. Oftentimes putting the man into the position that he had endeavored to put the other fellow into. Or paralleling the thing with that which he has endeavored to place upon the other, and thus, they became very interesting things. I was not able to go through all of my debate notes of the years that have passed and get all of the quibbles that backfired during that time. There shall be a good many of them that I shall not be able to get to during these lectures. But some of these I hope to bring to you, as I did yesterday, and trust they may be of interest and importance to you.

In this connection, I mentioned yesterday of the book club, and I want to say just a little more about it to make a little more definite announcement of it. The club which I started sometime ago to publish some of my books, including a number of debates of which I will be at least the co-author. And then some other books that I plan to publish. In that list, there was to be one entitled, "Quibbles that Backfired." That will take up the material presented in these speeches and others that I shall not get to at this time. One book has been published already. There has been a delay in getting others out for the reason stated yesterday morning, but we hope to get another under way before a great while. I have some cards that give a little information about the matter, that maybe signed by those whom might wish to become members of the club. Members of the club will get the books at 20 per cent discount from the retail price. No money to be paid in advance; pay for the book when you receive it. The first book, "The Porter-Myers Debate", is available to all who might become members of the club, and will be mailed to you upon my return home. I don't have the books with me here. There will not be a publication of any book that has ever been in print before, so you will not get anything that is a duplicate of what you have. However, I do plan just a little later, within a very short time, while waiting to get another book published, to offer to club members who do not have it at club price, "The Porter-Bogard Debate." Now some of you have that book already. In case you already have it, or want another copy, you can get the book at club price, if you are a member of the club. It was the last debate that Mr. Bogard had prior to his death. A number of quibbles in that debate, of course, will not be discussed in these

speeches. However, I might mention that it was in that debate that Mr. Bogard took the position that Jesus Christ was born totally depraved. Believe it or not! He had not intended to take that position, I feel sure. But during the course of one of his arguments on the depravity of the sinner, his inherited nature, he made an argument upon the word flesh, and declared that when the Lord referred to flesh, or when the word flesh was mentioned in the Book of God concerning us, that it does not refer to flesh upon our bones, it doesn't refer to skin, nor our nails nor hair, nor that which our body is composed, but the Lord referred to our depraved nature. That the term flesh indicated our sinful nature, the nature we received from our parents, an inherited depravity. That he declared to be a total depravity. And he gave a list of passages along the line that mentioned the word flesh. Among these he listed Col. 1:22 which has reference to the body of his flesh. All these he put together describing the totally depraved nature of the man. In responding to that, I suggested to him, if he did not know, that one of the passages referred to had reference to Jesus Christ himself. Col. 1:22: "In the body of his flesh," was reference made concerning Christ, and was offering himself as a sacrifice for our sins. He said he knew that. I suggested that upon the basis of his argument that Jesus Christ was born totally depraved. And willing to take the consequences of his argument, he stood back and declared that Jesus was born totally depraved, and took upon himself a totally depraved nature. Though he did not sin, he had the depraved nature, and was a totally depraved man. Of course I showed that according to his application of depravity that the totally depraved man could not even do one good thing. And he couldn't even think a good thought, nor speak a good word, and if Jesus Christ had a totally depraved nature, and if he did anything, he sinned. There wasn't any way around it. He couldn't do anything else. And so that book containing that quibble along with others is available, and will be available to club members at the book club price.

Now then to others that I have listed for our confederating this morning.

In the year 1919, I met a fellow, a member of the Baptist church, near Formosa, Arkansas. It was a brief debate concerning the subject of baptism as a condition of salvation. His name was Mr. Jim Cobbin" During the course of this short discussion, although other matters were not involved, he mentioned there are three church ordinances which he called baptism, the Lord's Supper, and foot washing. He said, "Now, Porter would

cut off one of the dog's ears. He wants to do away with the foot washing." I said in reply, "Well, all normal dogs I ever saw had just two ears. And I suppose if you had a dog with three ears one of them ought to be cut off, because he would be an abnormal dog."

In debate with Mr. W. A. Ivan, at Washburn, Missouri, in 1931, which I mentioned yesterday, concerning some other matters, I introduced an argument based upon the statement made by Paul in the Colossian letter concerning the circumcision of Christ. In Col. 2:11-13, the apostle said, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism where also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And ye being dead in your sins and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having for given you of all trespasses." And upon the basis of the statement made by the apostle Paul, I showed the circumcision to which the apostle referred took place, or occurred in baptism. Here is the circumcision that is called the circumcision of Christ; that is the circumcision that the Lord authorized. The word circumcision indicating a cutting loose or a cutting around; that there was a cutting loose of something, and that which is referred to is the circumcision of Christ. And that circumcision is described as putting off the body of the sins of the flesh and having your trespasses forgiven. When we are circumcised, with the circumcision of Christ, it is the cutting loose of our sins; and therefore, forgiveness of our sins cannot be accomplished except through this divine operation. But it is accomplished, Paul said, when we are buried with him in baptism and raised with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead.

Mr. Ivan said that this cannot be accomplished in baptism. That this circumcision cannot take place there and forgiveness of sins mentioned cannot be accomplished that way, for he declared the apostle Paul said the circumcision was made without hands, and I have never seen any baptism taken place without hands. The preacher, the man who administers baptism always uses his hands when he baptizes, and therefore it cannot refer to a circumcision taking place in that. It is a circumcision without hands.

Well, of course, the circumcision is without hands, because that is the divine side. God is the one who cuts loose the sins. That is the operation God performs, it is without hands, but

that certainly does not indicate that the baptism cannot be performed by men in connection with the circumcision that Jesus makes. On the same basis I replied that men cannot be saved by the preaching of the gospel, at least in most cases, I very seldom see any man who preached without his hands, and that circumcision is made without hands.

In debating Mr. E. G. Newsom, in Bernie Missouri, in 1935, he made the charge that we baptize infidels. He said according to Porter's argument, and the doctrine which his brethren hold, they contend that in the plan of salvation, faith comes first, that men must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and that belief is followed by repentance. But they say that repentance means a change of mind, so if a man believes in the Lord first, then he has a change of mind, he becomes an unbeliever, and therefore, you baptize an unbeliever; you baptize an infidel. I said, "Mr. Newsom, have you ever repented since your conversion? What do God's children do when they repent? They must first believe in order to be saved, they are believers in the Lord Jesus Christ as Christians, and then as Christians, they must repent of the sins they commit. They change their minds, they become unbelievers, and if you have ever repented of any sin you have committed since you were converted, then you became an infidel. The cause was a change of mind - a change from a believer to an unbeliever."

Another quibble that is oftentimes made has been made by many preachers of various type throughout the land, by those who oppose the idea of baptism for the remission of sins, or as a condition of salvation. Always, of course, they try to literalize the things as much as possible, and I have had them measure the distance to Christ. It has been said, in this particular, by Mr. C. A. Smith, who I met in Southwest Missouri, a few years ago in 1932, that according to Porter's position, you measure the distance to Christ by the tapeline. He said, "Show me how far it is to the creek, and I'll show you how far it is to Christ. The man who lives nearest to the creek, lives nearest to Christ." And I showed that upon the basis of that we could measure the distance to the Baptist church with a tapeline. Show me how far it is to the creek, and I'll show you how far it is to the Baptist church. And the man who lives nearest to the creek lives nearest to the Baptist church. It works as well in one case as it does in the other.

In my debate with Mr. F. S. Gibson to which reference was

also made yesterday morning, in 1934 in Arkansas, in the congregation where I made the confession, where I was baptized years ago, where I preached my first sermon. Mr. Gipson, endeavored to illustrate and to show that baptism cannot be a condition of salvation. Of course, men get the idea sometimes that we think there is some kind of power in the water to wash sins away, they call it water salvation or baptism regeneration; that we have an idea that the power is in the water, and the water accomplishes the matter; that it has some cleansing power of some kind, with respect to matters of that kind. So during the course of the debate, he endeavored to illustrate that it could not be done. He had a bottle, and he took a dirty handkerchief and placed it in the bottle and he sealed it. He took a pan of water, and he dipped the bottle in the water, brought it up out, and the handkerchief was still dirty. He said, "You wash the outer man to cleanse the inner man, but it cannot be done. Dip it a hundred times if you want to, take it up, and the old handkerchief in the bottle is still dirty; the inner man is still unclean. You cannot do it by water." In response, I said to Mr. Gipson, "Will you please put that bottle on the bench and pray for it.?"

In meeting Vernon Barr over at Boliver, Tennessee in 1953, he followed a course that preachers sometimes follow in an effort to create prejudice and stir up emotions in a community to get people in an unfavorable mind to receiving the truth about the subject of baptism, and often will bring up some local case of some man dying without being baptized. On this particular occasion, Mr. Barr referred to a man who had the misfortune of a car accident. "The man," he said, "died without being baptized. Porter, tell me that Mr. So and So went to HELL." And the man's widow was in the audience that night. He knew, of course, that she was there, and that she had friends and relatives there, and so he said, "Tell me, did Mr. So and So go to HELL?" He died without being baptized. Well, he made the charge in the closing speech that night, and I knew nothing about the case, but had a little time to investigate before the next session. So I found out during the investigation something about the man, and in my next speech I referred to it again. I showed the purpose of the thing charged, the effort being made by Mr. Barr simply to arouse and create prejudice against the truth; to close the minds of the people against that which God had revealed by the use of some local incident. And I had judged from the statement made by Mr. Barr, and I am sure that others who knew nothing about the case reached the same conclusion, that the man died without having time to be baptized. But upon investiga-

tion, I found that the man, after having had the car accident, lived and operated a peanut stand from the court house square for several years, and that Baptist preachers had kept him from being baptized. And if he went to hell and stood before the judgment bar of God condemned to hell, that Baptist preachers like Mr. Barr were responsible for it.

I met Mr. Ralph Green in 1935 at Leachville, Arkansas. Mr. Green was a representative of the people we know as Jehovah's Witnesses. We had a rather lengthy debate covering a number of propositions. These people are materialists in the conception of religious matters. They hold to the idea that man is wholly mortal, that he dies like the little dog Rover, he dies all over; he is just as dead as the dead dog when he dies. Of course, there is no eternal punishment for him. During the course of the debate, we discussed the punishment of the wicked. I contended that there would be an everlasting punishment according to Matthew 25:46. That means they would be tormented day and night forever and ever, according to Revelation 20:10. In our investigation of it, Mr. Green said that Jesus Christ became a ransom for our sins according to I Timothy 2:5-6; that he gave himself a ransom for us, and the word ransom means he paid a corresponding price. And that being true, if the penalty for sin is endless torment, that would mean that Jesus Christ suffered endless torment, for he paid the ransom price, a corresponding price for our sins. I said in my reply to that, "My friend, contend that the penalty for sin is utter eternal extinction of both body and soul; that man become totally annihilated. At the judgment bar of God, he stood condemned in sin. Jesus Christ paid the corresponding price, he gave himself a ransom for us. Therefore, Jesus Christ in body and soul became utterly extinct and annihilated; an utter end to him. It was merely a boomerang, or a "quibble that backfired."

Hoyt Chastain said, in our debate at Malvern, Arkansas in 1953, on the question of the possibility of apostasy, that in order to prove that any child of God could ever go to hell, I must find an example of it. I must turn to the book of God and find where some man became a child of God, that he died in some kind of sin, and then went to hell. I'd have to find an example to prove it; I couldn't prove it otherwise. Of course it made no difference what God said about a thing. If God said that if people do such things, they go to hell, that was not enough for him. It would have to be proven by an EXAMPLE. And upon that basis I said

to Mr. Chastain, "Will you please prove to me an unbeliever will go to hell? WHERE IS YOUR EXAMPLE? Can you take the book of God and find some man who was an unbeliever who died in unbelief, and find where that man went to hell?" I know that God said that he would, but he wasn't willing to take that. God said a lot of things men are not willing to accept, they want something else besides. And so the matter of example returned upon with the same force with which he tried to place it upon me.

At Hulbert, Oklahoma, in 1940, in my first debate with Mr. Ben M. Bogard, concerning the matter of apostasy, I introduced the statement upon Revelation 22:19, regarding people having names taken out of the book of life. I showed that in Phillipian 4:3, the people of God had their names in the book of life, that the Lord told his disciple to rejoice because their names were written in heaven. And in the Hebrew letter, reference is spoken of about those of the church of the firstborn who are written in heaven. And thus, we have revealed to us a book which is known as the book of life in which God has enrolled the names of his people. That God declared that any man that would take away from the book of this prophecy, God would take away his part out of the book of life. But his part in the book of life is his NAME. And when that name is taken from the book of life, the name is not in the book; if a child of God turns to sin and continues in sin and has his name erased, he comes to the judgement bar of God Almighty, and the book does not contain his name, what is the result? Everyone not found in the book of life is cast into the lake of fire, so we are told in Rev. 12. And the child of God will go down to hell, therefore, because his name is not written in the book of life. Mr. Bogard said that everyone has a right to the book of life. I showed that no one has that right except the people of God, except those who are his, who get their names enrolled, and you cannot blot out a name that was never written. When it has been blotted out it is not there, and so he stands condemned. Mr. Bogard illustrated by the Indians and the land reserved for them. He said they were given certain portions of land, and all of them had a right to it. He had a part there, but some Indians fail to show up at the appointed time and they lost their part. All people have a right, all people have a part to the book of life, and it is not limited merely to Christians, God's people, but to the whole world. I said, "Why, your very illustration cuts you loose from that. Because I had no part in that reservation, I wasn't an Indian. And nobody had any part except INDIANS. And the very illustration that you made proves my

point. That only Christians have their names in the book of life and they are the only ones that have any part there. "

I met W. C. Wright of the Christian church in a debate in Monett, Arkansas, where I now live, in 1921. While he was a preacher for the Christian church, he had gone beyond their ordinary doctrine, and had embraced the doctrine of the Christadelphians. He had become a materialist in concept. He held to the idea of no endless punishment for the wicked, and no resurrection for the unbeliever. Their position is, and his position was, as he had expressed it, that when an unbeliever dies, he is just as we sometimes say a long time dead. There will be no resurrection for him. He affirmed during that debate that only regenerated people will share in the resurrection of the dead. He defined regenerated people as those who had believed in the Lord, repented of their sins, confessed their faith in Christ and had been baptized into him. Nobody else is regenerated today, they are God's people and they have no part, anybody but them, in the resurrection. And in our discussion of it, he introduced a statement by Paul in I Cor. 15. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive", and he defined as "in Christ" those who had been baptized into Christ. He preached that in Christ all shall be made alive. Nobody shall be made alive except those that are in Christ. Therefore, nobody raised from the dead except God's people; nobody but Christians. Only those "in Christ" will be made alive. I said in responding to it, "I know that the term in Christ sometimes refers to those who are Christians, but not always. In this place, I am certain that it does not. For not only did Paul say that "in Christ shall all be made alive," but he said that "as in Adam, all die." As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. And if "in Christ" means only Christians, "in Adam" means only sinners. They are used in contrast. If in Christ means nobody will be raised except Christians, then those who die in Adam means nobody will die except alien sinners. And upon that basis then, we would have to reach the conclusion that those who are raised will be those who never died, and not one of those who died will ever be raised."

The matter of children of God getting drunk and dying drunk has given Baptist preachers a great deal of trouble. I have often times in my debates with them asked them a series of questions: "Is it possible for a child of God to get drunk and commit murder? And if a child of God should die while he is drunk and in the act of murder, will he go to heaven?" Of course, men try to evade and edge around the thing, sometimes they come right out and say that God wouldn't allow it to happen. Even Bogard

took that position with me one time, and others also--that God would not allow a child of God to die while he is drunk. And of course, I suggested, as many of our brethren have in days gone by, that if you want to live forever, become a child of God, get drunk and stay drunk. If you will do that, even an atomic bomb could not kill you.

In meeting Mr. Canada, the Pentecostal preacher whom I met in Oakland, California, in 1951, discussing whether or not miraculous works continue with Christians today, I introduced I Cor. 13:8-10, with which you are familiar, that charity never fails, where there are prophecies, they shall fail; where there are tongues, they shall cease, where there be knowledge, it shall banish away, for now we know in part, we prophecy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. And I showed of course, as we often times do, that here are miraculous gifts, in parts, the gift of tongues, the gift of knowledge, the gift of prophecy, and that Paul declared that these things will cease when that which is perfect is come. When there is that complete perfect revelation of God's will; when we reach that in completion, then these things in part are discontinued. Tongues cease, prophecies fail, and knowledge vanishes away. Mr. Canada said that reference was made to our reaching heaven. When that which is perfect is come refers and means heaven, when we get to heaven. Then we reach perfection; we don't reach it now. But in further elaboration on the argument, he said, 'I'm willing to say that these things cease, yes. Tongues cease and prophecies fail when the church went into apostasy. When the church goes into apostasy, there comes about in the people of God, a certain condition where they can't exercise those miraculous gifts. Tongues cease, and prophecies fail, and knowledge vanishes away. It was done when the church goes into apostasy.' I said, "Well, upon the basis of that, then the church will apostatize in heaven. Because you have made the passage to refer to our condition in heaven, and Paul was talking about when the perfect is come, then these things cease, and the perfect doesn't come until we get to heaven. So we reach apostasy, therefore, when we reach heaven. Tongues cease, prophecies fail, and knowledge vanishes away."

Regarding this book of life again, in my debate with D. N. Jackson, in Fulton, Miss., in 1952, I showed that God had declared that he would blot out the names of those who sinned against him, that their names would be erased from the book of life. Mr. Jackson said that it is utterly impossible for the devil to get into heaven to erase the names of God's children. How can the devil erase God's people names from the book? He cannot

get to heaven, their names are written in heaven." I said, "He won't have to. I didn't say, and God didn't say, the devil would erase them, God said, 'I will do it.' The devil would not have to do it. " So he came back and he said now, "Porter declares that God said he would erase the names from the book of life. That God said he would blot out the name, but he said that I deny that God said any such thing. I challenge him to produce the proof. " And he pressed the thing over and over, and I let him go and let him have as much rope as he wanted. And he kept on pressing the matter. Where did God say it? God did not say it; you must prove it. Finally I spoke from my seat, and I said, "Mr. Jackson read Exodus 32 and verses 32 and 33. " He tried to evade the thing, but I held him to the point. "You have called for the proof, I demand that you read it." Well, he began reading Exodus 32, 31-33. "Moses prayed to God and said, 'This people has committed a great evil and made them gods of gold. Yet now if thou wilt forgive them, and if not blot me out I pray out of thy book which thou hast written.'" He said, "Why, that is what MOSES said. Moses prayed, blot me out of thy book, God didn't say it; MOSES said it." I said, "Read the NEXT verse." He said, "I will, but I'm going to read this first. " He went over to Exodus 17:14 and read about the battle with Amalek where the hands of Moses were held up and the battle went on and Moses prevailed; the people of God prevailed in the battle, and that God commanded that this be written down as a memorial in a BOOK, and he said, "There it is. " I said, "Read Exo. 32. " He went back finally to read it, and read that Moses prayed, "Blot me out of the book which thou hast written", and the next verse says whosoever has sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. God said it. Not Moses. Some brethren had reached the place where they thought I couldn't produce it, and were getting uneasy about it. With Mr. L. R. Riley in Mayfield, Kentucky, in 1952, he began to make some statements about the charge having been made against him that he preached infant damnation. I don't know just what the background of all of it was, but he had been charged with preaching infant damnation, and said he didn't believe in infant damnation, and wanted people to know that he didn't teach any such doctrine. That I could not charge on him the doctrine of infant damnation. In the course of our discussion, we came to depravity. We had a general church question, and he said that he became a child of God when he was sixteen. "At the age of sixteen, I became a child of God," he said I had been pressing him along various lines about the matter, and he had said that a child of the devil cannot go to heaven. There will be no children of the devil in heaven. I asked him a direct question about it, no

CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL IN HEAVEN. Then when he said he became a child of God at 16, I said, "When did you become a child of the devil?" His reply was, "At birth," and gave Eph., the statement made by Paul being the children of wrath by nature. And he became a child of the devil at birth. I put them together and showed that Mr. Riley said that he became a child of the devil at birth, but became a child of God at sixteen. Had he died before sixteen, he would have died a child of the devil. Had he died at the age of one year or six weeks, he would be dying a child of the DEVIL. Yet, he said there would be no children of devil in heaven I said, "Where would you go? If that is not infant damnation, what would it be?"

I met Mr. Gipson, as I mentioned a while ago, in the debate in Arkansas, and he had a chart which Brother Grider reminded me of a while ago when he told of a chart used on him one time by a preacher, a goat chart. This one was simply as brother Grider was telling about. Mr. Gipson had a goat chart in which a picture of a lot of goats all together, but he had a picture of a preacher, of a man baptizing a goat. He had the goat drawn, a literal goat, of course, and there were people standing on the bank. There was the preacher down in the water. He had the goat, the little goat there, just baptizing him, and brought him up a goat, he baptized him as a goat, he brought him up a goat, and he was still a goat. He charged on me that I was baptizing a goat, trying to make a sheep out of him. And you couldn't baptize a goat to make a sheep out of him. I had heard that Mr. Gipson had a chart like that in some former debates with somebody. So I prepared me a chart to reply to it. I got my chart ready, and I hung it on the wall, and I folded it back so it couldn't be seen. And I bided my time. I began to get uneasy that he was not going to use his goat chart. He kept going along till finally at almost at the close of the debate he got to it. He brought out his goat chart and introduced there the preacher, the Campbellite preacher, baptizing goats trying to make a sheep out of him. Put him down a goat, and brought him up a goat. I said, "Now I don't need to say anything about that at all. I am just going to unfold my chart and let it speak for itself." I unfolded the chart, spread it out so the audience could see it, and the top of the house almost came off. I had drawn on that chart a picture of a Baptist preacher in the form of a physique that Mr. Gipson had. And had a church bench drawn with the goat standing on that bench with large tears dropping down from his eyes. Over here in the grass some other goats lying around, not even under conviction yet. Mr. Gipson down on his knees praying for the goat, "Oh Lord, change this goat into a sheep!" Here are two of them already leaving the place, saying, "He failed on me." The others

said, "I'm still a goat." I didn't have to say a word. I just let them look at it.

But I must hurry.

Some others I mention briefly because my time is about gone. Mr. Ballard, in our debate at Lufkin, Texas, in 1957, made the argument often times made on the Lord's preserves. He gave Psalms 37:28; Psalms 145:20; 97:10 and other references, showing that the Lord preserves his people. The Lord preserves the souls of his saints. And declared that the Lord's preserves will not spoil. I went to Colossians the first chapter, and I read where Paul addressed the saints and faithful brethren in Colosse. I said, "I suppose these are some of the Lord's preserves. They are declared to be the saints and faithful brethren, the very kind you are talking about here becoming the Lord's preserves. Mr. Ballard said the Lord's preserves won't spoil. But in the eighth verse of the second chapter, Paul said to these preserves of the Lord, 'Beware lest any may spoil you.' "

Well, they have all been guilty sometimes of riding the train. I thought of this yesterday in brother Keller's talk, when he talked about Baptist preachers tracing the chain of succession, and once his tongue got a little twisted you know. He started to say chase, instead of trace. He made me think of sometimes instead of tracing the chain, they chase the train. So on Mark 16:16 where the Lord said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." They made this illustration. Mr. Bogard made it with me, and others also. He said we make a parallel of that. A man boards the train, he sits down, and he goes to Little Rock. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, "He that boards the train and sits down shall go to Little Rock." How he said if I board the train, I can go to Little Rock whether I sit down or not. That may add to my comfort, so going to Little Rock he makes parallel to salvation, sitting down parallel to baptism, and boarding the train parallel to faith. The essential thing to go to Little Rock is to board the train. You will get there whether you sit down or not; the essential thing to salvation is to believe. Baptism may add to your comfort, but you will get there whether you are baptized or not. I said, "Well, he makes baptism parallel to sitting down, belief parallel to boarding the train, and since a man can go to Little Rock without sitting down, then he can reach salvation without baptism, which makes baptism non-essential. On that same basis, it makes FAITH non-essential because Mr. Bogard, did it ever occur to you that I can go to Little Rock without ever boarding a train? And besides all of that, that doesn't very well fit your doctrine, because to be parallel with you, it would have to say, 'He that boards the train

is already in Little Rock before he has time to sit down."

Mr. Riley, concerning the matter of works, said, "Works won't do anything for a man but send him to hell." That was in our debate at Gleason, Tenn. in 1951. "Works will do nothing for a man but SEND HIM TO HELL." Yet when I questioned him about live faith and dead faith, he said that faith that saves a man is a faith that must WORK. I showed that according to him, a faith that saves is a faith that sends to hell. Because that is all that works will do for a man.

D. N. Jackson, in Poplar Bluff, Missouri, in 1946, said I had a man with no place to go. In John 3:18, the Lord said, "The unbeliever is not condemned." I say he can't go to heaven till he is baptized. So the unbeliever is not condemned, he believes before he is baptized, he reaches a place where he is not condemned before he is baptized. He can't go to hell, he is not condemned, Porter says he can't go to heaven because he has not been baptized. If a man dies between faith and baptism, where will he go? Put him out on a stump somewhere and let him whistle eternity away?" he said. I said, "He will go to the same place where your man will go. You place repentance before faith and repentance puts a man where he will not perish. You say he cannot be saved until he reaches faith. Yet he repents before faith. If he does between repentance and faith, where will he go? Put him on the same stump and let him whistle the same tune?"

One of the amazing things that happened was G. E. Jones, at Truman, Arkansas, on this drunk question of the child of God. He said that a child of God can get drunk once, but he can't get drunk any more. The spirit won't allow him to, he can get drunk once, but he never could become a drunkard, he couldn't get drunk anymore. I have found the infallible criteria by which to determine your conversion. If you think you have been converted, become a child of God, and if you want to be absolutely sure about, get you a jug of liquor and drink it. If you get drunk, it doesn't prove anything. Wait until you sober up. Then get you another jug and try it again, and if the second jug won't make you drunk, you have been converted, you can be sure about it.

Marvin Hicks, in our debate at Lufkin, Texas, 1957, argued upon the matter of being baptized, according to Matt. 28:19, baptizing in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. He said, "Now the Lord didn't say baptizing them in the NAMES of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit--not a plurality of names, but one name, in the NAME, singular, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That there is one name, the Father, the

Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that name is Jesus. And so one name for the three. Therefore, the three are one person, of course. One name for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, not three names, but one name." Well, I called attention to a statement made by Jacob in Gen. 48:16, when addressing the sons of Joseph he said, "Let my name be called upon them, and the name of my Father Abraham and Isaac." Now notice here we have the same singular number, name. Let my name and the name of my Father Abraham and Isaac; not the names of my father Abraham and Isaac, but the name, singular number. I said, "What is the one name of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob?" There would have to be according to what my opponent said. He lit up in his seat like he wanted to answer. I said, "You want to answer?" He said, "Yes." I said, "What is it?" He said, "Israel." His brethren clapped their hands. I said, "Didn't you know that Abraham was dead many years before the name Israel was ever given? Abraham had been dead many years before the name Israel was ever given, and yet you say that is the name of Abraham. You are an inspired man and didn't know that." He actually claimed to be inspired as the Apostle Paul, and yet didn't know that Abraham died many years before the name Israel was given. Just two or three more points briefly.

Vernon L. Barr, Pensacola, Florida, 1952, endeavored to find Baptist church in the Bible. I had written it on the blackboard Baptist church and Baptist churches, church of Christ and Churches of Christ, and I put the passages Rom. 16:16 parallel with churches of Christ, and insisted that he place a passage on the board that contained either a Baptist church or Baptist churches. Now I had proposed it for many of his brethren through the years, and nobody had ever put a reference on the board. A passage that refers to either a Baptist church or Baptist churches, I will take both of them. I said maybe Mr. Barr can find it. None of his brethren ever have. I pleaded with them over and over to give me the passage, no man has ever written it on the board. He came back in his next speech and said, "I'll do it." He went over and wrote down a passage, I Cor. 1:1-2. There were a number of young people in their teens sitting back in the audience, a group of them that had come from some of the Baptist churches, some of the localities, and they really cheered. They thought "our man certainly found it. After all these others failed, our man found it," seemed to be their idea. So I came to it, and I said, "Well, I guess I have been wrong all these years. I have been contending there is no such statement in the book of God, no mention made of the Baptist church or Baptist churches, but Mr. Barr has found it. I'll have to apologize, I guess I have been wrong. Let's turn and read it and see." I opened up my book,

read it, and Paul addressed his letter unto the church of God which is at Corinth. "Now maybe I am mistaken. Is that it? Is that it? Maybe I have been wrong, let's see, yes, unto the Baptist church which is at Corinth. That's what it says. No, my book doesn't say that, maybe I have the wrong book, let me have yours, Mr. Barr. " So I picked up his and read it, and it wasn't in his either. It did not contain Baptist church or Baptist churches, but merely the church of God which is at Corinth. And the "Quibble Backfired" on him there.

Some other things in connection with that which I shall mention tomorrow. Now one other point.

Now this was very rich. It occurred in a discussion near where I live, with Mr. John L. Causey, 1951. At the beginning of that debate, Mr. Causey threatened me with some fun when I came to the word Christian. I was curious to know what it would be. So I introduced the matter early in order to find out what it was. I showed the statement made in the book of God regarding Christian, that Agrippa said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch. "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed. " I waited for his reaction. He finally came to it in his closing speech that night, and said, "Now for the word Christian. If you want to insist on calling yourselves Christians, then here it is." He said that the word Christian comes from the Greek word Christianos. Which comes from the Greek word Christos, which means Christ, which comes from the Greek word Creo which means to anoint with oil. And the word Christian therefore means those who are anointed with oil. "And if you insist on calling yourselves Christians, I am going to call you 'oilers' instead of Christians.

I came to it right at the close of my final speech that night, he was leading at that particular time. I said, "Before I close, I come to that statement he made regarding the meaning of the word Christian from the Greek words and the significance that they had, that the word Christian means one anointed with oil, and I turned to him and I said, "John, I want to ask you a question. John, are you a Christian?" (long pause) And I waited, and John turned red. I said, "John, are you a Christian? I think this audience ought to know. I want to know. John, are you a Christian?" He said, "I'll tell you tomorrow night." I said, "Fine, I'll not let you forget about it. " And so the next night I reminded him of it, and insisted that he tell us whether or not he was a Christian. And he finally got to it. He said, "Well, I have not been anointed with oil." I said, "Now you good Baptist people out there, don't you ever fall out with me and my brethren if we say you are not a Christian; John L. Causey says YOU ARE not.

He says he has not been anointed with oil, so he is not a Christian. That is what the word means. At that time, he was the editor of a paper published by his brethren. I had some copies of it, and I picked it up and read some statements from it. Here was an obituary telling of the death of Mrs. Bogard, Ben M. Bogard's mother. And telling about her funeral service, the paper said that she was a consecrated Christian. That means that she was consecrated by being anointed with oil. And in the same paper there was an article based upon Christian education. That meant, of course, telling people how to take a bath in oil.

"QUIBBLES THAT BACKFIRED" (3)

Some brother suggested to me yesterday that instead of calling these "Quibbles That Backfired", I might call them "Dodges that Backfired", and that when a Dodge backfires, it is because it has bad points.

Regarding the book club that Brother Cope just mentioned, the first book mentioned on the card handed out is the Porter - Myers Debate. Mr. Meyers is a representative of the Pentecostal Church of God, with headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee, of the H. L. Chester group. It is a written discussion, one for which he challenged, and requested that he be allowed to publish it in book form. It is unlike any other debate that has ever been published, as far as I know. Not because of the men involved, or the superiority of the men concerned, but because of the nature of the discussion. Mr. Myers affirmed that the church known as the Church of Christ today was founded by Alexander and Thomas Campbell and Barton W. Stone at the beginning of the nineteenth century. That is not the exact wording of it, but that's the idea involved. I then affirmed that the church is the exclusive New Testament church that was established on the first Pentecost after Christ arose. The length of the articles found in the book make it equivalent to a four session debate delivered orally. It is a book of some 240 pages, I believe, and the retail price of it is \$3.00, so the club members would get it at a 20 per cent discount, which will be \$2.40. You send the money after you get the book, and I don't have the books with me. I will mail them to you when I get home, if you care to sign for membership.

In reference by Brother Needham to the PhD degree, and other degrees, reminded me of a little limerick I wrote one time, and somewhere along the line in the publication of these books, I plan a book of poetry. I have some compositions that have been proclaimed by men high in the literature world as containing poetry. I don't know. But the little limerick I composed one time concerning evolution ran like this: "Said the monkey as he climbed among the trees, to his off-spring who were hunting for some fleas, 'If you will exercise your mind, then a billion years will find your descendants flashing PhD degrees.' "

I have taken up "Quibbles that Backfired" because I wanted to call attention to a number of them, of course. By nature of the fact that we got started late and because of unavoidable circumstances, we have been having to cut down somewhat on the length of the speeches, therefore, I shall not be able to present all that I had prepared for this time. I will, therefore, run through and select some here and there and get before you those

which time will allow.

In my debate with Mr. F. S. Gipson, in Mangram, Arkansas, in 1934, in other debates with other men on other occasions since, this quibble was made, and you have heard it all of your life. The man who is made a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, makes a confession of his faith in the Lord and starts on his way to be baptized, is accidentally killed before he gets there. A limb falls on him, or something of that kind. If a man gets killed on his way to be baptized, will he go to heaven or hell? What is to be the condition of that man? My reply was, "I suppose he is in the same condition as that man who is penitent at the mourner's bench and trying to pray through to salvation. Before he gets through he smothers to death.

Mr. W. A. Ida, in Washburn, Missouri, in referring to John 3:5 in which the Lord stated that a man must be born of the water and the spirit or he could not enter into the kingdom of God, declared that the Lord referred to the natural birth. That this was the thing involved and that we had no passage here to indicate anything about the importance of baptism. That the Lord simply meant the natural birth. In response, I told him according to the science of obstetrics, there was such thing known as a dry birth, and in that case, I wonder where the child would go, not having been born of water.

In meeting W. H. Little, at Troup, Texas, he constantly referred to me as "Brother" Porter. I called him "Elder" Little, or "Mr." Little. He made some objection to it. He thought if he called me brother, I ought to call him brother, not simply "Mr." or "Elder." I told him that I did not intend any discourtesy about the matter, but I remember the Lord said one time about some matters, "That whosoever does the will of my Father, the same is my mother, brother, and sister." "And I don't consider that you have done it. And therefore, I do not address you as brother, but I want to be fair about it. I tell you what I will do. I will call you cousin, if you want me to. We have two characters of the New Testament, Jesus and John the Baptist, who were cousins. I am following Jesus, you are following John. So I will call you cousin.

Now I would not want to slight entirely all of my brethren in these "Quibbles that Backfired". So I am going to pay a little attention to some of those as we go along with some others, we shall get back to the denominational world presently. Brother Needham, who preceded me, had a number of things to say re-

garding the promotions of Benevolent Societies to do the work of the church, and various things of that nature. You are aware of the fact that there have been a number of discussions between brethren upon these matters. In the course of these discussions I met Brother Guy N. Woods in two discussions and Brother Roy Deaver in one. My first debate with Brother Woods was held at Indianapolis, Indiana. It had hardly gotten under way in his first speech until he tried to classify me, and try to identify me, with the Ketcherside group, and with Brother Garrett. And so he claimed I had something in common with him, and began to endeavor to prejudice the minds of the brethren because of that. When I came to the stand I said, "Brother Woods, do you have anything in common with Leroy Garrett?" From his seat he said, "Not a thing on earth that I know of." I said, "Leroy opposes missionary societies in evangelism. Do you?" But those who are aware of the statements made by Brother Woods in days gone by will recall that in the Abilene lectures of 1939, in the annual lesson commentary published by the Gospel Advocate in 1946, Brother Woods made a number of statements regarding human institutions to do the work of the church. He opposed any such organizations, charitable organizations, benevolent organizations, or anything of that kind to do the work that God designed the church to do. And he said, and I am not giving the exact quotations, but at least the thought that he could never appreciate the idea that some brethren could see grave danger in missionary societies, and yet scruple not to form similar organizations to do the benevolent work of the church, or to care for orphans. Since he in that debate was endeavoring to defend benevolent organizations in the work of benevolence for the church, I asked him to what organizations did he refer. When back in those days gone by, he said he could not understand that situation. What kind of organization did he oppose that was similar to the missionary society that brethren had established to do the benevolent work of the church? His answer was, "The Christian Women's Board of Missions." Now anybody that knows anything at all about that knows that is simply and purely a quibble. Brother Woods had no such reference in that statement, because he knew as well as I knew, as much as I told the audience at that time, that the Women's Christian Board of Missions did not see a grave danger in missionary societies. That was the very thing they were promoting. And he had no reference to them; he had reference to somebody that opposed missionary societies, now who were they? He has not told me until this day, except for that quibble.

At Paragould he came up with this quibble, and it has been used some more in days since. "The church performs its duty

and the home performs its duty. That there is no rival between them, and therefore the support of our present institutional homes is perfectly alright and scriptural. The duty or the function of the church is to furnish the money. The duty of the home is to provide the care. And when the church furnishes the money for the care and the needy, it has completed its work. And then the home takes over and does its work. There is no rivalry between them; the home is not doing the work of the church. I said, "Brother Woods, in days gone by, when you opposed human organizations to do the work of the church, what did you oppose? Did you oppose their raising the money? Was that what they were doing?" No, he was not opposing that. The fact was they were NOT raising the money. The churches were raising the money, and they were SPENDING it. And so, it was merely a quibble that he used on that occasion to get out of a hole that he had gotten into.

Now this one argument has done more to confuse the minds of some brethren, judging from their confessionals which they have made through the papers, than any other argument that has been produced. That the church is the church and the home is the home. God did not authorize the church to function as the home. The church cannot therefore provide, except to furnish the funds for the care of the needy. And this has been echoed and re-echoed throughout the brotherhood by everyone who has taken up the fight in defense of human institutions.

At Dumas, Texas, when I met brother Roy Deaver, this came out a little fuller than on other occasions. And he insisted definitely that the home is doing its work and the church is doing its work, that the church has its function; the home has its function. And he said the church's duty is to provide the funds. The duty of the home is to provide the care. And he declared that one cannot do the work of the other, that God never intended for the church to function as a home. If the church functioned, as a home, if the church tries to provide the care, it functions as a home, the church becomes a home, and God did not intend for it to do that. The only thing the church can do is to provide the funds, then its work ceases. The home takes over and provides the care and is performing its own work, and no conflicting or overlapping between the two.

And I said in response to that, "I am sure that God never intended for the church to function as a home, that the church is not a home. Furthermore, I do not believe that the church is an automobile. I do not believe the church is a train. I do not believe that the church is a gospel meeting. But I believe the church can provide an automobile to take a preacher to a train

to get him to a place to conduct a gospel meeting. When the church does, that, the church does not become an automobile. And it doesn't become a train and it does not become a gospel meeting. And I do not believe the church is a bus, but I believe the church can provide a bus to transport people to and from services, who are in need of such transportation. When the church provides a bus, I do not believe the church ceases to be a church and becomes a bus. Along that same idea, I am sure that a church can provide a shelter, and food and clothing for people in need without becoming a home. The church is not a home. But now he said the church provides the funds, the home provides the care. This is the most ridiculous quibble and contains no argument whatsoever that brethren have taken in defense of human organizations, and who on earth anybody has ever been deceived by it is a puzzle to me. Now let us look at it. The church provides the funds. That means what? I am going to draw a rectangle here (draws on blackboard.) And in that rectangle, I am going to write: pennies, nickels, dimes and dollars. And here is the work of the church. The church provides the funds; the church provides the pennies, the nickels, the dimes, and the dollars. And then the home takes over and does its work, performs its functions. The home does what? The home feeds, clothes, bathes, spansks. And they say the church cannot do this. The church cannot feed a person in destitute circumstances, the church cannot clothe, bathe, the church cannot SPANK. The homes do this. It's the duty of the home. And if the church does this, then the church has invaded the function of the home. The church ceases to be a church and becomes a home. And that was the contention all along. So I drew me a chart something like this. The church cannot do this (pointing at lower rectangle.) If the church does this, it invades the function of the home, and it becomes a home. And I said, "Brother Deaver, can the home do this? (pointing to top rectangle.) Can the home provide any pennies, nickels, dimes or dollars? If it does, then on the basis of that argument or quibble, it becomes a church. The home ceases to be a home and becomes a church. If the church becomes a home when it provides this (lower rectangle) then the home becomes a church when it provides this (top rectangle.) Brother Deaver, tell us whether or not the home can provide pennies, nickels, dimes and dollars. Any kind of home, because they made it mean any kind of home, private home, or any other kind of home. Can it do this? And upon the basis of that argument, the home, a private home, or any other kind of home cannot provide a penny, a nickel, a dime, or dollar into the care for the needy. The only thing it can do is to administer the care. I wonder where the church would get the money in the first place. All the

All the money the church might provide in the first place must COME from the home. And that would cut out benevolence all together." Brother Deaver's reply was, "Brother Porter, I thought that you understood that their duties overlapped." I said, "I did, but that is what I am trying to get you to see." Well, so much for that.

I met brother H. C. Welch of Texas a few years ago at Charleston, West Virginia. Brother Welch is identified and was at that time, with what we know as the anti-Bible class brethren, and the one-cup brethren, that is, the brethren that insist on having only one drinking vessel in the communion service. We were discussing during this debate those two issues. That is, we were to discuss those two issues. But the second part of it, the part that concerned the communion service was never finished. In fact, the first speech was never finished. They wouldn't let me make it. They finally closed the debate to keep me from making the argument that I started to make. It was never finished. But on the first half of it regarding the Bible class teaching, we had that part of the discussion. He insisted, as brethren know their position along the line, that all teaching must be done in an undivided assembly. There must be one assembly, there must be only one teacher. Therefore, our Bible class work transgresses the law of God, goes contrary to I Corinthians in matters of that kind regarding one teacher for one assembly. During the course of that discussion, brother Welch made the argument or the statement that, "I believe that a Bible class is an assembly. Now Porter will deny that. When he comes to the stand, he will deny that a Bible class is an assembly, but I believe that a Bible class is an assembly." Well, when I took the stand, I said, "Brother Welch, I am sorry that I am going to have to disappoint you. I am going to agree with you. I am going to agree with you that a Bible class is an assembly, and I will shake hands with you if you want me to." He said, "You mean a church assembly?" I said, "Well, if it is made up of members of the church, we will call it a church assembly." He said, "All right, we'll shake hands." So we shook hands that a Bible class is an assembly. If they are members of the church, then a church assembly, I said, "Now Brother Welch, since we have agreed that a Bible class is an assembly, I also believe that two Bible classes are two assemblies. Do you want

to shake again?" And he began to backup. Of course, he had already admitted in the statement he made that we did not violate I Cor. 14:31, that we had only one teacher for one assembly, if we had two Bible classes and two teachers; ten Bible classes, ten teachers; and still no violation of his argument whatsoever.

I debated brother J. Ervin Waters on two occasions. He is also identified with the same group of brethren. One of these is in book form, the one held in Quincy, Illinois. It was in that debate that we were discussing the matter of the communion service, and he was contending that in the administrations of the fruit of the vine, only one drinking vessel can be used in serving the congregation. Well, during the course of it, I asked brother Waters (and I respect brother Waters highly; he is a very brilliant man; and a very fine debater) the question: If serving the congregation the fruit of the vine from one drinking vessel, the cup should accidentally be dropped, and it's contents spilled, how would you serve the rest of the congregation? If you get another cup and finish it up, why you use two cups instead of one; you have part of the congregation served from cup, and another part from another drinking vessel. How would you serve the rest of them? Brother Waters said (and you can verify it by reading the book in print,) "I would get another cup and serve the entire congregation."

"You mean you would serve all those who had already taken of it, you would go and serve the whole thing again?"

"Yes, I would serve the entire congregation," he said. And he said, "Brother Porter, if you were baptizing a man, and because of a slippery ground, or in some way, you lost your balance, you failed to get the man under, and had him only partly buried, what would you do? Would you baptize the whole man, or just baptize the part that you had not baptized?" I said, "Well, in that case, brother Waters, I would baptize the whole man. But I will tell you what I would not do. If I had baptized a number of them right before him, I wouldn't bring them back and baptize them again. "He had one speech that followed that. That was my last speech of the debate. I never had another privilege of responding to what he said in the closing speech, but some day I may. In the closing speech he said, "Brother Porter the difference is this: In baptizing, the man is the unit, but in the communion service, the congregation is the unit." That was the quibble that he followed the other quibble with, and I did not have a chance to explode it. But upon the basis of that, the whole congregation must commune. The whole congregation must take the Lord's supper before anyone has done it. And if by some reason or the other, one may be forced to leave the audience, if a per-

son becomes sick and has to leave and cannot stay for the communion service, the others just as well dismiss and go home, because regardless of what they do, the unit has not done it. I will get to make that someday, maybe.

Now back to the denominational situation, in 1936, when I met Mr. H. A. Thompson in Weatherford, Texas, we were discussing Rom. 6:3-4 about burying the man. He claimed a man is raised in newness of life before he is buried in baptism. I claimed that we buried a dead, then he is raised to walk in newness of life. During the course of it, we had a great deal to say about burying the dead man as a live man, which man are you burying, and so on. On the last night of the discussion, he gave me a written question and said, "Mr. Porter, if you bury a dead man, is it not true that you become a religious undertaker instead of a gospel preacher?" I said, "Maybe so. But if I bury a live man, then I would be a religious murderer. I think I had rather be a religious undertaker."

In the last debate I had with Mr. Vernon Barr, in McGhee, Arkansas, which was held in 1956, while we were discussing the subject of the possibility of apostasy, Mr. Barr came up with this idea. He said, "Vernon Barr is not as good as God. Vernon Barr would not send one of Vernon Barr's children to hell. I wouldn't send my child to hell, and I know that God is better than Vernon Barr. Therefore, I know that God wouldn't send his child to hell." I responded, "Mr. Barr, would you send my child to hell? Well, upon that basis of that argument, God wouldn't send the Devil's child to hell either."

A few of these I just must get in before I close.

In debating Mr. J. Frank Crosswell, at Cushing, Oklahoma, in 1930, Mr. Crosswell represented the people known as the Christian Adventists, or the First Day Adventists. They hold the same position regarding materialism as the 7th Day Adventists, but they disagree upon the day question. And they keep the 1st day of the week, or use the first day of the week as the day of worship to God. We were discussing the immortality of the soul, or, the matter of man being wholly mortal and unconscious between death and the resurrection. I had given some passages regarding Paul being absent from the body, 2 Cor. 5:6-8; willing to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. Paul showed that when he was absent from the body, he was **PRESENT WITH THE LORD**. And yet, if Paul went out of existence when he died, how could he be present with the Lord when absent from the body? Mr. Crosswell said, "Well, it so happens

that the term 'body' there means church, that the Lord referring to the body said it is the church; the body is the church, and Paul is talking about the church being absent from the body; the body is the church." I told him, "Well, in that case, Paul is indicating that the church is all going to hell. When he gets to heaven, he is going to be ABSENT from all the rest of them. No-body will get to heaven but him."

In my debate with Marvin Hicks in Lufkin, Texas in 1957, while discussing the question of miraculous gifts, powers of healing, and things of that nature, I told Mr. Hicks that I was a victim of a very rare blood malady, known as polysythemavera. If you cannot remember that, just call it erasothrytosis and do just as well. Though a blood malady that has always been fatal, and in 1942, I was given by medical science only two years to live. But thanks to the advancement of medical science, and the development of the atomic bomb, they developed the isotopes to be used for medical purposes. I became one of the "guinea pigs" of the doctor in California who discovered the remedy. My life was spared. It has not been cured; I have to make annual trips to California for my examinations and treatment from my doctors. Now, if you have the powers you claim you have, heal my malady. I am the victim of polysythemia, give me healing. " He said, "Mr. Porter, if you believe I can heal, I will pray for you. I wouldn't perform a miracle to try to convince an unbeliever. " I wonder why he would try to convince one who was a believer already. But he said, "If you believe that I can do it, I will pray for you." I said then, "You cannot heal me, you will not heal me because you say I am an unbeliever, then I am sure you can do something else. You believe that I am a child of the devil, you said so. You believe that I am an enemy of the righteousness of God; you have said so. And the Apostle Paul in Acts 13, facing Elymas the sorcerer, denounces him as a child of the devil and an enemy of all righteousness. 'Will thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord', and Paul struck him blind. Strike me blind, Mr. Hicks, I am an unbeliever, and you cannot heal me, so strike me blind." Well, he did not make the effort. At least I can still see my way around.

In my debate with Mr. Sherrill, near Marked Tree, Arkansas, in 1940, I asked him the usual line of questions that I have asked Baptist preachers on the question of apostasy. If a child of God can get drunk and commit murder, can a child of God get drunk and die while in the act of murder, and if a child of God should die while drunk and in the act of murder, will he go to heaven anyway? Mr. Sherrill said, "We are talking about chil-

dren of God, we are not talking about murderers, and drunkards and things of that kind. We are talking about children of God. " He said a child of God will not do those things. I said, "Well, how about Noah and David? Do you believe that they are children of God? You have been arguing on other questions that David was saved and he couldn't lose his salvation, just lost the joy of it, and that Noah was saved before he ever went into the Ark, that they are already children of God. Now tell me if you still believe that way--Noah got drunk, and David committed murder. Were they God's children?" He came back in his next speech and said, "Porter, you tell us, were Noah and David children of God? So he did not tell me. So, in my next speech, I said, "Mr. Sherrill, I am going to say YES. I believe they were children of God, now what do YOU say about it?" He kept coming back, and he still would not say. And finally he made his last speech, and he had given me the last speech of the debate--a very unusual thing, as I mentioned the other night--so in my closing speech, I called his attention to it again. I said, "Mr. Sherrill, I have been trying to get you, ever since this was introduced, to tell me whether you believe whether or not Noah and David were God's children. Noah got drunk; David committed murder. You haven't answered my question." He said, "I did answer it," he spoke from his seat. I said, "You did?" He said, "Yes sir, I answered it." I said, "I don't remember what you said. What DID YOU SAY?" He said, "You know what I said." I said, "No, I don't recall that you said anything. You came back and asked me if I believed they were God's children, and I told you yes, but you never told me what you believed about it. I want to know what you said. If there is anybody in the house who remembers hearing Mr. Sherrill answer that question regardless of who you may be, hold up your hand." I looked around over the audience, and back down over here, one elderly lady was holding up her hand, the only one in the entire audience. I said, "Lady, you heard Mr. Sherrill answer the question?" She said, "Yes." I said, "What did he say?" She said, "I don't remember exactly what he said, I don't remember his exact words." I said, "Well, did he say they were God's children?" She said, "Yes." I stooped down, and said, "Elder Sherrill, do you remember saying that?" And he began to turn red, and the audience began to laugh, and the more they laughed, the redder he got. Brother Joe Blue was moderating for me, and he reached over to him and said, "The fool woman, she ought to stay out of this."

I just have time to give you a few more, and then I must close.

In my debate with Brother Julian Hunt of the Christian church, one of the very conservatives of the Christian church group, in a discussion which we had in Lexington, Kentucky, back in 1956, we were discussing the matter of instrumental music. He introduced a number of scriptures, and he had an argument which ran something like this: Things mentioned in the New Testament are for three purposes—either to approve, to condemn, or to neutralize, whatever that meant. Those were the three points of his argument. Things were introduced either to condemn, approve or to neutralize. And he gave a few instances in which the term music is mentioned in the New Testament, in which it was condemned, and all the others, he gave as examples of approval. And among those by which he had the matter of approval stamped to it was found in Revelation 18, where he found the harpers and trumpets, and those making music on the trumpets and harps, and so on. Here is something that God approved. Here is instrumental music. I said, "Julian, did you not know that in Revelation 18 there are harps, trumpets, and all that he saw were in Babylon? And that in the very beginning of that chapter, Babylon is described as the hold of every unclean beast and defiled thing, foul spirit and things of that kind? And yet you say there is the authority for music in the church." He came back and said, "Yes, I knew that. Certainly Babylon represents the apostate church and Catholicism. I know that. But, the statement says that the sound of the trumpet shall be heard no more at all in her, and God took instruments out of Babylon where they did not belong and placed them in the church where they did belong." I said, "Well, in that very same chapter, the statement is made that the light of the candle shall be seen no more in all of thee. Of course, I guess the candles, the Catholics have that in the wrong place, and we can take that from the Catholic church and put it in the church of the Lord, because the candle light is not to be seen any more there. And furthermore, the voice of the bride and bridegroom shall be heard no more at all in thee. Be no more marrying in the Catholic church, not only the priests, but all of it is to be taken away from that point." He came back in his next speech and said, "Brother Porter, I am astonished that you did not know that the Bridegroom was the Lord. The Lord is the Bridegroom." I said, "The very idea, the Lord, the bridegroom, and the Lord in Babylon, the Lord in the Catholic church?" He said, "Yes, the church went into apostasy and the Lord went with it. But He came out in the days of the reformation movement when Luther began to prevail in his opposition to Catholicism. He came out with Martin Luther." The Lord stayed in apostasy a long, long time.

One more thing, and I shall close. In Pensacola, Florida, in 1952, my debate with Mr. Vernon L. Barr. I had written on the blackboard that to which I called to your attention a number of times regarding the church; churches of Christ, and church of Christ (Rom. 16:16,) Baptist church and Baptist churches, and a line drawn for him to put a passage on one or the other. When Paul said "churches of Christ" he used the plural number, but the plural comprehends the singular. Of course he was making his fight that it doesn't say "the church of Christ" in the singular number. But I mentioned the fact that it did not say Baptist church or Baptist churches, singular or plural. If he would find either of them, I would take the other. Find the singular, I would take the plural; find the plural, I would take the singular. Find either of them, on Romans 16:16, he said, "You fellows are always talking about the name of the church." he said that Churches of Christ is not a name. I know nobody who claimed it was a proper name in the sense that a denomination may be named. But it is a designation by which the church is described, by which it is called, along with a number of other designations, and I am willing to take any that is found in the Bible. And he said, "In Romans 16:16, the churches of Christ salute you, the only thing on earth that means is that it belongs to Christ. It denotes possession." Nobody that I knew of ever denied that it denoted possession, or that it indicated that it belonged to Christ. So he said that simply means that it belongs to Christ. "You fellows are so concerned about the name, you remind me of an incident one time when a train pulled into a railroad station, a little colored boy came down the platform selling sandwiches. He said, 'Hot po'k sandwiches', 'hot po'k sandwiches.' The fellow stuck his head out the window of the car in which he was riding, and said, 'Here son, let me have one.' So he bought it, he paid him for it, and when he unwrapped it the thing was as cold as a cucumber. He called him back and said, 'Look here what you sold me. You said this was a hot pork sandwich. This sandwich is as cold as a wedge.' He said, 'Yas suh. That's just the name of them.' " Well, I had to reply. So I came back to the stand, and I said, "Mr. Barr, about that time another colored boy came down from the other end of the platform selling the sandwiches. He was hollering 'Sandwiches of po'k, sandwiches of po'k.' And the fellow thought he would try that. So he bought one and paid the boy for it, and unwrapped it, and it was two slices of bun, and a big wad of hog's hair between. He called the boy back and said, 'Look here son, what you sold me. You said this was a sandwich of pork.' He said, 'Dat don't mean nutin', 'cept it jus' belongs to de hog.'"